

are subject to deduction because of the earnings limitation.

H.R. 14828. July 22, 1976. International Relations. Authorizes the President to regulate the privileges and immunities of foreign diplomatic missions and their personnel, in a manner consistent with the international agreements.

Requires the President to periodically publish a list of permanent foreign diplomatic missions and the personnel thereof.

Declares void any judicial writ or process against a person or the property of any person entitled to immunity from suit or process under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

H.R. 14829. July 22, 1976. Banking, Currency and Housing. Creates the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, the Self-Help Development Fund, and the Cooperative Bank and Assistance Administration to assist the formation and growth of consumer and other types of self-help cooperatives.

H.R. 14830. July 22, 1976. Post Office and Civil Service. Directs the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to reduce the reporting burden on respondents to the 1979 agricultural census.

Continues in effect the statistical classification of farms which was in effect on June 30, 1976, on and after the effective date of this Act.

Requires that such classifications for the 1979 and later censuses include establish-

ments which sell or would normally sell more than a minimum value of agricultural products.

H.R. 14831. July 22, 1976. Appropriations. Rescinds, pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, specified budget authority contained in the message of the President of July 1, 1976 (H. Doc. 94-542), and in the communication of the Comptroller General of July 15, 1976 (H. Doc. 94-556), for salaries and expenses of the Office of Drug Abuse Policy.

H.R. 14832. July 22, 1976. Interior and Insular Affairs. Requires that electric power in the southwestern power area be sold at agreed points of delivery and at uniform, nondiscriminatory rates.

Stipulates that agreed points of delivery shall not be changed unilaterally by the Secretary of the Interior.

H.R. 14833. July 22, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the medicare program of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for services furnished by physician extenders.

H.R. 14834. July 22, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to increase the percentage standard deduction to an amount equal to 20 percent of adjusted gross income but not to exceed (1) \$3,000 in the case of a joint return or a surviving spouse, (2) \$2,500 in the case of an unmarried individual, or (3) \$1,500 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return.

H.R. 14835. July 22, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow deductions with respect to the amortization of rehabilitation expenditures for historic structures, with respect to the depreciation of expenditures in substantially rehabilitating other property, and with respect to charitable contributions of partial interests in property for conservation purposes.

H.R. 14836. July 22, 1976. Armed Services. Directs the Administrator of General Services to purchase property suitable for use as a training facility for the Texas National Guard and to exchange such property presently held by the Texas National Guard.

H.R. 14837. July 22, 1976. Ways and Means. Amends the program of Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled of the Social Security Act to permit the exclusion of up to \$240 per year of income from a veteran's pension in computing the veteran's income for the purpose of determining his or her eligibility for supplemental security income benefits.

H.R. 14838. July 22, 1976. Judiciary. Authorizes classification of certain individuals as the natural-born alien daughter and grandchildren of a certain U.S. citizen for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 14839. July 22, 1976. Judiciary. Authorizes the admission of a certain individual to the United States for permanent residence.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SONS WRITE MOVING TRIBUTE TO THEIR LATE FATHER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, recently, I received a thank you card from a Cleveland family whom I have been close to for many years. This card contained a simple but moving message from Richard and Tillman Bauknight to their beloved father, Butler Bauknight, who recently passed away.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to share this tribute with you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives. I would also like to ask you to join with me in offering our sincerest condolences to Mr. Butler Bauknight's wife, Connie, and their two sons.

Therefore, I am submitting to you this message entitled "A Memorial Tribute to a Man . . . Butler Bauknight." It is a fitting legacy to a proud and gentle man:

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO A MAN . . . BUTLER BAUKNIGHT

We are gathered here today to pay our tribute to one who has been called from labor to reward. We will not forget him . . . nor his deed . . . nor his teachings . . . nor his love for all men of good will . . . nor his compassion for any man, woman, or child in need. Although he never was a man of wealth he gave to all . . . he gave that which no one could ever, ever buy . . . he gave Butler Bauknight . . . he gave quietly . . . he gave willingly . . . he gave love. To all who entered his home it was his pleasure to serve, to feed, to make welcome . . . no one was a stranger, in his home.

Butler Bauknight was a very proud man, a man's man, a man, as his sons, respect-

ed, honored, obeyed and shall eternally love. His life was completely devoted to the comfort and security of his wife and his family. With all due respect to the words, devoted and dedicated to his family, Dad walked tall among all men.

He gave respect to all and he demanded and commanded respect in return from all. Dad was small in size, yet he casted a giant shadow.

As we listen to the song (Trees), which was one of his favorites, we think lovingly of Butler Bauknight, we think of "what he instilled in us at a very early age, to set our goals as high as the tallest building".

He taught us that the word "cannot" was strictly forbidden because there was nothing impossible if one would just set his mind to it and ask God's help. Thus, he inspired many of his friends and many of our friends to find success in life. He did it by simply telling them. . . . "You Can Make It" . . . and they did. Many of us who were inspired by Dad are gathered here today and I just want you to know that he was proud of you . . . and he loved us all. Although Butler, at age 13, was deprived by death of his parents love and inspiration . . . yet he gave both to us all.

We of his blood and we of his family, shall greatly miss . . . but never . . . forget the man called Butler.

In closing our family would like to thank the Clergy, and all who helped to sustain us with your prayers, we also thank the Physicians and Nurses who cared for Dad during his illness and our very special thanks to Doc McCampbell who was always there for the past 26 years. We thank and love all of Dad's neighbors and friends. To him . . . to you . . . we feel honored to hereby recommit our lives . . . today . . . to his teachings and principles.

Finally, to all those who have "asked" please let me know if there is anything I can do? . . . we now ask you each to join us in our living tribute to Butler . . . just do something for someone in need . . . and then . . . just quietly smile . . . and walk away. . . .

Peace to you . . . with love . . . from the sons of . . . Butler Bauknight.

RUSSELL J. CAMERON

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in some quarters the Congress of the United States has been the subject of criticism for alleged lack of responsiveness to the real and pressing needs of the country. This allegation has been heard especially in the field of energy. What these critics do not seem to understand is that there are no easy, simple answers to the many complex questions facing this Nation as we attempt to meet our energy requirements and balance these needs with the other demands on our resources, technology, and especially our environment.

But, Mr. Speaker, a charge of being unresponsive implies a lack of communication. This is totally and completely untrue. As one example, since the beginning of this Congress, the Committee on Science and Technology, which I have the privilege to chair, has been considering one of the most important issues facing this Government in the field of energy. That is: How, when and in what manner shall America make use of its great potential energy supply from synthetic sources, primarily gas from coal and petroleum products from oil shale?

Mr. Speaker, during this last 18 months my committee has held countless hearings, reviewed mounds of testimony and studies, and produced a bill, H.R. 12112, which will soon be before this House to

let it work its will. In order to produce this bill we did communicate with our people. I believe we were responsive to the advice and concerns expressed to us by very knowledgeable and responsible citizens of different views.

I am very sad to relate to the House that one of the most able and knowledgeable men it has been my pleasure to know during this period has been recently and suddenly stricken with a very serious illness and is now receiving medical care in the M. D. Anderson Tumor Clinic in Houston in my State of Texas. That man is Mr. Russell J. Cameron, a native of Texas, but who has spent most of his adult life in Colorado. Mr. Cameron has devoted his life to the proper and wise development of natural resources. He has been extremely helpful to not only my committee but to others in bringing to bear his great expertise and patience as we considered the difficult issues of public policy before this Congress. I believe that even those who disagreed with Mr. Cameron's views respect his candor, integrity and knowledge. Russ Cameron has been a great and good example of what individual citizens can do to have an impact on the public policymaking procedure in our free system of government, especially the legislative process. I think there will be a meaningful and successful synthetic fuels industry in the United States one day and the contribution of citizens like Russ Cameron will have been largely responsible for this achievement. I also submit that this success represents a responsiveness on the part of Congress that is real and sensitive to the critical energy needs of our country as we strive for adequacy and security of fuel resources.

On behalf of my colleagues I want to express my best wishes to Russ and his family and to wish him well in his current battle. He is a steadfast fighter of great courage and conviction who is widely respected by those of us in these halls of Congress who know him.

CHIEF JUSTICE PATRICK BRETT
O'SULLIVAN

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to a great statesman, a dedicated public servant and one of Connecticut's outstanding citizens. It is particularly appropriate that the Honorable Patrick Brett O'Sullivan receive recognition at this time and place, for this is the eve of the birthday celebration of a man who served in this body more than 50 years ago and has piled accomplishment upon accomplishment ever since.

More affectionately known in his home town of Derby, Conn., and elsewhere in his native State as "P. B." O'Sullivan, the former U.S. Representative, Chief Justice of the Connecticut Supreme Court, leader of the Connecticut Democratic Party and indefatigable public servant

has been a source of inspiration to thousands who have admiringly watched his long and successful career.

"P. B." began that career as corporation counsel to the city of Derby in 1913 and in the same year became secretary-treasurer of the Connecticut Democratic Committee. He was elected to the Connecticut State Senate in 1916, only to resign the following year to enlist in the U.S. Navy and serve abroad the U.S.S. *North Dakota* until honorably discharged in 1919.

In 1922, Mr. O'Sullivan was elected to the 68th Congress, serving from 1923 to 1925 representing Connecticut's Fifth District. In fact, he was the only resident of the Lower Naugatuck River Valley to represent our district until I assumed the seat in January 1973, exactly 50 years after "P. B." O'Sullivan took his oath of office. This has been a source of personal pride and satisfaction to me, to have followed in the footsteps of this great son of the Valley.

As his friends and neighbors gather to honor "P. B." O'Sullivan on the occasion of his 89th birthday Wednesday, August 11, I want to add my personal congratulations, and I am sure those of my colleagues in this body, to this great gentleman. May he enjoy continued success, good health and happiness.

CONGRESSIONAL PETITION ON BEHALF OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that 91 of our colleagues have signed a petition to Soviet party leader Leonid Brezhnev urging him to grant fundamental human rights to Soviet Jews.

Congressman JOHN BUCHANAN of Alabama and I circulated this petition in the House of Representatives, but we did not author it. The petition was written by Jewish dissidents inside the Soviet Union and smuggled to the West. An international effort is now underway to gain 1 million signatures on the petition. These congressional endorsements will be added to others from around the world.

The congressional petition, however, is particularly important. It will express to Soviet leaders our concern over the continued persecution of Russian Jews, which is in flagrant violation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accord.

Among those signing the petition are all six House Members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was established by this Congress to oversee the Helsinki Accord.

We intend to deliver the petition to the Soviet Embassy at noon on Thursday.

The text of the petition and the names of those signing it follow:

PETITION ON BEHALF OF SOVIET JEWRY TO LEONID BREZHNEV, FIRST SECRETARY, CPSU

We, people of different races, religions, and political persuasions share a profound belief in the need to create permanent peace and

mutual trust among the nations. We also consider that the observance of elementary human rights is a fundamental prerequisite to such peace and trust.

Because you approved a new international declaration of human rights, when your Government signed the Helsinki Final Act (1975), we now call upon you to:

1. Free all the Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, who are suffering in labor camps and in prisons for their desire to leave for Israel.

2. Forbid all existing forms of persecution of Jews, who have expressed the wish to unite with their families and their own people.

3. Allow the "refuseniks"—those men, women and children who for years have been deprived of their basic rights and have lived under constant pressure without any means of livelihood—to leave Russia and emigrate.

PETITIONERS

Hon. Bella S. Abzug, New York, Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo, New York, Hon. Jerome A. Ambro, New York, Hon. Bill Archer, Texas, Hon. Les AuCoin, Oregon, Hon. Alphonzo Bell, California, Hon. Tom Beville, Alabama, Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham, New York.

Hon. James J. Blanchard, Michigan, Hon. Edward P. Boland, Massachusetts, Hon. John Breckinridge, Kentucky, Hon. John Buchanan, Alabama, Hon. John B. Conlan, Arizona, Hon. James C. Corman, California, Hon. William R. Cotter, Connecticut, Hon. Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey.

Hon. Christopher J. Dodd, Connecticut, Hon. Thomas J. Downey, New York, Hon. Robert F. Drinan, Massachusetts, Hon. Robert W. Edgar, Pennsylvania, Hon. Don Edwards, California, Hon. Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania, Hon. Dante B. Fascell, Florida, Hon. Millicent Fenwick, New Jersey.

Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., New York, Hon. Walter Flowers, Alabama, Hon. Donald M. Fraser, Minnesota, Hon. Bill Frenzel, Minnesota, Hon. Joseph M. Gaydos, Pennsylvania, Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman, New York, Hon. Gilbert Gude, Maryland, Hon. James M. Hanley, New York.

Hon. Tom Harkin, Iowa, Hon. Michael Harrington, Massachusetts, Hon. Herbert E. Harris II, Virginia, Hon. Elizabeth Holtzman, New York, Hon. Frank Horton, New York, Hon. William J. Hughes, New Jersey, Hon. Jack F. Kemp, New York, Hon. Edward I. Koch, New York.

Hon. John Krebs, California, Hon. John J. LaFalce, New York, Hon. Robert J. Lagomarsino, California, Hon. William Lehman, Florida, Hon. Norman F. Lent, New York, Hon. Clarence D. Long, Maryland, Hon. Stanley N. Lundine, New York, Hon. Matthew F. McHugh, New York.

Hon. Andrew Maguire, New Jersey, Hon. Romano L. Mazzoli, Kentucky, Hon. Edward Mezvinsky, Iowa, Hon. Abner J. Mikva, Illinois, Hon. Joe Moakley, Massachusetts, Hon. Charles A. Mosher, Ohio, Hon. Ronald M. Mottl, Ohio, Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania.

Hon. Henry J. Nowak, New York, Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Massachusetts, Hon. Richard L. Ottinger, New York, Hon. Edward W. Pattison, New York, Hon. Ron Paul, Texas, Hon. Claude Pepper, Florida, Hon. Peter A. Peyser, New York, Hon. Charles B. Rangel, New York.

Hon. Thomas M. Rees, California, Hon. Frederick W. Richmond, New York, Hon. Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan, Hon. Fred B. Rooney, Pennsylvania, Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York, Hon. Edward R. Roybal, California, Hon. Martin A. Russo, Illinois, Hon. Leo J. Ryan, California.

Hon. Jim Santini, Nevada, Hon. Paul S. Sarbanes, Maryland, Hon. James H. Scheuer, New York, Hon. Richard T. Schulze, Pennsylvania, Hon. Stephen J. Solarz, New York, Hon. Fortney H. Stark, California, Hon. Alan Steelman, Texas, Hon. Morris K. Udall, Arizona.

Hon. Henry A. Waxman, California, Hon.

William G. Whitehurst, Virginia, Hon. Charles Wilson, Texas, Hon. Lester L. Wolff, New York, Hon. Antonio Borja Won Pat, Guam, Hon. John W. Wydler, New York, Hon. Sidney R. Yates, Illinois, Hon. C. W. Bill Young, Florida, Hon. Leo C. Zeferetti, New York.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we have recently marked the 18th observance of Captive Nations Week, an occasion of special significance to millions of people throughout the world unwillingly under Communist rule.

It is truly appropriate that this year's commemoration comes so shortly after our Nation's Bicentennial celebration, for the history of our own struggle for self-determination is still fresh in our minds. It is this memory that should encourage us to remain steadfast in our conviction that people everywhere should be permitted to enjoy basic national freedoms and individual liberties.

Recently we witnessed a period of easing tensions between our country and the Soviet Union. The American public, however, viewed this policy with skepticism and became genuinely concerned that we were going too fast and giving up too much. The result of this sentiment has been the elimination of the word "détente" from the official vocabulary, an innocuous move on the surface but one with significant diplomatic implications. Yet although we are pursuing a more subtle course of cooperation with Soviet Russia, Communist hegemony continues. This ongoing threat makes it incumbent upon us to uphold our heritage of a free and open society and champion this cause reasonably and responsibly not only for the captive nations but also for potential victims of oppression.

In our cautious rapprochement with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, we should not be demure in insisting upon guarantees of certain essential rights for the citizenry. We should not hesitate to point out to tyrannical governments that are signatories to international humanistic accords that they are not abiding by the principles embodied in these agreements. We in the Congress should not balk in conditioning certain trade privileges on the right to emigrate. We should continue to press for the release of imprisoned religious leaders and to call for freedom to worship as one chooses.

Such steps are not, as some would have us believe, patent meddling in the internal affairs of another nation. These are affirmative actions aimed at bringing about worldwide awareness of the gross injustices of oppressive states and at encouraging meaningful revisions in the domestic social policies of these governments. For, to act any less emphatically would be a repudiation of our own freedom-loving, freedom-seeking, and freedom-guaranteeing past.

So let us continue to serve as a beacon of liberty to the captured nations and to demonstrate to these peoples that we acknowledge and support their struggle for self-determination.

EXPENSIVE DELAYS IN HOSPITAL COST-SAVING EXPERIMENTS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the 1972 Social Security Amendments, Congress extended the mandate of the Department of HEW to conduct experiments and demonstration projects as a means of finding ways to reduce hospital cost inflation. Part of this authority included experimentation with alternative methods in third-party reimbursement to hospitals, and specifically, prospective reimbursement.

Today, 4 years after the law was passed, few definitive, concrete, conclusions can be drawn from the woefully limited projects that have been conducted.

Everyone has data confirming the fact that hospital costs are increasing at a frightening inflationary rate and that the present third-party reimbursement system is largely responsible for this inflation. However, when we ask for conclusions on the effects of prospective reimbursement on containing costs, few are able to answer.

A high rate of hospital cost inflation is not a new phenomenon, and neither is the idea of prospective reimbursement. It seems to me that by now, some positive conclusions should have been provided regarding a solution to this serious problem, and frankly, I am disappointed that none are forthcoming.

On August 3, the Health Subcommittee, of which I am a member, conducted a hearing to discuss recommendations relating to revisions in the medicare hospital reimbursement system. The subcommittee heard from a parade of witnesses who emphasized the need for more research before we mandate the change to a prospective reimbursement system. Of course, I too agree that before any such major change in health policy is implemented, experimentation is necessary. However, what have HEW and the various hospital and insurance associations been doing these past 4 or 5 years? Why have the people who are now calling for more research not conducted more experiments by now or called more attention to HEW's failure to act?

Calls for future research are often excuses for postponing or delaying hard decisions today. Yet, the witnesses at the August 3 hearing are correct—HEW and the private sector have failed to give us adequate research. The result is a lost opportunity for slowing hospital-cost inflation—a lost opportunity that will cost the American economy billions of dollars in the years ahead.

During the August 3 hearing, the need for further research was reiterated and

emphasized over and over again. John Alexander McMahon, president of the American Hospital Association, testified:

In our view, no single method (of prospective reimbursement) has emerged that has proved satisfactory for general application. Therefore, experimentation should continue, and before the adoption of any system, there should be adequate time for trials and validation of the method so that, if necessary, modification may be made.

However, he said very little on the cost containment efforts that the AHA had conducted to the present. In fact, the hospital association hindered the implementation of the prospective reimbursement system in Maryland, challenging in court the guidelines of the Maryland Health Services Cost Review Commission.

The second witness, Daniel W. Pettigill, representing the Health Insurance Association of America, stated:

Alternative approaches to setting prospective rates not only should be experimented with but also will probably always be necessary because of inherent differences among various health care institutions.

He added:

Indeed, we regret that HEW has not done more in the way of experimenting to find effective approaches to prospective rate setting.

Speaking for the Federation of American Hospitals, Michael D. Bromberg explained that the association supported a "major overhaul" of the present reimbursement system for institutional providers. He continued:

However, we also believe that experimentation on a national basis involving several prospective methods is necessary to determine appropriate long-range systems.

And Mr. Bromberg criticized HEW's limited experimentation under section 222.

In response to a question, Mr. Bromberg described three or four experiments that he would like to be tried, but he gave no indication of what FAH has done to implement them or to have them implemented.

Neil Hollander, vice president for health care services of Blue Cross, lamented:

There isn't enough data covering enough time to provide a basis for analysis or comparison.

He added that prospective programs currently being attempted should be continued:

... at least until enough evidence is collected to determine the best directions for payment programs to take.

The vice chairman of the Maryland Health Services Cost Review Commission, Mr. Marcus Olson, explained the positive results his own commission has obtained in containing costs. He continued:

However, I would not conclude because of this experience that it would necessarily be desirable over the long run and over the whole country to have commission regulation of rates. We should have more experiment along this line and it might prove in the long run that this is good.

Overall, he explained, experience is limited.

Another criticism of HEW came from Mr. Roger Lipitz, president of the National Council of Health Care Services. He stated:

Section 222 of Public Law 92-603 required the Social Security Administration to carry out demonstration projects for innovative reimbursement systems in hospitals and long-term care facilities. Today, four years after the law's enactment, we have no such projects in nursing homes. We, therefore, have no experience or data to draw upon as to the problems involved or cost savings which might result from such systems.

Dr. Thomas Ainsworth, medical director of the Illinois Masonic Medical Center, also expressed the need for further research:

We further suggest that experiments in prospective case rate reimbursement methodology be undertaken before any prospective rate reimbursement program is implemented.

I have listened to all these cries for further research, and I wonder why so little has been done until now. Not only HEW, but also many of the witnesses who have testified, could, themselves, have done more to find a solution to escalating hospital costs.

Although others have to share the blame, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the major culprit in causing delays in experimentation with alternative forms of hospital reimbursement. Congress mandated medicare cost-saving experiments in the 1967 social security amendments and extended that mandate in 1972. Information gathered from two hearings held in May by the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee emphasized the incredible lack of timely and vigorous experimental effort on the part of the Social Security Administration, often caused by a problem of delegating responsibility. A report to be printed by the Oversight Subcommittee details the HEW delays.

While, over and over, representatives of hospitals and insurance companies, and officials of HEW, call for more research, hospital costs continue to rise. Michael Bromberg of the FAH described our predicament very well:

... we do not have the luxury of several more years in which to merely collect data, while continuing to inflate federally funded programs through the use of retrospective cost reimbursement.

I am disappointed by the apparent lack of concern on the part of HEW, and hope that experimentation with prospective reimbursement will be more vigorous from now on. Otherwise, in 10 years, we will still be hearing the need for more research; we will be stuck even further down in the quagmire of our present reimbursement system, while escalating hospital costs bankrupt families and governments alike.

WOMEN UPWARD BOUND

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an exciting program at Metropolitan Community

College in Minneapolis is bringing new opportunities to yet another disadvantaged group—women.

Called Women Upward Bound, this program has had a remarkable success with women who have few educational skills and low economic expectations. In addition to an academic retooling, the program provides participants with child care and other backup social services. But probably most important is its success at reawakening self-confidence. Graduates of the program have gone on to other colleges and vocational schools, and ultimately to new careers in a number of fields they had previously thought far beyond them.

With a little support, this is an idea which could easily be duplicated in many parts of the country. I am appending an article by Geri Joseph which gives further details:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, June 27, 1976]

WOMEN UPWARD BOUND

(By Geri Joseph)

In the heart of the inner city, a success story is happening. Even in livable Minneapolis, the inner city is not a place where success ordinarily thrives, and that would be reason enough for this column. But there is a better reason: The success story is threatened with an unhappy ending.

The story began with two remarkable young women—Mary Pruitt from Pennsylvania and Carol Kilps, whose family farms in Missouri. In 1970, they joined the staff of Metropolitan Community College, a new and non-traditional school on the edge of downtown Minneapolis. In no time at all they became good friends.

Each woman had several degrees in education or counseling. Each had worked by choice in the poverty wasteland of big cities. They knew a lot about the obstacles to learning, but they learned a lot more from the women they came to know as students.

Their students were not the usual collection of young people. They ranged in age from 17 to 60, with the average age around 25. While most were high-school graduates and some had had one or two quarters of college, a few had only gotten through eighth grade. And while several had come from privileged, suburban childhoods, most now barely managed to make ends meet. A number were on welfare.

Yet some inner need, a longing to achieve a better life through their own efforts, sent these women back to school—a flexible, experimental school, to be sure.

Mary Pruitt and Carol Kilps quickly discovered the gamut of problems that are barriers to achievement for so many poor women: Their experience with traditional education had been bad. Many were in dead-end jobs—or had no jobs at all—and lacked skills or training to do anything about it. A substantial number were divorced or separated and carried the whole burden of running a household. And the perennial difficulty of finding adequate day-care services for children was a discouraging hassle.

There was one other big problem—an appalling lack of confidence in their own abilities. Experts in human behavior have observed that away from home and family, many women—not just poor women—lack self-confidence. Blame it on the way they were raised and educated. But if women are to take advantage of opportunities beginning to open up to them, they must develop the self-confidence to reach out and try new things.

That thought was uppermost when Mary Pruitt and Carol Kilps began to talk about a program to provide both psychological sup-

port and academic learning. They haunted libraries, talked with a variety of experts and spent hours with each other talking and planning. By 1974, they had put together their Women Upward Bound project and got it funded through a two-year federal "seed-money" grant of \$25,000.

On paper, the project provides "group and individual counseling, courses in career exploration, academic skill development and readings about the achievements of other women." But that list tells little of the enormous efforts or the contagious spark contributed by the two women. They begged and borrowed from other staff at the college. They helped find part-time jobs and child-care facilities. They acted as intermediaries or advocates with the welfare department. They put students in touch with helpful agencies such as Working Opportunity for Women and Chrysalis.

On the academic side, women students got special aid in such fundamentals as learning how to use the library, getting the most out of a reference book or writing a theme. Besides her teaching, Carol saw 100 to 150 students a quarter for individualized study services. Mary worked with 200 who came to her for counseling two or three times a quarter. A 60-hour week was the usual routine.

Both women have been especially elated with the success of their course on Heritage of the American Woman. Their theory that women students could be encouraged, even inspired, by accomplishments of other women—women who rarely make traditional textbooks—appears to have been correct. A stack of letters proves it: "I hope you're happy! You've activated a rusty, tired, old brain and made me want to learn more and more," wrote one woman, "Your . . . class has changed my whole life. I'm now glad to be a woman for the first time in my life," wrote another.

There is more evidence that Women Upward Bound is a success story. Students have gone on to other colleges or vocational-technical schools. Several are at the Minneapolis College of Art and Design. One woman recently won a scholarship to Hamline University. Others have graduated from Metropolitan's two-year nursing course. Still others were trained and are working as drug counselors.

The ideas and wholehearted commitment of two young women have paid off. But the story is threatened by a not-unfamiliar obstacle: The money has run out, and there is nothing in the Metropolitan Community College budget to maintain the present program. Promises to seek legislative help next year are no comfort for this fall.

In their spare time, Ms. Pruitt and Mrs. Kilps have written a grant request to several foundations. They know that in the past foundations have not been particularly interested in women's projects. But they hope that changing times and the program's achievements will win support. They need \$27,300. That seems a small price to pay for a few more chapters of a success story.

LEGAL EFFECT OF SECTION 311, H.R. 14234, IS UNCERTAIN

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Senate amendment No. 55, which constitutes section 311 of the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1977 (H.R. 14234), was intended to restrict the authority of the President and the Secretary of the Army

to coordinate the personnel policy of the various Federal agencies in the Canal Zone. As I understand it, it would not in fact do so. Rather, it could serve only to limit the participation of the Governor in the coordination process inasmuch as this appropriation act provides only funds that he administers.

I also understand that the amendment would have no effect on funds available from other sources for this purpose, for example, DOD.

It would further appear that a purpose of the amendment was to limit the authority of the Canal Zone Civilian Personnel Policy Coordinating Board to establish personnel policy. As a matter of fact, the Board does not establish major personnel policy; it merely coordinates personnel policy among the various agencies in the Canal Zone. The establishment authority rests with the Secretary of the Army.

The effect of the bill, therefore, may be to inhibit the Secretary's ability to have policy recommendations coordinated prior to their being submitted for his decision.

The amendment, moreover, does not appear to make any change in the substantive law that creates a uniform wage and merit system for the Canal Zone. Therefore, notwithstanding this amendment, the various agencies will have to continue to apply that law and the implementing regulations in a uniform manner. Indeed, the legal effect of section 311 is uncertain.

REAGAN-SCHWEIKER TICKET

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Governor Reagan has taken considerable flack from various directions since the surprise announcement of his choice for a running mate.

I wish to share with my colleagues the following article from the Washington News-Intelligence Service, that presents a different strategic picture than has been projected by the press generally:

REAGAN-SCHWEIKER TICKET

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, August 4.—There are signs that a Republican ticket of former California Governor Ronald Reagan and Senator Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania, could attract massive support from the nation's large bloc of Catholic voters, including those that normally would vote democratic.

This is clearly indicated by the little-noticed endorsement of Reagan's selection of Schweiker by the U.S. Coalition For Life, the most influential Catholic oriented, national pro-life group in the country which includes both conservative and liberal church goers.

The highly respected, middle-of-the-road group believes the Reagan move lays the ground work for drawing heavy support from among the nation's 30,000,000 voting Catholics because of their growing disenchantment with Democratic Presidential nominee Jimmy Carter and his party's pro-abortion stand.

Although neither Reagan or Schweiker are Catholics, they have taken a strong public

stand for a Constitutional Amendment to end the massive killing of the unborn, which most of the nation's Catholic bishops and lay leaders now regard as the number one moral issue in the country.

While conservative Catholics have appeared inclined to flock to the Reagan banner, should he be the GOP nominee, the selection of Schweiker now opens the door to the more liberal Catholics, who have shied away from the former California Governor because of the reactionary picture painted of him in the press.

Nearly 7 out of 10 of these Catholic voters are concentrated in 12 large states, including Schweiker's home state of Pennsylvania where he has proven his ability to attract broad-based support among Catholic voters in such cities as Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Significantly, the 12 states contain 271 electoral votes—or one more than needed to elect a President. These states also are where Carter is the weakest.

Schweiker's stand for helping the Captive Nations of Europe and anti-detente stance against the Soviet Union fits into Reagan's strategy to win over the large ethnic vote in these large states.

With Schweiker on the ticket, Reagan's aides believe he could take full advantage of the recent awakening of ethnic pride and resulting political action among many Catholics in the North—Irish, Polish, Italian-American among them—and tensions and conflicts between them and blacks in the big cities.

EMOTIONAL ISSUES

On the emotional issues of prayer in school, busing, and gun control, Schweiker's positions either match or are very close to those of Reagan which should help increase the GOP drawing power among these ethnic voters.

Whether this Schweiker drawing power with Catholics and his conservative stand on the emotional issues will be enough to convince a majority of GOP delegates to the Republican National Convention that a Reagan-Schweiker ticket would be a winning combination and should be nominated is still to be determined.

The writing off of Reagan's candidacy because of his advance selection of Schweiker as his proposed running mate is definitely premature since its full impact on the majority of delegates won't be known for another week or 10 days and maybe not until the GOP Convention opens on Aug. 16.

After the first shock, there are signs that the more Conservative Republicans learn about Schweiker and his political potential the more they seem to like it. Both Reagan and Schweiker stand together on the key issues of defending and extending freedom and the protection of the dignity of life both here and abroad.

The success or failure of Reagan's move now appears to turn on whether Senator Schweiker is able to persuade Eastern Republican leaders that these are the issues on which the Republican party can win in November.

William Loeb, Publisher of the Manchester Union-Leader (N.H.), and a strong supporter of Reagan, believes it is too early for the verdict on the daring move of the former California Governor. He puts it like this:

"If Senator Schweiker could produce a number of delegates in Pennsylvania and other Eastern states now going to Ford, which would put Reagan across on the first ballot, then we would have to say that the Schweiker selection was a good one—and we would swallow it, be it somewhat distasteful.

"Further, if Senator Schweiker is able to persuade the Eastern Republican establishment that Ronald Reagan is NOT the horrendous reactionary that he is being painted as by the smear efforts of the left-wing

dominated communications industry in the U.S., this, too, would be a big plus.

"Also, it is very possible that Schweiker is not the bleeding-heart liberal that the media are trying to make him out to be in an attempt to alienate former Governor Reagan's conservative supporters.

"Information available to this newspaper indicates that Senator Schweiker is against abortion on demand, that he has introduced a resolution to allow prayer in the nation's schools, that he is against those who want to take away the people's right to own guns, and that he is against school busing. The Senator also led the fight to prevent the use of taxpayers' money and government credit to assist the Soviet Union in the development of its natural-gas facility.

"Furthermore, Senator Schweiker thinks that detente has so far been a one-way street, aiding the Russians more than it has the U.S."

LET THE SUNSHINE IN

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. President, Government secrecy has long been the shield which protects vices ranging from middle-headed bureaucracy to hard core tyranny.

When our Nation was young, secrecy was not much of a problem. We had a healthy mixture of a vigorous, independent press and a government based upon town meetings. Our leaders knew if they were to build a strong, united nation, they had to inspire the trust of our citizenry.

After the Civil War, as our Nation grew larger and more complex, government became increasingly centralized. The bureaucracy began to insulate itself against what it considered the cumbersome interference of the public. Gradually the same wall that maintains tyrannies abroad began to prevent public participation in bureaucratic decisions at home.

Now those barriers are under attack in Congress. The Freedom of Information Act, passed in 1966, has given Americans access to the files kept on them by a host of Government agencies, including the FBI and the CIA. This exposure has caused a reassessment of the entire bureaucratic intelligence-gathering operation with healthy effects for our democracy.

This drive toward a more vigorous, involved democracy received another boost last week when a bill with the catchy title of the Government Sunshine Act passed the House 390 to 86.

The Sunshine Act, of which I am a co-sponsor, gives the public a right to attend the previously closed meetings of agencies such as the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Parole Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Special interest groups such as the milk lobby and the oil companies have learned how to work effectively in smoke-filled rooms to influence the regulations that affect them. That is why too often the policies of these agencies benefit these

narrow interests rather than those of the general public.

Not only will these agencies now have to hold open meetings and keep transcripts of their discussions on file, but the Sunshine bill also prevents what lawyers call *ex parte* communications. These are true covert discussions where only one party to a proceeding meets with a member of an agency to try to win support.

Advance notice must be given of all meetings. When a meeting is closed for reasons such as national security or where trade secrets are involved, the agency must provide a written explanation of the reason for the secrecy. And the agency's closure of the meeting can be challenged in court.

By giving the public the fullest possible information about the way in which policy is determined, we are taking a major step toward strengthening our democracy. Experiences of the recent past have shown us time and time again that unwarranted secrecy has no place in a democratic society. All too often important policy decisions have been made behind a cloak of official secrecy, isolated from the informed opinion of the citizenry. With this "Sunshine Act" we have unlocked the doors of the Federal bureaucracy and invited all citizens, not simply a privileged elite, to scrutinize the decisionmaking and policy formulation processes of the Federal Government.

H.R. 11656, the Government in the Sunshine Act, was reported to the floor by a 32 to 7 vote of the Government Operations Committee. I am proud to have participated in the drafting of the bill in subcommittee and in the full committee. I might add that the Senate version of this bill passed the Senate by a rare unanimous vote of 94 to 0, and that 48 of our 50 States have Sunshine laws that apply to State executive branch agencies. The same principle of openness has already been implemented by this 94th Congress, which has opened more than 90 percent of its legislative drafting sessions to the public.

This act has undergone meticulous preparation. Much research, time and concern have gone into its formulation; efforts which involved legislators, lawyers, academicians, and citizens from all walks of life. The result is an act which is the most comprehensive and effective antisecrecy act ever to be reported by this Congress.

It is essential that at every level of government we rebuild public confidence in our democratic processes and effectively involve the people of the United States in the formulation of policy. I applaud the passage of this fine and important piece of legislation.

ARMENIANS IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions it has been my

privilege and pleasure, here on the floor of Congress and elsewhere, to speak on behalf of the Armenian people.

During the current celebration of our Nation's Bicentennial Year, it seems especially appropriate to relate the story about those Armenians who came to this land during the early part of America's history.

Armenians came to this continent in British Colonial days—and have been established as being here as early as 1618 in Virginia—during the time of Capt. John Smith. The first Armenian of whom there is a record in America is "Martin Ye Armenian" whose name appears in the log of a ship at Jamestown Colony. "Martin the Armenian" is mentioned in several papers of Colonial Virginia, where he began tobacco cultivation, from about 1618 to some time after 1623. Then history breaks off concerning the adventures and activities of this pioneer.

In 1653 we again pick up the history of early Armenians in America when it appears that two Armenians came here from the old country to develop the production and manufacture of silk in the Colony of Virginia. Armenians were considered expert cultivators of the silkworm, and the two who came here enjoyed a high reputation in their native land for their skill and experience. In December of 1656, the following resolution was passed by the Colonial Assembly of Virginia:

That George the Armenian, for his encouragement in the trade of silk, and to stay in the country to follow the same, have four thousand pounds of tobacco allowed him by the assembly.

Christopher Der Seropian, a student, came to the United States in 1843 and attended Yale University where he is credited with inaugurating the class book system there. He also developed the black and green colors which even today are used on American paper currency.

In California, a man named Seropian arrived in Fresno in the autumn of 1881, as well as a person called "Normart" who came earlier but returned East. The story about Normart is quite interesting, and I will discuss that in a moment.

The story about Seropian who arrived in Fresno in 1881 starts 11 years earlier when, in early 1870, Hagop, Garabed and Simon Seropian emigrated to the United States with some returning missionaries. They settled in Worcester, Mass. When word came a few years later that their father had died, Garabed and Simon returned to Turkey to settle the estate, and stayed there for 5 years. Hagop remained here and ran a fruit, stationery, and notions store in Worcester. Working long hours, he developed lung trouble. It appears that Hagop may have come to California during the mid-1870's, and later sent for his family and friends, telling them that the climate was very beneficial—with watermelons that grew "as large as boats"—and eggplants of 8 to 10 pounds. In any event, Hagop wrote his brothers and asked them to return so they could all go to California. Garabed and Simon, accompanied by their young half-brothers, George and John, once more landed at Ellis Island in 1880 and

arrived in Fresno the following year. Simon Seropian died in Fresno in 1923, and in 1945 George Seropian was the only living member of the five Seropian brothers who had established Fresno's Seropian Bros. Packing House.

The Normart story relates to an immigrant who, upon landing in the United States, when asked his name, joyfully and gratefully said—in Armenian—that he was a "Nor Mart," literally a "new man," while he also meant a "newborn, free man." Relatives who later came to Fresno, especially the younger generation, continued to use the name "Normart" as their surname.

We are living at a time in which the various peoples who comprise America are rediscovering their unique identity and are emphasizing the things in which they may take just pride from their own distinctive heritage. No ethnic group can excel the Armenians in their special contribution and achievement.

Indeed, they have set a pattern for all for, as many scholars have noted, the Armenians have shown a greater adaptability to American society than have most other immigrant groups, largely because they have appreciated the value of education, while at the same time they have managed to retain their ancient ideals and heritage, perhaps because they learned to cherish self-respect in their identity in the face of cruel persecution for so many centuries. Pride in their past and in the present is one assurance of hope and confidence for the future.

ELECTRONIC WAR AND THE CONSUMER COMMUNICATIONS REFORM ACT OF 1976

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, many pieces of legislation that purport to protect consumer interests, in fact, promote the very industries toward which consumers seek protection. Such so-called consumer protection legislation limits rather than expands the choices among products, fails to safeguard the quality of goods and services, and reinforces the conditions that foster price increases. An example of such deceptive legislation is the "Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976," which was written by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. One of the key assumptions behind this bill is that competition in the telecommunications industry is injurious to consumers. Curiously, some of the same people who seek in the name of consumer protection to deregulate industry are also the opponents of legislation to break up monopolies and oligopolies.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the Los Angeles Times, July 18, 1976, which examines the current attempts of A.T. & T. to retain its stranglehold on the communications market and the legislation it is promoting to accomplish this end:

ELECTRONIC WAR

(By Alexander Auerbach)

It's not on any calendar of bicentennial events, but a corporate battle royal just getting under way has already assumed historic proportions.

Involved are several of the world's wealthiest and most powerful corporations, a host of smaller firms, millions of workers, all three branches of the federal government and scores of state agencies.

The outcome will be felt in just about every household and business in the nation.

At the center of the controversy is the telephone. For most of us the phone is simply a routine convenience—something we think about only when it breaks or is unavailable.

But America's network of 144 million phones and the 700 million miles of wire and radio circuits that connect them is an awesome system in terms of both technology and money.

About 95% of the nation's households and virtually all businesses have phone service, and they can be connected in some 10 million billion combinations. While most of us think of the phone as simply a way to talk to someone else, the network also carries enormous amounts of computer data, plus documents in facsimile form and even TV and radio programs for rebroadcast by local stations.

Last year the nation's phone bill was about \$35 billion, of which about 85% went to the Bell System: the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its operating companies and other affiliates. With assets of \$80 billion, Ma Bell is the wealthiest corporation in the world.

Now other companies are fighting for a piece of the action.

They want to sell telephone hardware, such as switchboards, multiline desk phones, phone answering machines and other devices, to users who in the past have rented this equipment from their local phone utility. Frequently, the newcomers offer advanced technology, specialized features or styling the utilities can't or won't provide, plus some financial advantages to the user.

Other competitors have gone into the long distance message transmission business. Like Bell, they offer private lines to business customers at flat monthly rates, carrying voice and data traffic by microwave or satellite. But the so-called specialized common carriers also offer services Bell doesn't, and they undercut Bell's rates—often by 30% to 50%.

On top of all its problems in the marketplace, Bell is facing trouble in the courts. The Justice Department has sued to break up AT&T, claiming the company illegally monopolized the market for telecommunications equipment and services. Other antitrust suits have been filed by Bell's competitors.

AT&T reacted to these new challenges with ponderous slowness at first. Antitrust suits are nothing new to Bell; it has fought several during the past half century, and knows they drag on for years. The business lost to the new competition is still miniscule, amounting to about one half of 1% of Bell's revenues. And no organization of almost a million employees can react overnight to a change in its market.

But Bell's strategists realize that the initial crop of tiny, underfinanced competitors are gradually being joined by huge corporations with technical and marketing savvy and plenty of cash. Companies like International Business Machines Corp., International Telephone & Telegraph Co., RCA Corp., Southern Pacific Corp., Nippon Electric Co. Ltd. and many others all want part of what Bell once had all to itself.

So AT&T has begun to fight back in earnest.

For the first time in its history it is using

salesmanship—actively peddling its services rather than just passively accepting customer orders as it admits it has in the past. Some 25,000 sales representatives are getting a crash course in how to get out there and sell.

Where state and federal agencies will allow it, Bell is cutting price to meet and beat the newcomers. But many regulators, aware that Bell's size would allow it to operate some services at a loss to drive out competition, are requiring it to prove the merits of any price cuts.

AT&T is also harnessing the resources of Bell Labs and Western Electric, its research and manufacturing facilities, to come up with fancy new gear to match that offered by smaller firms. It is even buying hardware from outside suppliers to add to its line, something the Bell System has always been loath to do.

But by far its boldest move is on the legislative front.

Working through friendly senators and representatives, Bell has had introduced into Congress the "Consumer Communications Reform Act of 1976."

The bill, if passed, would have the effect of giving Bell a virtual monopoly on huge segments of the telecommunications market in the United States—even including services that have not yet been invented.

It would also allow Bell to buy out its new competitors with immunity from the antitrust laws. Any firms that didn't want to sell out would face major obstacles to doing business.

The regulation of telephone hardware, for example, would be taken away from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) by the bill and given to the states. So a manufacturer of switchboards, phones or other equipment would have to convince 50 different agencies—many of them understaffed and unaccustomed to dealing with the intricacies of modern technology—to permit the installation of nonutility devices in the first place, and then to clear his particular item.

The bill would establish as federal law the principle that any duplication of phone network or telegraph facilities is wasteful and against the public interest. The FCC would be prevented from licensing any specialized communications carrier offering services similar to those performed by the phone or telegraph companies, or services which the utilities could conceivably offer even if they were not actually doing so, and had no plans to.

An applicant who wanted to market a new service would have to prove it did not fall under these restrictions. That would be tough. The tremendous capacity and flexibility of the utility networks leaves little that, in theory at least, they cannot do.

The cost and delay involved in getting such a clearance would also be a major obstacle. MCI Communications Corp., Washington, D.C., the first firm to offer private line services in competition to Bell, spent six years and \$25 million in legal fees and other expenses before the FCC gave its approval and the firm could start construction.

Aware that the bill's sweeping anticompetitive provisions are likely to spark controversy, especially at a time when many other big corporations are under attack, Bell has come up with two simple but politically powerful arguments:

Attaching privately owned devices to the utility lines could erode the reliability of what is undeniably the world's best telephone network. The network is too important to the economy and even to national defense to be tampered with, Bell says.

Allowing competition to take away utility business, either in hardware or the message transmission business, will only benefit a few big corporate customers, Bell says, but will

inevitably mean higher phone bills for the general public.

While Bell admits that some of the phone equipment now for sale by its competitors is just as good as that manufactured by AT&T's Western Electric division, the big difference is in installation and maintenance, Bell argues.

Equipment that is badly installed or that falls into disrepair, or is poorly made in the first place, can cause noisy connections, tie up lines and otherwise mess up the network, Bell says. A short circuit or wiring error could even endanger phone company personnel, it warns.

Competing equipment makers, not surprisingly, argue that their devices are as reliable as Bell's, and are no more prone to cause network problems or produce dangerous voltages.

(Although the possibility of electrical shock to workers is widely cited by Bell, a company spokesman confirms that every line in the nationwide system is protected by two fuse-like devices to guard against lightning or a fallen power line sending dangerous electric current into a phone wire.)

The economic argument is more complex. According to Bell, basic monthly rates for residential service—the amount you must pay to have a plain black phone in your home—do not come close to covering the actual cost of providing the phone, the connecting wires to the switching center and other related costs.

The difference between the full cost and the basic fee is made up by "contributions" or "cross-subsidies," in Bell's words, from other types of service, such as long distance calls, color phones, and switchboards, key telephones and other business phone equipment, AT&T argues.

In short, Bell says that residential service is priced below cost, while other services are priced to recover not only their cost and a profit to Bell, but an excess fee to offset the loss of basic home service.

If competition is allowed to come in and take away the more profitable business from AT&T, according to this argument, the company will not have any excess revenue from which to draw a "contribution" for basic rates, and the price of home phone service will go up.

How much would it rise? A chart used widely by officials of AT&T shows monthly revenues of only \$7.85, compared to costs of \$13.70.

AT&T's board chairman, John deButts, said a few months ago that, "were the telephone companies deprived entirely of the contribution to common costs that revenues from their more discretionary services provide, they would face the necessity of increasing the average customer's bill for basic service by as much as 75%."

But, as deButts acknowledges, that 75% rise would occur only under the most extreme circumstances: competitors would have to take away every bit of Bell's business other than basic residential service—all its long distance calls, business customers, switchboards and colored extension phones—and Bell, after losing all this business, would continue paying the overhead costs for operations it no longer had.

That, of course, is not very likely. Executives of firms competing with Bell admit that only a small fraction of AT&T's business is vulnerable to competition, and they expect the giant company to continue to hold on to most of its customers even there.

The competitors say they couldn't raid AT&T even if they wanted to, because they could never come up with the huge amounts of capital it would take to build facilities and buy equipment to service much more than the small, relatively specialized markets they are now concentrating on.

The demand for telecommunications is

growing so fast, they say, that if Bell merely halted its expansion program and stayed at its present size, all the newcomers together would be unable even to take care of the growth in the market, much less take business away from Bell.

Lobbyists for AT&T have an additional economic argument aimed at rural residents—and their congressmen.

Long-distance rates are now figured on a flat per-mile basis everywhere in the nation. The charges for a phone call from Little Rock to Boise are the same as from Chicago to New York City. The actual costs to Bell of handling the two routes differ greatly, since the efficiencies of high-capacity equipment used on high-volume routes sharply reduce the costs of each call.

Because of the nationwide averaging of long-distance rates, says Bell, calls on rural routes are priced below their actual cost, while the rates on "high density" routes recover more than their actual cost to offset the losses in the countryside.

But now the specialized carriers are undercutting Bell's rates on high-density intercity routes. Bell, says if it is to meet this kind of competition it will have to lower its charges on routes between big cities and raise them on long distance calls out in the boondocks.

Millions of small-town families, says Bell, will wind up paying higher long-distance rates because a relative handful of big corporations want to cut their phone bills by using the new specialized carriers.

This point too is disputed by the entrepreneurs entering the communications field. They claim Bell has underpriced its private line offerings to business users, and would actually be more profitable without that business. Long-distance rates between rural points would not be affected, they claim.

AT&T has mounted a nationwide lobbying and public relations drive to make its case.

The company is running a series of full-page ads in major magazines with the theme, "One Bell System. It works." The thrust of the ads is that changing the present structure of the communications business—either by breaking up AT&T through antitrust actions or by opening the market to new competitors—will mean less reliability and higher cost.

Telephone company personnel, who are legendary joiners of Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary and other community organizations, are carrying the same message to these grass-roots groups, using policy statements and background materials prepared by AT&T.

The enormous number of Bell personnel, and the company's coast-to-coast locations, give it a special clout in dealing with Congress that no other firm enjoys.

By sending managers and executives of its local operating companies to Washington, Bell can easily produce a delegation from almost any congressman's home district to argue its case.

So far the Bell Bill has attracted more than a dozen senators and 100 representatives as co-sponsors. Hearings are expected to begin in September.

Regardless of the political maneuvering, however, all the parties involved will have a problem gathering support simply because of the complexity of the issues involved.

Bell, for example, says that competition will hurt most customers by reducing the subsidy its other services give to basic rates. The reason for the subsidy, it says, is to promote the universality of phone service, a goal set by the Communications Act of 1934.

But each of these assumptions is questioned by one or another of Bell's critics. Does a subsidy in fact exist?

Eugene V. Rostow, a professor of law at Yale and former head of a Presidential task force on communications policy, wrote in a

study commissioned by Bell that "approximately 30% of the revenues for interstate message toll and WATS (wide area telephone service) services are in effect used to help cover the costs of providing local service."

However MCI, which competes with Bell by offering private line services to business customers, says an analysis of AT&T's financial figures shows that WATS and message toll do indeed produce more revenues than needed to earn Bell's authorized rate of return, but this extra money does not go to the home phone user.

Instead, MCI claims, Bell uses the extra cash generated by WATS and toll services to offset its losses on private line business, charges for which Bell deliberately keeps low to undercut competitors, MCI says.

In 1974, MCI notes, Bell earned 8.9% on its message toll business, 12.3% on WATS, but only 5.5% on ordinary private lines and 2% on the lines it rents to radio and TV broadcasters.

There is no money available from Bell's long-distance business to subsidize local rates, MCI claims. While Bell's message toll and WATS services generated in 1974 \$190 million more than needed to produce the rate of return authorized by the FCC, its private lines, leased to business customers, fell short of the authorized revenue by almost exactly the same amount, MCI says.

So Bell's regular long distance customers are producing a subsidy for corporate users of Bell's private lines, not for residential telephone customers, according to MCI.

The average phone bills of some telephone subscribers may be below the revenues needed to cover the costs of providing their service, MCI says. But this shortfall is covered by the revenues from other residential phone customers, not from Bell's business customers.

Richard E. Wiley, chairman of the FCC, told a House hearing last November that the introduction of competition in the telephone hardware business by companies selling phones and switchboard systems "has not resulted in any increase in local telephone rates." As a result of competition, he said, "innovative and useful devices have become available to telephone subscribers."

John Eger, head of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, told the same hearing that "there simply is no reliable evidentiary foundation for assertion of any serious adverse impact from competition on local exchange rates, either now or in the future."

Even some of those who accept the Bell claim that revenues from business customers help keep residential rates low say that the impact of competition will be relatively small.

In a brief filed with state regulators last year, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., AT&T's California affiliate, said that if outside suppliers captured 50% of the market for telephone equipment, residential customers would see their phone bills rise \$1.10 to \$2.20 per month.

But according to a Stanford Research Institute study, competitors have only 6% of the equipment market now—including specialized computer terminals that Bell does not offer—and will have only 20% of the market by 1985.

A PT&T official conceded to California regulators that a loss of 10% of the equipment market to outside competitors could be offset by raising message unit charges by a quarter of a cent, while a 50% loss could be offset by a message unit hike of 1.25 cents. Since business customers pay about 64% of message unit costs, they would bear most of this increase, and residential basic rates would not rise at all.

Similarly, the PT&T witness agreed that any revenue lost to competitors in the message transmission business could be offset

by changing toll rates rather than basic rates.

The staff of the California regulatory commission noted that Bell's affiliate includes in its projections of equipment sales lost to competition the sales of devices it does not even offer.

If one accepts Bell's argument that competition may raise basic rates, would this hurt the goal of providing universal telephone service throughout the nation?

There are already substantial differences in basic residential rates among American cities. Basic service with unlimited local calls cost \$5.70 a month in Los Angeles and San Francisco, \$9.25 in Cleveland and \$11.25 in Indianapolis.

Residents of New York City pay \$7.34 for basic service plus an additional amount for each local call after the first 50. In Chicago the rate is \$6.45 with 80 free calls. (By comparison, Los Angeles residents can get phone service for \$2.50 a month with 30 free calls, or \$3.75 with 60 free calls.)

AT&T says a study conducted for it by an economic consulting firm shows that increases in basic rates cause some families to forego service. But Bell's own figures show no apparent correlation between the price of phone service and the number of persons who have a phone.

In San Francisco, for example, there are 102 phones per 100 residents, while in Los Angeles, where the rates are identical, there are less than 80 phones per 100 persons. Indianapolis, with the highest phone rates of any major city, has 81 phones per 100, while Cleveland, New York and Chicago all have between 74 and 77 phones per 100 residents.

Even if there is a subsidy provided to basic rates by other parts of Bell's business, some question whether such a subsidy is rational, or if Bell is the best one to determine which customer categories should get a subsidy and which should pay it.

Donald I. Baker, a deputy attorney general in the antitrust division of the Justice Department, said in a speech to a group of lawyers last year that, if one accepts the idea that a subsidy does exist, "the average residential user does not know that he is being subsidized, and it is not clear that, if he did, he would vote for a subsidy in this form. In essence, a subsidy from business users to residential users is simply a deeply buried sales tax."

The cost, Baker said, is passed along by companies in the form of higher prices for their products.

"We in the Department of Justice are highly suspicious of barely visible cross subsidies supported by anticompetitive regulation," he said.

Another point of controversy is AT&T's contention that telecommunications at the national level is a "national monopoly," best served by one regulated carrier rather than several competitors.

"There are significant economies of scale in a single supplier situation which are lost as duplicative circuits are established," says a Bell position paper.

Since Western Union has been offering telecommunications services since before the invention of the telephone, there has never been a "single supplier situation" in this country.

In a massive brief filed with the FCC, MCI argues that Bell does not in fact enjoy economies of scale.

Indeed, at the local level, Bell's figures indicate that the unit costs of servicing customers go up as more subscribers are added, MCI claims.

Only about 20% of Bell's facilities have the potential of showing declining unit costs with added business volume, according to MCI's analysis, and much of this 20% may

be operating at less than efficient levels, so the actual costs increase, rather than decline, with greater usage.

Right now the only area in which Bell faces serious competition in the transmission business is in the private lines used by corporate customers to link their facilities in different cities. Unlike its competitors, who build separate systems to handle only private lines, Bell simply draws lines at random from its network and earmarks them for use full-time by these corporate customers.

A system designed solely for private line usage should show lower cost per line as more users take the service. But Bell's method should have the opposite result, its competitors argue.

Since Bell's private lines occupy part of its circuit and switching network 24 hours a day, they contribute to its need for total capacity. Bell's pricing for ordinary toll calls penalizes those who call during peak periods by charging higher rates. But private line users, who take up Bell capacity during peak times as well as at night, pay among the lowest rates.

The business of supplying telephone equipment will change dramatically if the Justice Department succeeds through its antimonopoly lawsuit in forcing AT&T to divest Western Electric, the wholly owned subsidiary which last year sold some \$7 billion in equipment to Bell System companies.

Ironically, many companies now in the communications equipment business fear such a move, since Western Electric—now limited by a consent decree to selling only to AT&T and the government—would be a powerful adversary once broken away from its parent company.

One industry analyst, for example believes Western Electric would quickly apply its experience in building electronic switching gear to enter the computer field, and would emerge within a decade as the nation's second or third largest computer manufacturer.

AT&T wants to hold onto its subsidiary, arguing that Western Electric's prices are about 30% lower than those of outside suppliers, resulting in savings that are passed along to phone customers in lower rates.

But advocates of divestiture claim that a large part of the price difference occurs simply because Western incurs no selling costs in supplying its parent, unlike competing firms. They also argue that the arrangement has deprived the nation's electronics companies of a \$7 billion market, and has retarded the development of new telecommunications devices.

Sorting out these and the many other issues involved will not be easy, because the vital financial information needed for an analysis of Bell's operations is simply not available.

At the insistence of state and federal regulators, AT&T uses the Uniform System of Accounts, a ponderous accounting system that allows costs and revenues to be allocated almost arbitrarily to different parts of a utility's operations.

The accounting firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., in a study of utility accounting, said, "The data actually available from the Uniform System of Accounts now are not significantly different from those which were available in the late 19th century."

A. T. & T.

This is American Telephone & Telegraph Co.:

Holding company for 23 telephone operating companies, including

Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Serves 118.5 million phones, handling 470 million calls per day.

Owens Bell Telephone Laboratories, a research facility that has been awarded 17,000

patents and two Nobel prizes.

Owens Western Electric Co., which manufactures and sells only to

AT&T (about \$7 billion) and the U.S. government (about \$500 million)

Revenues in 1975 of \$29 billion.

Profits in 1975 of \$3.15 billion.

Assets of \$80.2 billion as of Dec. 31, 1975.

Employees: 937,000

Shareholders: 2,921,735

Capital outlays for 1976 planned at \$10.2 billion.

SECURITY IMPLICATIONS OF THE PHILADELPHIA "DISEASE"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events that followed an American Legion Convention in Philadelphia in which a medical catastrophe of undetermined origin killed 27 persons and left at least 128 ill—some of whom remain on the critical list—must be a cause of major concern to all involved with the internal security of our country and the well being of our citizens.

The immediate reaction of the executive branch bureaucrats to the news of the tragedy was that it must have been caused by swine flu. Therefore it was necessary to pass legislation for mass inoculations. As I commented on the floor when this issue was raised on April 5, 1976, this, "might make very good panic legislation, but it is not good medicine."

The medical evidence now available indicates that the problem was not swine flu or any other virus. It appears that the legionnaires were the victims of a chemical toxic substance introduced either deliberately or accidentally. If this tragedy was deliberately caused then we must conclude that it was a terrorist act. We know that terrorist groups exist in our country. We also know that the potential use of toxic substances as a means of covert warfare has been considered by the Soviet Union, Red China and other Communist countries.

While our intelligence community has been severely disrupted and informants in terrorist groups have been exposed, it is very difficult to determine whether a terrorist group was involved in the Philadelphia tragedy.

At the same time, our own Government has severely restricted research in the area of chemical and biological warfare, which might have provided us with information or antidotes in this instance. On November 25, 1969, President Nixon publicly announced that he had cancelled our chemical and biological research programs. He promised, however, that this would not, "leave us vulnerable to surprise by an enemy who does not observe these rational restraints. Our intelligence community will continue to watch carefully the nature and extent of the biological programs of others." I wonder whether our intelligence com-

munity still has the ability to do that watching.

On February 20, 1970, Henry Kissinger issued a memorandum as head of the National Security Council ordering that, "The U.S. military program for toxins will be confined to research and development for defensive purposes only." Kissinger ordered the destruction of existing stocks of toxic weapons.

Our country remains vulnerable to enemy attack in many ways. Perhaps the most frightening is our vulnerability to chemical or bacteriological attack. The solution is not mass inoculation, but a system of internal and external security including research on potential enemy weapons systems.

WAYS AND MEANS OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE FOLLOW-UP HEARING ON INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last November, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee held a hearing which has had a broad public impact in an area where much remains to be done—individual retirement accounts. The hearing concerned a critical consumer-related problem which a potentially massive segment—in fact, more than half—of our national labor force may face. The affected people are employees who do not enjoy coverage under a qualified employer-sponsored pension, profit-sharing, or other tax-advantaged retirement plan, and are now eligible to establish an individual retirement account—IRA—arrangement, a personal pension plan. The problem they face is in choosing the most advantageous type of IRA arrangement—U.S. individual retirement bond, commercial bank or savings and loan trusted account, insurance annuity contract or endowment contract, mutual fund, and so forth—and then choosing the IRA sponsor or seller who offers the best return on the arrangement best suited to the goals and needs of the individual.

The November 17, 1975, hearing was chaired by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable J. J. PICKLE of Texas, a member of the Oversight Subcommittee whose energy and continuing interest in this area are paralleled by his concern that the individual retirement program serve the needs of the tens of millions of American working people who may benefit from it. The hearing established that some of the sponsors or sellers of different types of IRA arrangements, in their zeal to get into a new market, had been misrepresenting their products and misleading the public through their promotional campaigns.

Since that hearing, Congressman

PICKLE and I have enlisted the combined assistance of the Congressional Research Service and a number of Federal agencies—the Internal Revenue Service, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of Public Debt of the Treasury Department—in evaluating the problems and informing the employee-consumer. Each of these agencies has produced a consumer-oriented publication.

According to statistics provided by the Internal Revenue Service, 1,111,000 IRA's had been established as of June 1976. Because this figure may represent only the tip of the iceberg, and the end-year buying season will again soon be upon us, now is the time for consolidating and updating these combined efforts on behalf of consumer protection.

Therefore, I have scheduled a hearing on this subject for Monday, September 13, 1976. The exact time, place, and list of witnesses will be announced at a later date.

THE PLIGHT OF THE SOVIET JEW

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, for some time now Members of this body have been addressing themselves to the plight of the Soviet Jews and the oppressive conditions under which they live. I would like to bring to the attention of the public the case of the Dekhovich family.

In March of 1975 the Dekhovich family, consisting of Meilikh and Zina Dekhovich, two daughters, and a son, applied for exit visas for Israel. In anticipation of receiving those visas, they sold their apartment, gave up their jobs, and their oldest daughter voluntarily stopped her studies. Only their son, Boris Dekhovich, continued to work. From the time his family applied for exit visas he was harassed by authorities and those with whom he worked.

For several months the family was homeless and without employment. Each inquiry as to the status of their exit visas was met with refusal, silence or talk of the "regime."

They eventually learned they were being refused because of the military service of Boris Dekhovich, although he never had access to any sensitive material and had never signed any documents concerning his status in the Soviet Union.

In August of 1975 most of the family was allowed to leave the Soviet Union—all but Boris. They had to promise to take no action to try to assist their son in joining them.

The Dekhovich family has heard nothing from Boris since their departure from the Soviet Union, and this separation of the family weighs heavily on all of them. For no reason—except the fact that the Dekhovich family is Jewish—

the authorities in the Soviet Union have subjected this family to harassment, separation, and heartache.

The Soviet Union continues to practice oppressive practices against Soviet Jewry and it is incumbent upon all the people of the free world to speak out against these practices and bring pressure to bear to end these practices.

ACTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF BURN INJURIES TO CHILDREN, INC.

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress an organization based in Medford, Mass.: Action for the Prevention of Burn Injuries to Children, Inc.—APBIC. This organization was founded in May 1972 by two women who are mothers of children who received serious burn injuries in accidents.

The founders of the organization, after suffering with the trauma of living with burn victims, felt there was a definite lack in counseling services available to the families of burn victims. By establishing APBIC, they hoped to fill this void by providing for the education of children and adults about the possibility of fires and how to contain flames; the enactment of comprehensive legislation to insure that clothes sold commercially are flame retardant; and support and guidance to those families of burn victims.

APBIC has functioned mainly on private donations with additional funds derived from State grants. Because of these generous contributions and grants, APBIC has been able to grow from a small group to a statewide organization. To increase the public's awareness of burn injuries and efforts which can be taken to avoid injury, the organization has established a library, it is a sizable collection focusing on burn treatment. In addition APBIC has started a regular newsletter which is circulated to interested individuals, organizations and medical personnel. Furthermore, the founders of this organization have appeared on radio and television to increase public awareness of the facts surrounding burn injuries.

Over two million Americans suffer burn injuries each year. More than 12,000 deaths are recorded annually as a result of burns. One third of these victims are children and young adults. With these startling facts in mind, it is evident that greater attention must be paid to the treatment of burn victims and the education of those who could be potential victims. APBIC should be congratulated and commended on the fine work it is doing.

BLACK PARTICIPATION IN THE BICENTENNIAL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, WILLIAM CLAY of Missouri, has written for Essence magazine an insightful and thought-provoking article concerning blacks and the Bicentennial. In light of the ongoing spirit of celebration on our Nation, I feel the need to bring his comments to the attention of the other Members of the House.

His editorial follows:

ON THE ISSUE: BLACKS AND THE AMERICAN BICENTENNIAL

A major question in Black America today is whether or not Blacks should celebrate America's Bicentennial. To answer properly we must stand back from our history and obtain a fuller, more analytical view of its broad sweep. We must be able to clearly distinguish the relationship between the passing events of our daily lives and the great tide of our total history.

We should start by understanding that everything we do as Black individuals counts either as a point for us or a point against us in our struggle. What we do now in America, in Africa, in the Caribbean will play a role in shaping the action of those who follow us in much the same way that our actions are shaped and measured by the actions of the Harriet Tubmans, the Nat Turners, the Frederick Douglasses, the W.E.B. Du Boises, the Martin Luther Kings and the Paul Robesons.

They could have done nothing, but this was not their response to the mandate of the masses they served. Instead they looked at much more than the events of their own short lives. They looked at the total tide of Black history. They saw its beginnings and were thus able to follow its magnificent flow beyond to generations destined to follow them.

It is incumbent upon us all to understand that we as a people make collective and individual decisions that help us chart the course of our lives. We also shape America's response to us as a people. We may decide to challenge America or to let her rest and forget us. We may decide to make compromises that could be used as leverage against us for decades into the future. But understand that whatever each one of us does counts.

It is against this background of age-old Black struggle and self-sacrificing commitment that we must consider the question: Should Blacks celebrate America's Bicentennial? For me the answer is no. But we cannot rest with gut feelings. They may be personally satisfying, but they may not be shared by the majority of Black Americans. Because of the very conditions of which I have spoken, that majority has neither the time nor the inclination to apply to such intellectual questions, so it becomes a part of our commitment/responsibility to ponder this question. It becomes a part of our commitment/responsibility to focus the long-term implications and consequences of such a question by first putting the entire matter in historical perspective. Will celebration at this point benefit us as a people? How will it affect us in the political, economic and social arenas? Perhaps most important, what will it do to our collective spirit as a people still oppressed in 1976?

Our great challenge is to humanize America, to liberate not only ourselves but all Americans. We must forge a new system of human social values for all Americans.

If this is indeed the challenge to Black America, do we help ourselves in our task by giving a stamp of approval through celebration of a nation whose past is fraught with deceitful myth and the harshest forms of human exploitation? In my opinion consensus to celebrate the Bicentennial gives tacit approval of American foreign policy in South Africa, in Chile, in Korea, in Brazil. Since when do the oppressed join with their oppressors in celebration of their condition?

These are just some of the questions we must ask ourselves, for the implications of our deliberations are greater than we might have first thought. Only after we have considered this proposition seriously in the context of its many ramifications must we take our position energetically to our people. Then we should consider ourselves sufficiently prepared to argue for one course of action or another with clear logic and moral force.

I have gone through the process. I have pondered this issue. I have discussed it with colleagues. I have anguished over it and my personal answer remains. No. We as Blacks in America in 1976 have no business celebrating the Bicentennial. Certainly there is no intelligent reason to celebrate our own second classness, our own debasement, our own condition of what remains de facto servitude.

Any celebration at this point in our struggle would be tragically premature, and because Nat Turner and Martin Luther King, Jr., gave their lives and Harriet Tubman risked hers and Paul Robeson so fully committed his, it would be a betrayal to celebrate anything less than the America they fought for.

Over a century ago Frederick Douglass said: "What, to the American slave, is your Fourth of July? I answer, a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty of which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a 'sham' . . . your shouts of liberty and equality, a hollow mockery; . . . a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages."

Is this statement any less meaningful today? Does he not still suggest something important for our consideration today? For what to the American Black is the Bicentennial? I suggest that it must be an occasion of great solemnity, an occasion on which we talk about joblessness, hunger, drug dependency and human despair. I suggest that we practice no meekness but ask in the loudest, most enraged voice possible why America cannot find the will to feed her hungry, to relieve her oppressed, to look after her old, to safeguard and nurture her young. Weariness is the lot of the oppressed, but remember that ours is a heavy responsibility, a responsibility that was carried well before our time and will be carried well after. Let us muster our strength and courage to do what we know must be done. The truth is that celebration never proceeds to social change; it merely confirms the status quo. Only struggle brings change. It is not an easy course, but can we honestly say to ourselves that there is any other way?

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus: Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Cal., chairperson; Walter Fauntroy, Washington, D.C., vice-chairperson; Andrew Young, Ga., treasurer; Cardiss Collins, Ill., secretary; Shirley Chisholm, N.Y.; William Clay, Mo.; John Conyers, Mich.; Ronald Dellums, Cal.; Charles Diggs, Mich.; Harold Ford, Tenn.; Augustus Hawkins, Cal.; Barbara Jordan, Tex.; Ralph Metcalfe, Ill.; Parn Mitchell,

Md.; Robert N. C. Nix, Pa.; Charles Rangel, N.Y.; Louis Stokes, Ohio.

FAILURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO MAKE NURSING HOME INSPECTION REPORTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1975, I reported to the House (page 21003) on Social Security's failure to make readily available to the public its inspection reports on nursing homes which participate in the medicare program.

Section 229D of the Social Security Act of 1972 requires that within 90 days of an inspection of a facility, copies of that inspection report be made public "in readily available form and place." This amendment provides for public disclosure of the existence of any deficiencies of nursing homes accepting medicare patients.

Poorly administered last year, I believed that the amendment was a total failure. Unfortunately, this failure continues; in fact, such reports appear to be even less accessible now than they were last year.

To test the availability and usefulness of these reports to the public, a member of my staff, posing as a consumer, visited a Social Security Administration branch office in the southeast area of the District of Columbia. An employee there stated that the office had not kept such reports on file for years, and that none of the other offices would have copies of the reports. Despite this warning, the District Office at 2100 M Street, N.W., was visited. The first employee there said he would check to see how many reports were on file there. After conferring with another official, however, my staff member was given only the names and telephone numbers of four local agencies of the District of Columbia government which might prove helpful in locating the reports. As the calls were placed, the situation became more complicated, ludicrous and frustrating: some of the telephone numbers were for the same general D.C. government offices; other numbers referred the caller to offices that had been called previously.

In all, eight calls were made to the D.C. government without luck. It should be noted that Senate Report 92-1230, which explains the congressional intent behind the disclosure provision, states that information relative to individual institutions "be available for public inspection in readily accessible form and fashion in Social Security district offices and local welfare offices upon request."

Only one phone call proved fruitful, to a volunteer run Nursing Home Information Center. The staff there was very helpful in showing inspection and de-

ficiency reports, plans of action to correct the deficiencies, and fire inspection reports for over 50 local nursing homes. When told that two social security offices did not have these reports on file, the Nursing Home Information Center aide was genuinely surprised, as she thought all branch offices were required to have such reports on file.

I requested a member of my Cleveland staff to conduct the same survey in the Cleveland area. While my aide encountered the same type of confusion at the Cleveland district office as was found in the Washington area, he received almost immediate assistance at the Severance Center social security office—an office which I have always found to be of exceptionally fine quality. The report follows:

My first contact with SSA was by telephone when I called their single Cleveland number and requested a copy of the inspection reports. I was advised to call the local office in my area which was Severance Circle. The Severance Circle Office stated that the information was available but I would have to come to the office to see it. There was no confusion and the individual with whom I spoke knew exactly what I was speaking about.

I then visited the downtown District Cleveland Office. There I waited for an interviewer who went to a superior who directed her to the office manager. Following about fifteen minutes of research, she returned with a large book which merely listed medical facilities throughout the area and which were not related to the inspection reports I requested. The only information which she offered was that the nursing homes on the list were approved by SSA for medicare reimbursement. This was the only information available. There were no files of any type on the quality of the individual homes.

I visited the Severance Office to check the information available. There was a little confusion at first, but then I was shown a large three ring notebook and told that the reports within were filed by the Ohio Department of Health, Division of Nursing Homes. The book listed only those homes within the Severance District. The reports were very thorough. There were two columns, one for deficiencies and the other for steps taken to eliminate the deficiencies. Some examples under the subheading of "maintenance: a) "flooring in bathroom in process of repair"—and across the page, "floor should be complete by April 15, 1976, new tile is being laid;" b) "wall cleaning and/or repair still needed in kitchenettes in nurse's station and in sanitizer rooms," and the reply—"these areas will be cleaned and painted by April 15, 1976." There were pages such as these on each home. I was free to copy the material but not to reproduce it.

On both of my visits I have found the Severance Office to be well managed.

The general inaccessibility of these reports to the public deprives the health consumer of potentially valuable information on the quality of nursing homes and other facilities. Social security workers were aware of the existence of such reports, but said that to keep all the reports on file was too unwieldy. The present system of lack of disclosure of nursing home inspection reports serves only to shield the institutions. The American people spend too much on health, both personally and through their tax dollars; they should not have to face the investigative task of searching for reports required by law that are virtually unavailable from the agencies that should maintain them.

The system continues to fail the very people it was created to protect. First, if, as it appears, there is little public demand for such reports, I believe it is because the Social Security Administration has failed to publicize adequately their availability. I personally believe that citizens "shopping" for a nursing home for a relative would be very interested in reading the latest survey reports. Local newspapers should be interested in the latest report on the quality of facilities in their areas.

Because social security has continually failed to make these reports known and available, I believe that the law—or the regulations—should be amended to require that copies of the reports be posted at the entrance way of the institutions that have been inspected. Until this is done, or some other corrective action is taken, the public seeking such reports will be faced with an incredible bureaucratic run-around that frustrates and destroys the intent of Congress in enacting this "consumer" provision.

CARDION ELECTRONICS OF WOODBURY, N.Y. TO RECEIVE AWARD FROM DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1976, Cardion Electronics of Woodbury, N.Y., will be awarded the Department of Commerce "E" Award for exports. I am very proud to represent the congressional district in which this outstanding firm is located.

Standing as one of many examples of Long Island's excellence in aerospace, aviation, and communication technology, Cardion Electronics has, in recent years, had an outstanding record of success. Already, they have designed, manufactured, sold, and installed aviation systems equipment at 18 sites in 7 NATO countries. In addition, the company has sold surveillance radar equipment in the Middle East and has installed, operated, and trained personnel for an integrated airport automated surface weather system in Brazil. Overall, Cardion Electronics has increased its exports from 3 percent of total sales in 1972 to 53 percent in 1974. This increase has contributed both to the company's growth and to the Nation's export expansion program.

Cardion attributes its success in this highly competitive market to price competitiveness, high quality products, an outstanding program of after sale assistance, and a superb worldwide reputation. In addition, to facilitate the efforts of its distributors, Cardion provides various training programs for the purchasers of its products. In sum, Cardion's export program is a comprehensive, high quality program.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the efforts of Cardion Electronics. They are indicative of the dedication to excellence that characterizes American industry.

BICENTENNIAL ESSAY CONTEST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the winning essay in a Bicentennial essay contest recently held in my district. This contest was sponsored by Hillenbrand Industries, Inc., from Batesville, Ind., and was open to all students in grades 10 through 12 in the Batesville High School and the nearby Oldenburg Immaculate Conception Academy. The theme the students were asked to write about was "What Are Our Country's Problems and What Can Young People Do To Solve Them?"

The winning essay was written by Nancy Klosterman, a student at the academy, and she is to be congratulated for her outstanding performance and writing ability.

Her excellent essay follows:

AMERICA'S PROBLEMS AND WHAT YOUNG PEOPLE CAN DO TO SOLVE THEM

Within the context of the United States' two centuries of growth, the role of America's youth cannot be ignored. In retrospect, the agrarian economy of colonial America and the factories of the American Industrial Revolution depended heavily on child labor, and even America-at-war relied on youthful recruits and draftees.

Youth have an even greater role in America today as we celebrate the beginning of our third century of freedom and independence. Perhaps it would be well to define youth's role in a changing society as to the political and social aspects of the American scene.

On the political scene, presidential primaries are indicating the relative popularity of the prospective candidates. The responsibility of each young voter—indeed, of every voter—is to research fully the past record of each candidate and his future commitments—commitments in terms of promises to voters, ambitions for higher offices, and possible affiliations with private business concerns which could conflict with his responsibilities to public office. To combat the problem of voter apathy, youth must undertake this research and delve beneath the surface stereotypes by questioning the candidates; researching his views; and discriminately evaluating campaign materials, television information, and the reporting of new publications. Newspapers and other sources can provide periodic voting records of state and national legislators. Never before has the public had such easy access to information! However, the information gap is yet too wide; according to a survey conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress and printed in the June, 1974 issue of American Education (a publication produced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), "only 41 percent of the 17-year-olds and 44 percent of the 26 to 35 age group can correctly use a simple ballot," and "nearly one in three . . . young adults cannot suggest some means of researching a . . . candidate's background."

But correct and wisely-chosen information is a basis on which to construct appropriate action. Politically, this responsible and constructive action can take the form of voting; of becoming involved in local, state, or national campaigns; and of becoming involved in local government issues. Student participation in nonviolent protest demonstrations

can aid in focusing the public's attention on various concerns: In The Politics of Protest, a government task force under the direction of Jerome H. Skolnick defends, by example of history, the right of Americans to change a government or system which has become oppressive: "The Boston Tea Party was an attempt by a few to alter an oppressive system of taxation without representation . . . If the Boston Tea Party is seen historically as a legitimate method of reproducing such necessary social change, then present-day militancy, whether by blacks or students, can claim a similar legitimacy." However, I believe that, except in very extreme situations, violent tactics should not be employed.

Also, student investigations of government bureaucracy in order to effect necessary political change can be attempted. According to the September of 1974 issue of Today's Health, a group of California high school students noticed, during the gasoline shortage, that many state legislators were permitted to lease, through a state contract, gas-eating luxury cars. With the exception of one assemblyman, the students' efforts to force the use of more economical cars were thwarted. But dealt with constructively, the students' experience of the frustration of storming the wall of bureaucracy can become a springboard from which they can become aware of, and resolve to remedy, the problem of political abuses.

The second topic dealing with youth's solutions to the United States' problems is the social aspect of the American scene. Several discussion points can be grouped under this topic: abortion, crime, the illegal use of narcotics, inflation, unemployment, irresponsible resource consumption—a veritable Pandora's box of social ills.

Abortion-on-demand, the crime of destroying an unborn human being, is now legal. Concerned youth have protested this crime by picketing, distributing literature, belonging to pro-life organizations, and participating in mass rallies. These young people can help to offer reluctant parents alternatives to abortion. According to a recent Cincinnati Enquirer article, a communal, youth-dominated "farm" in Tennessee is giving unwed mothers the option of having their babies rather than aborting them. If these women decide they do not want to keep the baby, the "farm" members will raise him. This type of youth concern for life is necessary if we wish for there to be a future generation.

Crime and the illegal use of narcotics are closely linked since many youth-related thefts involve supporting a "habit." Stricter controls, health hazards, and the realization of their exploitation by big-time dealers should wake users from their drugged stupor to strive for a world from which they will not feel it necessary to escape.

In response to inflation and unemployment, youth, the future policymakers, must learn from economic policies and mistakes so that hard times may be held at bay. Another economic woe is the irresponsible use of government funds. This can border on the ridiculous. For example, according to the February 23, 1976 issue of Time, Medicaid has been billed for, among other things, pregnancy tests for a man, and sickle-cell anemia tests for whites. Young people must not become inured to the injustice, but must recognize and report these abuses.

Irresponsible energy consumption is depleting our natural resources. Perhaps cautious nuclear energy research and research into new food sources by tomorrow's corps of young scientists will provide a solution. In the interim, America must determine whether she has the right to continue rapid consumption at the expense of struggling nations.

I have attempted to survey the spectrum of American problems and to propose practical responses for youth. However, we must not overlook the fact that Americans have much to be proud of, including the freedom of speech and the freedom to disagree and to chart new courses. These and similar ideas linger in the minds of thoughtful young people—questions ripening to answers as youth matures.

STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTS NO
UNITED STATES-VIETNAM DI-
RECT NEGOTIATIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1976, I sent a letter to Secretary Kissinger inquiring whether negotiations had commenced between the United States and Vietnam over the MIA issue and other questions of mutual concern to the two countries. As Members may recall, uncertainty concerning these negotiations had arisen during consideration of my amendment to the fiscal year 1977 foreign aid appropriation measure which related to MIA's. It seemed to me at the time that the total prohibition contained in the bill as reported against any aid to Vietnam would inhibit and delay, rather than encourage and accelerate, the opening of direct negotiations between Vietnam and the United States.

During the debate, however, several Members who opposed the amendment, made reference to negotiations which supposedly were already underway or to direct talks which allegedly were going on. This was the first public suggestion that negotiations were taking place. It came as a major surprise.

Had negotiations already begun or were diplomatic efforts stalled? Were these direct negotiations, or were they through intermediaries? Were they face to face or by diplomatic note? Surely the answers to these questions should significantly influence our future steps to resolve the MIA and other issues on the agenda of unfinished business from the Vietnam war. Surely the families of those men listed as MIA should have the right to know whether or not negotiations are in progress.

In an attempt to resolve this confusion, I sent Dr. Kissinger a letter asking for clarification. The State Department has recently responded to my letter.

I would like to inform my colleagues that, according to the State Department, there are no direct negotiations between the United States and Vietnam currently taking place. The State Department's response refers only to an ongoing exchange of messages with the Vietnamese and indicates the American willingness to discuss outstanding issues with and suggests that we are prepared in principle for talks in which each side will be free to raise any issue that it wishes but nowhere does this response suggest that direct negotiations have actually begun.

Although it confirms my expectations, this letter is saddening. It would have been a wonderful surprise—to the MIA families and to all Americans—to find out that talks were underway.

But if the news is saddening, at least we now have a clearer picture of the current situation. Negotiations are not taking place. Therefore it is necessary for Congress to do everything possible to encourage these talks to begin.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my letter to Secretary Kissinger and the response from Assistant Secretary McCloskey follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1976.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY KISSINGER: I am writing to request information about the current state of negotiations between the United States and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam concerning the Missing-in-Action and other matters of mutual interest.

During consideration of an amendment I offered on June 25 to the Foreign Aid Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1977, several Members made reference to "talks now going on" between the two countries or to "negotiations which are already underway." Since I had offered my amendment to encourage the initiation of direct bilateral negotiations, I feel it is important to clarify the question of whether such negotiations have actually commenced.

I would therefore appreciate answers to the following questions:

1. Is there regular direct contact between the United States and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam taking place in Paris or any other location concerning the MIA's and other matters of mutual interest? Is this contact in the nature of direct negotiations on these matters, or preliminary discussions concerning the possibility of beginning negotiations in the future?

2. If discussions or negotiations are occurring, when did they begin and at what diplomatic level are they taking place?

3. If direct negotiations are now occurring, are negotiations at a higher level anticipated in the future?

4. If neither talks nor negotiations are being held, what is the position of the State Department regarding initiatives or concrete proposals from the American side to begin either?

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

BELLA S. ABZUG,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1976.

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ABZUG: Secretary Kissinger has asked me to reply to your letter of June 28 regarding United States relations with Vietnam.

We have been involved in an ongoing exchange of messages with the Vietnamese which we initiated on March 26. We have indicated our willingness to discuss outstanding issues with them and have made clear that our principal concern in any such discussions would be an accounting for our missing men and the return of the remains of those killed in Indochina.

We are prepared in principle for talks in which each side will be free to raise any issue that it wishes. The outcome of any such talks could of course determine whether or not there is a sufficient basis for improved relations. As far as we are concerned, an absolute

preconditioned for further progress toward normalization of relations with Vietnam would be a satisfactory resolution of the missing-in-action issue as indicated above.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT J. MCCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

PROBLEMS WITH CONVERTER
TECHNOLOGY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Clean Air Act amendments legislation (H.R. 10498), which is presently under consideration by the Congress, contains provisions which would alter the current automobile emission standards. This is the second time in 6 years that the statutory standards established in the Clean Air Act of 1970 have had to be postponed. The reason for this postponement is that no one knows how to meet these standards on most vehicles, given the current technology.

However, recently I received information from the manufacturers of the "Engelhard" three-way catalytic converter that indicated that their converter, when placed on a Volvo was capable of not only removing the required pollutants from the emissions but also increasing the fuel economy of the Volvo by 10 percent. In the interest of being fully informed on this new technology prior to voting on the various amendments to the auto emissions provisions of H.R. 10498, I wrote to the four major auto manufacturers to inquire about capabilities of this converter to bring our domestic automobiles in compliance with the statutory standards.

Unfortunately, it appears that there is substantial information and data available to indicate that implementation of the Engelhard converter is not, as yet, feasible on the vast majority of both domestic and foreign automobiles.

I am therefore submitting for my colleagues' consideration copies of letters I have received from Ford Motor Co. and General Motors Corp., outlining the problems with the general application of this converter technology.

The letters follow:

FORD MOTOR CO.,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1976.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Your letter of July 22, 1976, asked for information on the feasibility of the "three-way" catalytic converter.

Ford considers the three-way catalytic converter to be a promising technology for meeting future emission standards. In fact, it was Ford, in 1968, that first observed the ability of some catalysts to remove all three pollutants—hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen—on a single catalytic bed. We published this information in the technical literature and urged all catalyst companies that we deal with to investigate this avenue of emission control.

However, this experimental catalyst experi-

enced serious problems with durability and it wasn't until unleaded fuel was mandated in 1975 and the lead content of that gasoline was substantially reduced (with EPA approval of test fuels at a very low level for 1977) that rapid progress was made in development of the system. As a result of this progress, Ford plans to introduce a three-way technology on one small engine line for 1978 for limited application in California if development proceeds on schedule.

However, there are a number of problems which must be solved before the three-way system can receive widespread application to all car lines. As you are aware, Volvo has developed the system on a small 4-cylinder engine line for application in California; however, they have noted that they are having many more difficulties in applying the technology to their larger (6 cylinder) engines.

At Ford, we have some 13 engine lines and have considerable engineering work ahead of us before feasibility of mass production of a three-way catalyst system for all of them is established.

Also, the availability of rhodium, a noble metal which is required for these catalysts in sufficient quantities to support total car production is still a question. At this point, loadings of rhodium are required for durability of the catalyst which are substantially out of proportion to the level at which rhodium is mined. Our goal is, of course, to have durable noble metal catalysts in which the ratio of rhodium to platinum is equivalent to the way it is found in the ground.

Finally, and most importantly, even when the three-way system is tested, the rhodium content lowered and it is proved to be applicable to a broader product—or total product—range, there still needs to be adequate time to phase in the three-way technology at an orderly pace with adequate field experience. In this way, we can be assured that there are no unknown side effects such as the "sulfuric acid scare" which occurred when oxidation catalysts were first introduced on 1975 models. Also, the customer will be able to profit from cost reductions which almost always result from gaining engineering experience, from "getting the bugs out" and eliminating any operating difficulties.

For these reasons, we have supported a five-year phase-in of more stringent standards before dropping to the ultimately more stringent levels. In this regard, the Environmental Protection Agency has noted in a recent letter to Congressman Maguire that, because of the lead time problems which I have mentioned, they estimate the earliest possible date at which time the industry could adopt three-way catalytic technology is the 1981 model year.

For these reasons, we are strongly supporting the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment which would allow an adequate lead time to develop and introduce advanced technologies.

Thank you for your interest.

Very truly yours,

W. E. BROWN.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1976.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Thank you for your letter of July 22 regarding the feasibility of using a three-way catalyst system to meet future emission standards. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify some of the important issues raised about this subject which has become a part of the Congressional debate on the Clean Air amendments.

The recent statement by the California Air Resources Board that a Volvo, equipped

with a three-way catalyst, has met the statutory federal emissions standards does not alter, in any way, the necessity to amend the Clean Air Act. Nor does it diminish the desirability of setting new standards at the levels recommended by EPA Administrator Train and now contained in the amendment proposed by Representatives John Dingell and James Broyhill.

The three-way catalyst is not new technology. General Motors and, according to press reports, others companies have been working on the system for some years. General Motors reported on our experience with three-way catalyst equipped cars to the Environmental Protection Agency in December 1975. While these cars achieved low emission numbers, there were several drawbacks, many of which apply to the system used on the Volvo in question.

First, the Volvo system uses rhodium—a scarce metal supplied primarily from South Africa and the Soviet Union. Rhodium is not found by itself; it is a platinum group metal which occurs naturally in ore in a ratio of about one part of rhodium for every twenty parts of platinum. Production and marketing of these metals is closely controlled by the South African and Soviet producers to match world demand. For example, one producer notified California officials that it was concerned that the three-way catalyst "should not have a greater platinum-rhodium ratio than the ratio in which platinum and rhodium occur naturally, i.e., the mine ratio . . ." This supplier went on to state that while it was capable of supplying rhodium in a higher ratio in the early stages of its use, thereafter "the ratio will have to revert to the mine ratio as far as our ability to supply is concerned."

The rhodium-platinum ratio in the three-way converter certified by California on the Volvo was four to twenty—four times the natural occurring rate of rhodium. Under current circumstances, it is apparent the supplies of rhodium would not be available in this ratio.

While a low volume manufacturer might be able to secure sufficient rhodium for its production run, it would be irresponsible for the entire industry or the government to act on the basis that an adequate supply is available for normal production.

Second, the system announced in California has worked only on a four-cylinder engine. Volvo has yet to make the system work on its six-cylinder engine. Again, it would be irresponsible to mandate a system which has not been shown to be applicable to six and eight cylinder cars which comprises the bulk of U.S. production and sales.

Third, the system is costly and needs frequent maintenance. It requires a special fuel control system (fuel injection) in addition to a three-way catalyst.

(The four-cylinder Volvo had fuel injection as standard equipment prior to 1977.) The three-way catalyst system, not including the fuel injection system, would add around \$150 to the cost of the car. And, the owner must replace the air/fuel ratio sensor (at around \$20.00) every 15,000 miles or the system will fall to be effective.

In addition to these problems and limitations, there are other points which need clarification. The statement by California officials that the 1977 model Volvo with the three-way catalyst achieved a 10% fuel economy improvement misleads by being incomplete. This improvement is based on a comparison with 1976 models which had no catalytic converter. Two years ago GM added a catalyst system and achieved an average 28% fuel economy gain over previous models. (The catalytic converter itself has no direct effect on fuel economy. It permits engine adjustments that do make fuel economy improvements but also increase emissions; the catalyst has the capacity to control these

higher engine emissions.) It is incorrect to suggest that the Volvo catalyst does anything more for fuel economy than the catalysts on almost all cars sold in the U.S. today.

I want to stress that nothing said here is meant to be critical of the Volvo development. The work it reflects is commendable; all potential means for controlling emissions must be explored. Caution, however, is in order to avoid misusing the Volvo experience in the political process. I am enclosing a news clip which indicates that the exaggerated claims made for this system have not come from the manufacturer.

Finally, what should Congress do? The auto industry needs action now to avoid serious disruption affecting the entire economy. The federal certification process we must follow to obtain approval of our 1978 models for production must be underway now in order to complete the process without disruption. We are making the initial preparations but must know what the 1978 standards will be. Virtually everyone recognizes the need to change the 1978 statutory standards but Congress has not yet acted and we do not yet have the new standards. I am enclosing a recent telegram from our Chairman, Mr. Thomas Murphy, to Speaker Albert calling for immediate action.

When it acts, Congress should adopt the emission levels proposed by Representatives Dingell and Broyhill. While GM believes a five-year continuance of the current standards is in the public interest, we agree that the more stringent standards proposed by Representatives Dingell and Broyhill represent the best balance between fuel economy and emission control which can be expected at this time. According to a government analysis, the Dingell/Broyhill amendment would result in the savings of 9.27 billions gallons of gasoline in the 1980-1985 period as compared with fuel consumption under the standards contained in the bill reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This analysis also indicated that, during the same period, initial purchase and operating costs would be \$22.3 billion more.

These tremendous costs and additional fuel consumption are not balanced by any significant improvement in the quality of the air, which would result from proposed standards more stringent than those suggested by the Dingell/Broyhill amendment. This is clearly pointed out by the comprehensive analysis of April 8, 1976, conducted by the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Federal Energy Administration.

Tremendous strides have been made in controlling auto-related pollution. As new cars replace older, less controlled vehicles, the quality of our air will steadily improve. Clear evidence does not exist to indicate that requirements more stringent than those in the Dingell/Broyhill amendment are necessary. If there is any doubt about this, it should be resolved by a comprehensive, scientific analysis of the public need for air quality improvements. Today our nation is making decisions costing billions of dollars without the scientific data base necessary to know whether these decisions are sound or even helpful.

When dealing with technical issues, what seems to be true one day may not be the next. We continue to make every effort to improve our auto emission control systems and hope daily to make significant breakthroughs. However, this letter contains the facts as we know them today. I hope they are helpful to you in your consideration of this very important matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. JOHNSTON,
Director, Government Relations.

Enclosures.

WOULD PRESIDENT CARTER FAVOR
WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out frequently on the subject of wage and price levels, and what I think we ought to be doing about them. My reason for doing so is that I see a very real chance that the problem of inflation will be exacerbated in the coming months. In my estimation, we should be planning now on how we will deal with the possibility of a resurgence of inflation if it materializes, rather than waiting around until the problem actually comes upon us. And I am pessimistic about our ability to hold down inflation without stifling the recovery, unless we adopt some form of effective wage-price restraint.

I was very interested to learn that, according to columnist Hobart Rowen, there are some indications that our Democratic Presidential nominee, Gov. Jimmy Carter, may be thinking along similar lines. Apparently, Governor Carter is giving thought to the possibility of instituting something akin to the wage-price guideposts of the Kennedy era. That may or may not be sufficient, but in my view it would be a step in the right direction.

As Mr. Rowen points out, we continue to face a familiar unemployment-inflation dilemma, which to many economists is known under the rubric of the "Phillips Curve." The reference is to the hallowed dictum of British economist A. W. Phillips, who held that there was an inverse correlation between unemployment and inflation rates. As unemployment comes down, we cannot avoid, by traditional means, the increasing costs of rising prices. Moreover, reducing unemployment below 4 percent or so would run the risk of a raging inflation. And with the unemployment rate having risen in July for the second month in a row, from 7.5 to 7.8 percent, our unemployment problems are certainly far from over.

Our Congressional Budget Office is also warning us that the unemployment-inflation dilemma will not go away. CBO says this problem "is leading to interest in other alternatives outside of traditional fiscal and monetary policy." The alternatives CBO mentions include wage-price guidelines and controls, as well as policies to improve competition in business and industry.

I would certainly favor policies to spur competition. I have also been saying for some time that, if we want to pursue policies designed to continue the recovery while at the same time preventing a resurgence of inflation, we ought to establish a comprehensive program of controls or guidelines on wages, prices, rents and interest. All of them would have to be controlled in some measure if we were to provide equity to all sectors of the population.

We cannot, for example, expect labor to adhere to guideposts unless we also do something about the surge in rents that is expected later this year. The same principle follows for other parts of the economy as well.

Let me conclude by repeating my earlier warning. We must not allow election year inhibitions to prevent us from confronting both labor and management with the need to follow noninflationary guidelines. And beyond that, let us not permit the case for wage-price controls to continue being the "unmentionable topic" in economic policy. Let us hope that the new Democratic administration which we expect to be coming to Washington will bring this issue into sharp focus.

I include Mr. Rowen's column on the subject in the RECORD at this point:

CARTER'S PLAN: OFFERING CLUES

(By Hobart Rowen)

How is Jimmy Carter—if elected president—going to reduce unemployment, control inflation and balance the budget, all within the space of a four-year term? It's a good question, and even if we must wait for precise answers, there are some clues on the developing strategy.

Much of the debate on the effort to create a "full employment" economy has focused on the concern that, just by definition, full employment means a serious price inflation.

Most Establishment economists, liberal or conservative, follow the dictum laid down many years ago by a British economist, A. W. Phillips. He held that, in periods when jobless rates are low, inflation rates are high, and vice versa.

The general view is that 4 or 4.5 per cent unemployment is the dividing line. To get below it, you run the risk of a raging inflation. This has become a touchy political issue, and fires up many of the supporters of the Humphrey-Hawkins "full employment" bill, especially the Black Caucus.

What the "Phillips Curve" adherents seem to be saying is that, if the cost in higher prices to the vast majority of people with jobs is another 2 or 3 percent just to reduce the unemployment rate by 1 percent, it isn't worth it.

Politicians, as they have in the Nixon-Ford administration, begin to justify 5 per cent unemployment—and maybe 6—is a "realistic" full-employment level.

Carter insisted on one Meet the Press show that very low unemployment and inflation rates could exist side by side. He cited the post-Korean experience. But Carter's own chief economist, Lawrence R. Klein of the Wharton school, concedes that was one of the exceptions proving the rule.

In recent congressional testimony, Klein said that, "more often than not, (there was) an inverse trade-off . . ." between unemployment and inflation.

Another expression of support for the traditional view that there is a clear—and, unhappily, an opposing—relationship between unemployment and inflation—came from the Congressional Budget Office.

The dramatically lower inflation in the last year was at least in part "a response to the recession which reached its trough (low point) in March 1975 rather than to recovery which has taken place since," CBO says.

What the CBO deduces is that the Phillips curve is still alive enough to give policymakers "an unemployment-inflation dilemma." That is, if they choose to fight unemployment by traditional means (lower taxes, bigger federal budgets), inflation will get worse. And if they choose to fight inflation

with the "old-time religion" of austerity, unemployment will increase.

Unless the government confesses it doesn't know how to govern, there must be a way out of this dilemma.

Charles W. Killingsworth, a labor market economist and supporter of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, says the answer is to provide "structural" aids for those groups and areas of society suffering recession, instead of across-the-board tax cuts and pump-priming that might prove inflationary.

Without endorsing the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, the CBO report comes to the same general conclusion. The dilemma posed for policy-makers "is leading to interest in other alternatives outside of traditional fiscal and monetary policies," the CBO says.

Mentioned are not only wage-price guidelines and controls, but policies to improve competition in business and industry.

Carter's economist, Klein, made clear he worries about the economy slowing down in 1977 and suffering a decline in 1978 unless it is given some new thrust. How, then, to control inflation?

After a briefing by Klein and other economists last week in Plains, Ga., Carter indicated he is thinking seriously of reinstating something like the Kennedy wage-price guideposts, perhaps with greater labor-management participation.

According to Klein, a vigorously expanding economy would provide the revenues for balancing the budget by 1979 or 1980, even if taxes were cut in the interim to provide a forward thrust.

If Carter is elected, such an underlying activist push for a high-employment economy will mark a main difference from the Ford administration. Under the tutelage of Treasury Secretary William Simon and economic adviser Alan Greenspan, the Ford administration has made price stability the basic focus of economic policy.

CHINA REPORT: A CLARIFICATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many Members must receive, as do I, the "China Report" newsletter published by the Committee For a Free China.

An item in the June 1976 edition caught my eye: a story headlined "ROC A Free Society" the first paragraph of which I quote below:

Dr. Allen S. Whiting, professor of political science at the University of Michigan and a highly respected liberal academician, has affirmed that the ROC is a comparatively free and open society backed up by a sound military, economic and political set-up.

This is in part a paraphrase of a sentence that appears on page 29 of Whiting's April 1976 booklet, "China and the United States: What Next?" No. 230 in the Foreign Policy Association's "headline series."

Here is the sentence which the editors of "China Report" paraphrased:

Although the Republic of China is an authoritarian regime operating under explicit national emergency conditions sanctioned by the ongoing civil war, by contrast with the mainland, it is a relatively open society.

When compared with the People's Republic of China, a great many authori-

tarian societies in the world could be characterized as relatively open, so the Whiting statement tells us very little.

And, concerning the "China Report" paraphrase of Whiting as they say in the law, *res ipsa loquitur*, the thing speaks for itself.

PANAMA GATEWAY HAUNTS
ADMINISTRATION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there has been an attempt of late to "cool" the issue of the Panama Canal, because the American people have shown a tendency to react with genuine anger at the persistent attempts by architects of the new world order to divest the United States of the Canal and Canal Zone. These architects of the new world order are largely Americans. As in so very many cases, only Americans could do to us the harmful things which are being done.

The Panama Canal giveaway being engineered by the State Department is among the many issues which those who must face the electorate hope will be swept under the carpet "until November," until after the elections. Clearly, this is cynical dishonesty from those who are generally to be found prattling about "citizen participation" or "the people's right to know."

I am pleased that a number of my colleagues, such as the Honorable LEONOR SULLIVAN, are not so willing to "cool" the issue for the convenience of Mr. Kissinger and the administration in general. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat carried, on July 1, some very pertinent remarks by my colleague, Mrs. SULLIVAN, who has stood so firmly against the State Department's sneak play.

The article follows:

ANSWERS ON RED ROLE IN PANAMA DEMANDED
(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, D-St. Louis, has demanded "very clear answers" from President Ford on her suspicions of growing infiltration by Cuba's Castro regime in the Republic of Panama.

One question put to Mr. Ford was whether secret intelligence reports in Washington show that Cuban or other foreign Communist personnel are "teaching guerrilla warfare and terrorist tactics" in Panama, with a possible aim of taking over the United States-controlled Panama Canal or Canal Zone.

In an unusually strongly worded letter to her friend and long-time House colleague, Mrs. Sullivan told the President that Americans will be "outraged and disillusioned" if they find "any indication that information relative to communism in Panama and threats to the Panama Canal are being covered up."

As chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, which has jurisdiction over the canal, Mrs. Sullivan sent her three-page letter to Mr. Ford July 27, with a request for a reply "as rapidly as possible."

By Thursday, the White House had acknowledged receiving the letter and said it was working on answers to Mrs. Sullivan's eight questions.

Mrs. Sullivan said in her letter that the

questions were based on "citizen reports from the Canal Zone and other locations on the presence and labors of various types of Cubans and other non-Panamanian personnel within the Republic of Panama," an independent small nation in which the Canal Zone is situated.

"The reports indicate that Communist agitators, military cadre and 'technicians' are engaged in the infiltration of Panamanian society in key positions and areas, and that 'the party line' being spread by those who are infiltrating is clearly anti-American and directed toward wresting control of the canal from the United States," she said.

Mrs. Sullivan opposes a new treaty, now being negotiated, that would transfer United States control and sovereignty over the canal to the Republic of Panama over a period of years.

She has denounced as pro-Communist the Panamanian government of chief of state and strongman Gen. Omar Torrijos. The proposed treaty, she has charged, would turn the canal into a "Red lake."

In May, the Pentagon denied that Cuban military or guerrilla forces were present in Panama, or that Cuban arms and ammunition were being smuggled into the country.

But in her letter to the President, Mrs. Sullivan indicated skepticism about the Pentagon denial. She called on Mr. Ford himself to clear up "the confusion and questions" by giving her "clear, forthright and substantive answers."

Her questions included:

Whether Washington intelligence files reflect any secret trips to Cuba by Col. Manuel Noriega, the second-ranking official and hatchetman in the Torrijos government.

Whether the Partido del Pueblo, Panama's only openly operating political party, is "essentially a Communist organization."

Whether American citizens, such as soldiers stationed in the Canal Zone, have been imprisoned on the island of Cuba by the Panama government, and whether any have been killed in attempting to escape.

Whether there is truth to a rumor that an attempt to seize part of the Canal Zone and a confrontation with the United States will be attempted late this year in order to place the Panama Canal issue before the United Nations.

DIVESTITURE OF OIL COMPANIES

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, considerable controversy has surrounded recent debates on dismemberment of the large, vertically integrated oil companies into their various components. I have received numerous communications from my constituents on this subject and, after careful examination of both sides of this issue, I have concluded that vertical divestiture of the oil companies is not in the best interests of the United States.

Dismemberment, or divestiture, would prohibit the 18 largest oil companies from operating in more than 1 of the 4 major sectors of the oil business—exploration, transportation, refining, and marketing. Proponents of divestiture legislation believe that divestiture would increase competition within the oil industry and also encourage truly competitive bidding for Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—OPEC—oil. How-

ever, as I shall attempt to illustrate, these statements are predicated upon false assumptions—that competition is nonexistent in the oil industry and that smaller companies could effectively negotiate with the OPEC cartel and perhaps bring down the world price of oil.

Although the Senate Judiciary Committee acted favorably upon a divestiture bill in June, further action by the entire Senate is unlikely because of time constraints, according to Senate leaders. The House of Representatives has not taken any action on similar legislation and such action is highly unlikely to occur this year. In spite of the low probability of House action, I feel that an explanation of my stance on this matter should be made public.

Contrary to divestiture proponents' statements, there is competition in the oil industry. Very few other businesses contain 18 major competitors. The four leading oil companies control less than 30 percent of the market, whereas the four leading auto manufacturers and the four leading aluminum companies control more than 92 percent of their respective markets. In addition, there are over 10,000 companies engaged in exploring for new oil and 131 companies own the 260 refineries in this country.

Entry into the oil marketplace and continued growth by those new entrants are commonplace. Every year new corporations are formed and begin operating in different parts of the oil business. Probably the most successful new entrant since World War II has been Amerada Hess, predominantly an east coast operation. In fact, Hess has prospered and grown to such an extent that it is one of the 18 companies faced with possible dismemberment. Divestiture seems an improper reward for efficiency.

Independent oil companies have continued to increase their share of the market over the last two decades. In the mid 1960's, independents controlled roughly 20 percent of the oil market, whereas in 1976 that share has grown to over 30 percent. These figures refute the allegation made by divestiture advocates that an oligopoly controls the oil market and that this oligopoly is continually increasing its percentage of that market at the expense of the smaller companies.

Clark Oil & Refining Co., a leading independent in the Midwest, has stated its opposition to divestiture in its annual report to its shareholders. Although not directly affected by the proposed breakup of the leaders, Clark officials state that the chaos that would ensue would disrupt investment at precisely the time when new capital is essential for new developments to combat the oil cartel.

Major oil companies, because of their economic power, have the ability to negotiate on an equal basis with foreign governments. While advocates of divestiture contend that small refiners could break the OPEC cartel's stranglehold on oil through competitive bidding, the reverse of this proposition seems more likely. Concentrated power normally dominates smaller, diverse elements in the business world and I do not think that this situation will prove the exception to the rule. However, merely because the economic

giants possess this power does not mean that they abuse it in their domestic operations with smaller companies.

The competitive equality of our large oil companies has come to the attention of foreign countries. In an effort to match our companies' strength, Japan and other Western nations are encouraging their domestic oil companies to combine their operations and form cartels. How ironic that the United States is contemplating breaking up its major oil companies, while other nations copy their structures.

Many experts believe that there are serious disadvantages to divestiture. Almost everyone who has studied the divestiture issue agrees on one point—regardless of whatever else happens, divestiture will not produce one more drop of oil than would be produced if the status quo were maintained.

Even the staunchest advocates of divestiture admit that their proposals will probably not reduce the price of oil. Indeed, dismemberment could result in higher prices because of the inherent inefficiencies in multiple corporate transactions.

An integrated oil company can operate portions of its operation at a low profit because it earns higher profits from other segments of its business. By averaging its expenses and profits, a company can market its product at a lower price to the consumer, yet still earn enough money to attract investors for its stock. Divestiture would eliminate this averaging process and each segment would be forced to turn an attractive profit on its own. Those segments who are now "carried" by the more profitable portions of the business would be forced to increase their prices to raise their profits, enabling them to attract new investors that would otherwise invest elsewhere. Of course, as we all know, these price increases would eventually be passed along to the consumers.

Furthermore, even if prices were reduced, this might only prove a short-run benefit that precedes a longrun disaster. Lower prices would inevitably result in increased consumption by most consumers, industrial as well as individual. Increased consumption would further deplete the United States known reserves, leading to increased dependence once again on foreign oil. The energy crisis would be at hand once again, except that the OPEC cartel would be in an even stronger position and could extract even higher prices.

This country must recognize that alternative sources of energy must be developed, and soon. Whether the Government develops them or the oil companies should expand horizontally into this area is a question that requires more investigation, but in the very near future that question must be answered. However, breaking up the oil companies will not move this country one step closer to energy independence—our most important goal.

The time and expense of dismantling the 18 major oil companies greatly outweighs any possible benefits, according to industry spokesman. In the early 1950's DuPont Chemical Co. was ordered

to sell its General Motors stock because these holdings violated the antitrust laws. In order to preserve the stability of the stock market, the divestiture plan allowed DuPont to sell the stock over a 10-year period. Imagine the difficulties of separating the various components and then placing the stock in the market once divestiture is mandated. They would be tremendous. The only other comparable event is the New Deal's Holding Company Act. That undertaking took 40 years to accomplish. This is probably the most compelling argument against divestiture.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think it would look foolish for Congress to break up these corporations and impede our country's advance toward energy independence.

THE DECLARATION

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, throughout the celebration of America's Bicentennial, we have all heard and read many words reflecting on this great event—words which encourage all of us to re-examine and reaffirm those values on which our country was founded.

Recently, one of my constituents, Mrs. Marjorie Theroux, sent me a recording of the words written by her son, Gary Theroux, and his friend, Bob Gilbert. This recording first appeared as a radio editorial in Los Angeles on April 17, 1976, and made a strong impression on its listeners. I submit for the Record a copy of the stirring words of "The Declaration" for all of us to consider as part of our Bicentennial reflections:

THE DECLARATION

Two hundred years ago, the fathers of our republic met in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Gathered were fifty men, with differing occupations—lawyers, farmers, businessmen, an inventor, a schoolteacher—yet bound by one single, overwhelming belief. A belief that foremost among the transcendent values of man is the individual's right to use his God-given free will, and that the sole purpose of government is to protect that freedom through the preservation of internal order, provision for national defense, and the administration of justice. Those fifty assembled were well aware that when government ventures beyond those rightful functions, it accumulates powers which tend to threaten individual liberty. On that historic day, those men did openly and defiantly declare, under the threat of death, their full and complete independence from the autocratic rule of the British Crown. Upon signing that declaration, those representatives of thirteen desultory colonies stood on their own, yet together, and established a United States of America.

Two hundred momentous, incredible years have passed, and America has grown from a rebellious upstart, into the strongest, most successful, and inspiring civilization of all time. Nowhere else on the face of this earth can you find the spirit of *laissez faire*—power to the people—more evident than right here.

Stand up, American, on your own two feet. American, because that's what made our country great! Remember the cornerstones

of our nation—courage, ingenuity, self-reliance, and a determined unity against domination. Seven generations of Americans now entrust you with the precious, hard-earned gift of freedom, now yours to pass on to your children. Guard it well, for today, at this very moment, less than one-fifth of the world's population still enjoys the liberty to write, speak and vote as they please. Yet, in our own last election, barely over half the eligible Americans even bothered to show up at the ballot box. So many of us are so wrapped up in enjoying the fruits of freedom that we neglect to make sure the bounty will be there tomorrow. Despite such warnings as tight job markets, rising prices and dwindling supplies, a tragic number of us have no interest, or even any concept of current legislation, assuming that somehow "big government" will always know best, and will do our thinking for us. Many Americans are so blasé about their own future, and the future of their children that they vote for slick journalism and bumper stickers, and not their own convictions. Do you know that if you asked them about their congressman, they couldn't even tell you his name!

As we move into our third century of progress, let us keep from merely celebrating symbols and slogans. Let us instead always keep in mind the belief upon which this nation was founded—that every American has the sovereign right to live his life in any manner he may choose, as long as he does not tread on the equal rights of his neighbor. Let us reaffirm our commitment to make the ideals of liberty and justice for all more than mere words on paper, and let us not once forget the American Dream—that one day, all mankind, everywhere, will be free. That's the legacy born to us in the founding of our nation, two hundred years ago.

MOTHER OF TWO OLYMPIC BOXERS CREDITS THE LORD FOR THEIR SUCCESS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Americans share the great pride of the people of St. Louis in the achievements at Montreal this year of Michael and Leon Spinks, both of them gold medal winners in Olympic boxing competition, Michael, 20, in the middleweight classification and Leon, a 23-year-old lance corporal in the Marine Corps, as a light heavyweight. This is the first time two brothers have ever won gold medals in the Olympics.

During the Olympic Games, when both young men had won their quarter-final bouts but were still a long way from their top awards they ultimately won, Sheila Rule of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch interviewed the Spinks brothers' mother, Mrs. Kay Spinks, in her apartment in the Darst-Webbe housing complex and wrote a beautiful article about the religious orientation of Mrs. Spinks and her sons.

Mr. Speaker, for an understanding of how two young men from a poor family living in a tough neighborhood "got into boxing because they wanted a legitimate way to defend themselves in the neighborhood they lived in without getting into trouble," and rose to the pinnacle

of amateur boxing in the Olympic Games, I commend Sheila Rule's article for its sensitive reflection of Mrs. Spinks' faith in God and in humanity.

The article is as follows:

MOTHER OF TWO OLYMPIC BOXERS CREDITS THE LORD FOR THEIR SUCCESS

(By Sheila Rule)

Mrs. Kay Spinks speaks of the climb to fame of her two sons with quiet understatement. Only when she discusses the power she believes put them in the limelight does her voice surge like the sea.

"It is the Lord that has put my sons where they are," Mrs. Spinks said. "He has His hand in my children's lives; He has a plan for them."

Her eyes wandered to a case laden with trophies on which were etched the names of her sons, Michael and Leon Spinks, the first brother combination ever to win Olympic boxing trials championships in the same year. They became the first St. Louisans to win since 1956.

Both won quarterfinal bouts yesterday in competition at the Summer Olympics in Montreal, Canada. Leon won his light heavyweight match with Ottomar Sachse of East Germany, and Michael beat Poland's Ryszard Paslewicz in a battle of middleweights.

Their moves were followed closely by their mother, who watched the bouts on television in her small apartment in the Darst-Webbe housing complex on Chouteau Avenue.

In an interview yesterday, Mrs. Spinks emphasized that she preferred to remain an observer in the hoopla surrounding her sons' success.

"This is their thing; not mine," she said. "I don't want to take the spotlight away from them and try to be the star. But people here started seeking me out. It's like living in a goldfish bowl."

She exhibited pride in her sons' accomplishments and said that she slowly had come to peace with herself over their participation in boxing.

"I wanted them to be preachers. I thought if they'd been preachers they wouldn't have to fight. The word of God would put fear in people and make them leave my boys alone," she said.

She laughed softly and then went on talking about Leon, 23 years old, and Michael, 20. "They got into boxing because they wanted a legitimate way to defend themselves in the neighborhood they lived in without getting into trouble. They kept getting bouts but I didn't think any of this was serious." The family lived in the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex 18 years before moving to Darst-Webbe.

"I often prayed God would bring them out of the ring but the harder I prayed the more they stayed in the ring," she said. "I felt that they no longer needed boxing, that God could take care of them. But my mother said that if God wanted them to stay in the ring He must have a plan. So they stayed and I just took a seat and watched."

Mrs. Spinks rarely mentioned her sons names without a mention of God's influence on their lives. Her words rode on evangelistic inflections.

"They are timid, fun-loving boys who I've taught to thank God for everything," she said.

Before continuing, she spoke softly to one of her seven children. Five of them, including Michael, live with her.

"I try to keep Michael's and Leon's feet on the ground," she said. "I guess I'm kind of like their manager that way. I tell them the best winner in the world is a good loser. They may be good winners but I want them to ask themselves what kind of losers they are."

The two boxers pray for their fellow Olympic participants daily, Mrs. Spinks said, "and their day is not made unless they contact their mama for encouragement."

That encouragement has seen the Spinks brothers through many lean years with their low-income family. But even when the children walked through the cold with holes in their shoes, they found a way to send money to persons needier and less fortunate than they, said Mrs. Spinks, who has had to rear her children alone since her husband left the home 12 years ago.

When the excitement of Olympic participation ends, Leon will return to his duties as a lance corporal in the Marine Corps. Michael will return to his job as a part-time dishwasher.

But Michael will not experience a letdown when he resumes his unglamorous job, said Mrs. Spinks, a young-looking woman who shies away from telling her age.

"Before Michael left for the Olympics he said he believed however things turned out that God would fix things so he could do better as far as a job," she said. "He said God would make the proper changes in due time."

Mrs. Spinks said she has attempted to instill in her sons one emotion in particular—"I-o-v-e." By their actions, she believes she's been successful.

"They fight other boxers with no malice or revenge in their hearts," she says. "Leon said it was just a sport that they enjoyed."

"They are good boys. But they are good in secret and they let the Lord reward them in the open. I guess the Lord is giving them a reward."

THE NEED TO REFORM THE FPC

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reforms of the Federal Power Commission—the Federal agency that regulates wholesale rates of electricity—should be high on the agenda of this Congress. H.R. 12608 includes many important reform provisions, and I urge the Energy and Power Subcommittee to expedite consideration of this bill. Congress should stop the Federal Power Commission from allowing wholesale suppliers to raise their rates until the Commission determines that a rate increase is lawful. Currently, the FPC allows a rate increase to become effective during the ratemaking process. Since at least part of the requested rate increase is often denied, this FPC practice results in situations where suppliers overcharge wholesale customers, who in turn overcharge consumers.

Although consumers eventually receive refunds for overpayments, no interest is paid on the overcharge, nor is the electric cooperative reimbursed for the cost of making refunds. Mr. Harry K. Boman, manager of the Prince William Electric Cooperative, in his letter of July 28, 1976 to me points out the need to reform FPC's procedures. The Prince William Electric Cooperative, which is located in my district, buys electricity from Vepco and sells it to its 25,000 members. Because the FPC allowed Vepco to raise its rates and then later decided that the rate increase was unlawful, some \$1,332,426.55 will be refunded to the cooperative's members. The administrative costs to the cooperative of making the refunds will be about \$25,000. The point is, however, that the consumers should not have been

overcharged in the first place. For this reason, I think Congress ought to stop the FPC from allowing rate increases to become effective until a final determination has been made.

Mr. Bowman's letter, which succinctly points out the need for reform, follows:

PRINCE WILLIAM
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Manassas, Va., July 28, 1976.

HON. HERBERT HARRIS,
1229 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: In the next couple weeks the Prince William Electric Cooperative will be refunding \$1,332,426.55 to its 25,000 member consumers. These refunds are the result of Wholesale Rate overcharges paid by the Cooperative members to the Virginia Electric Power Company.

We are happy to be able to make these refunds to our members, but very strongly object to the Federal Power Commission procedures that created the overcharges by VEPCO. As you know, the Federal Power Commission's common practice is to allow rate increases to become effective without review or public hearings. Of course, these increases are allowed with the understanding that refunds must be made if final approval reduces the rate increases.

The Federal Power Commission does require interest to be paid on any overcharges, but no allowances are made for the consumer unrest created by the overcharges or for the costly process of returning the refunds to the member consumer. We estimate our cost will be at least \$25,000 to make these refunds.

The Board of Directors of Prince William Electric Cooperative, on behalf of its nearly 25,000 members, urgently requests your support of proposed Regulatory Reform Legislation similar to H.R. 12608, as proposed by Congressman McFall and S. 3311, as proposed by Senator Moss. Of particular concern to us is the present Federal Power Commission practice or allowing rates to become effective without hearings on the "pancaking" practice of allowing new rates to be effective before previous rate requests have been finally determined.

We solicit your strong support of these Federal Power Commission reforms in the interest of our member consumers to promote a more competitive electric industry.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation in the past.

Very truly yours,

HARRY K. BOWMAN,
Manager.

FOOD STAMP FRAUD

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, have you ever wondered why it costs so much to run the Government? A major reason is sheer waste and abuse of the taxpayers' money.

One of the most wasteful and most abused Federal programs is the food stamp program. Due to a lack of proper standards and controls, the cost of this program has grown to more than \$5 billion a year.

Under current law there is no maximum income limit to qualify for food stamps. No minimum age exists for eligibility as a household. College students whose parents earn high salaries may qualify. Even those who are on strike

from their jobs are eligible to participate in the program.

This is bad enough. Now add to that, however, the element of fraud.

According to the August 7 Washington Star, a pastor and a bishop of a Washington, D.C. church have pleaded guilty to defrauding the Government of \$262,775. These two men collected but did not deposit the money received from the sale of food stamps. Instead of returning the money to the Government, they used it to pay for airline tickets, travel agency fees, and closing costs on their church and private home.

No wonder so many Americans are disgusted with the Government. The taxpayers of this Nation are tired of seeing their money thrown away. It is time to tighten food stamp eligibility requirements and place stricter controls on their distribution. With all of this, the liberals on the House Agriculture Committee are not improving the food stamp law which allows this fraud. They are making it worse. Here is the article from the Washington Star:

D.C. FOOD STAMP FRAUD ADMITTED BY
2 CHURCHMEN
(By Susan Axelrod)

The pastor and bishop of a Southeast Washington church pleaded guilty yesterday to defrauding the government of \$262,775.84 and using some of the money to pay for airline tickets, travel agency fees and closing costs on their church and private home.

Albert R. Hamrick, a pastor of St. Phillip's Pentecostal Church, 4201 Wheeler Road SE, had been accused of collecting—but not depositing in a Federal Reserve Bank—\$29,892.84 from the sale of food stamps at the church.

Lucius S. Cartwright, a bishop at St. Phillip's, agreed with the government's charge that he collected but did not deposit in a federal bank \$232,883 from food stamps he sold at St. Phillip's Ice Cream Parlor at 4049 Minnesota Ave. NE.

St. Phillip's Pentecostal Church was identified in January by government auditors and FBI agents as being among 12 institutions in the District and 18 nationwide suspected of misusing government funds. It is the first case in the District to be presented in court, but the investigation is continuing, government officials said.

Asst. U.S. Atty. Eric B. Marcy told U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy that Cartwright signed a contract to sell food stamps with the District's Department of Human Resources in April 1972 and continued to sell them until last February.

Marcy said low-income persons eligible to purchase food stamps would pay Cartwright or Hamrick an average of \$30 and receive coupons enabling them to purchase \$100 worth of food.

Money collected from selling food stamps is to be deposited weekly in a Federal Reserve bank regardless of the amount, or within 24 hours if the amount exceeds \$1,000, Marcy said.

Cartwright and Hamrick collected the money, but instead of forwarding it, they would allow it to sit in accounts at Suburban Trust Co. and the National Bank of Washington for two to three months—a process called "lapping"—and use it "to pay personal expenses and expenses of St. Phillip's Pentecostal Church," according to the government.

The men's deposits in the Federal Reserve Bank were two to three months behind, the government charged, and Hamrick and Cartwright would back-date the deposits and food stamp forms "in order to conceal the accumulation of monies in these accounts."

None of the missing money has been recovered, Marcy said. In its contract with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, DHR guarantees all sales. DHR could file a civil suit against the two men to try to recoup its losses.

The government said either Hamrick or Cartwright used food stamp money to:

Pay Loyal Travel, Inc., \$1,982.50 to charter a bus to Montreal in August 1972.

Pay the National Bank of Washington \$6,929.84 for the closing cost on the purchase of St. Phillip's Pentecostal Church in December 1972.

Pay \$6,387.74 for the closing costs on the house in which both men live at 11808 Pitt Drive, Oxon Hill, in January 1974 and a month later make a mortgage payment of \$380.12.

Pay Eastern Airlines \$3,690.90 in May 1974. Pay a total of \$6,640 to Taylor Freezing Equipment for equipment purchased for the ice cream parlor in the summer of 1974.

Pay Bob Banning Dodge \$6,683 for a Dodge van in July 1974.

Marcy said he did not know whether any members of St. Phillip's bought food stamps from Cartwright or Hamrick.

In requesting a personal recognizance bond, Cartwright's attorney told Judge Waddy his client was "a minister, a man of the cloth . . . whose sole occupation is ministering to his flock."

The two men were released on their personal recognizance pending sentencing. They could receive up to five years in jail, a \$10,000 fine or both.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENT, H.R. 10210

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, last month the House approved several significant improvements in the unemployment compensation system and I was pleased to support the final passage of the bill. This was the result of extensive hearings and work in the Subcommittee on Unemployment Compensation of the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

Begun some 40 years ago, the unemployment compensation program has slowly been extended and improved over the years until, if the House-passed amendments are approved by the Senate and signed into law by the President, the unemployment insurance coverage will at last cover virtually the entire labor force. In addition, the House-passed amendments take important steps to restore financial soundness to the system and provide for certain other needed improvements.

The most serious immediate problem faced by the unemployment compensation program has been brought on by the recent severe recession, which has drained funds out of the trust fund to a point where many States have had to borrow large sums from the Federal Government to meet their obligations to qualified unemployed persons. The bill approved by the House would increase the wage bases against which unemployment taxes are levied from \$4,200 to \$6,000. An increase to \$8,000 would have permitted restoration of financial sound-

ness somewhat sooner, but the increase to \$6,000 is a long step in the right direction. In addition, under the bill the net Federal unemployment compensation tax rate was increased from .5 percent to .7 percent for a limited period of 5 years to permit repayment from the Federal fund for advances received from general revenues—a further and necessary step toward financial soundness.

Unemployment compensation has been the major bulwark against the ravages of recession and unemployment in recent years. Without it, the effects on those thrown out of work by the recent economic recession would have been catastrophic to the point of dragging down the full economy into a major depression. Under the unemployment compensation program several million unemployed received assistance promptly to keep them and their families in food and other necessary consumption items until the recession abated and they would begin to find jobs again. At the worst of the recent recession, payments mounted to nearly \$18 billion at an annual rate and did more than any other program to offset and contain the recession.

The bill just passed would extend coverage to more than 700,000 agricultural workers and some 400,000 domestic workers, 7.7 million local government employees, and 600,000 State government employees.

A proposed amendment to the bill of far-reaching significance would have established a national benefits standard requiring each State to pay to qualified unemployed a weekly benefit equal to 50 percent of the individual's former weekly wage up to the maximum provided by the State government. It would have required further that the maximum State benefit be equal to at least two-thirds the statewide average weekly wage for covered workers in the State. It was thought that the 50 percent level would be the best way to insure that unemployed workers anywhere have enough money to meet most essential non-deferred living expenses, such as food, rent, and clothing. The Ford administration, like every administration from Eisenhower's on, has favored such a standard. However, the amendment was defeated primarily on the basis of its cost and a preference for leaving standards of this kind in State hands.

Other improvements are made by the bill in the so-called trigger provisions by means of which benefit payments to qualified unemployed are set in motion and then stopped. The new triggers are more prompt and sensitive to actual job conditions in the various States.

Finally, a National Commission on Unemployment Compensation is provided to examine in longer range perspective the operation of the job insurance system and recommend changes. I hope this Commission will review and evaluate the total 40-year experience, project future trends and needs, and draw together a statesman-like program for improving the system. Long-range financial soundness is a must. Extending the coverage should be completed. Retraining and relocation provisions should be strengthened to reduce the time an unemployed

person can remain in a benefit-receiving status without making a determined effort to regain a job. A satisfactory coordination of unemployment compensation requirements in the different States has yet to be achieved. Food stamp, public assistance, and other welfare programs are still not dovetailed well enough with unemployment compensation. The possibilities for substituting a negative income tax, or some variant of it, for at least portions of other income maintenance programs, needs careful investigation. Jobs programs, whether governmental or private, offer advantages over both unemployment compensation and public assistance programs and should be brought into the picture.

These are some of the pressing problems and promising solutions that the Commission ought to look into.

ECOLOGY'S MISSING PRICE TAG

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from today's edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Ecology's Missing Price Tag."

The article is by Dr. Lewis J. Perl, vice president of the National Economic Research Associates and it points out the present and future economic effects of the environmental legislation that the Congress has passed over the last few years.

Dr. Perl states:

That by 1983 between 3% and 6% of the GNP and between 7% and 10% of total gross private domestic investment could be expended to comply with federal clean air and water legislation. By way of comparison, in 1974 about 7% of GNP was allocated to all educational programs in the United States, the same percentage to health, and about 1% to law enforcement.

Dr. Perl is not suggesting that these amounts are unwarranted but rather that this represents a significant reordering of our national priorities that will have to come about at the expense of other important objectives and that we need to assess whether we are getting our money's worth.

The most startling statistic is Dr. Perl's estimate of the cost-benefits ratio of the current amendments to the Clean Air Act that are now waiting action on the House floor. He has estimated the cost-benefit ratio of the significant deterioration standards in the House bill to be 33.5 to 1.

When the House resumes debate on these amendments to the Clean Air Act, our colleague Congressman CHAPPELL will be offering an amendment that will call for an exhaustive study of the policy of significant deterioration before the Congress enacts this concept into legislative law. I urge my colleagues to read the entire article by Dr. Perl on ecology's missing price tag and to give serious consideration to the Chappell proposal be-

fore making a final decision on the merits of enacting this policy into law before its economic effects are fully understood.

The article follows:

ECOLOGY'S MISSING PRICE TAG

(By Lewis J. Perl)

In "The Closing Circle," Barry Commoner states as the fourth law of ecology that "there is no such thing as a free lunch." This is also the first law of economics. As used by Mr. Commoner, this phrase is intended to mean that we cannot go on doing damage to the environment indefinitely without paying a price for it. What is equally true, however, is that to reduce the effects of economic activity on the environment or to alleviate the damage caused by past activities, we must also pay a price.

There is a wide range of environmental objectives society may choose to pursue, but each one is associated with some real resource costs. Society must decide which environmental controls are worth the expenditures they require and which are not.

Over the last two or three years, there have been numerous attempts to assess the cost of federal pollution-control legislation. In its 1975 report, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) suggested that the 1974 to 1983 capital expenditures would be \$115.2 billion, with the cost in 1983 reaching about \$34.5 billion a year or 1.5% of Gross National Product. However, other data suggest that CEQ has underestimated these costs.

The National Commission on Water Quality (NCWQ) estimated the capital requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act at \$95 billion to \$182 billion, compared with the CEQ's estimate of \$48.8 billion. National Economic Research Associates' (NERA) own studies for the Electric Utility Industry indicate that the industry's capital expenditures for water and air pollution over the 1974 to 1983 period would approximate \$38 billion, whereas the CEQ puts these estimates at only \$16.7 billion.

A LARGE INVESTMENT

If we combine the NCWQ estimates on water-pollution control and NERA's own estimates on air-pollution control for the Electrical Utility Industry with the CEQ's estimates for all other pollution-control costs, we come up with a total capital investment from 1974 to 1983 of \$175 billion to \$263 billion and annual costs in 1983 of \$55 billion to \$66 billion. This is \$679 to \$815 per household per year (in 1975 dollars). If the CEQ's estimates in other areas are off by as much as their figures for utilities and water quality, annual costs could be as high as \$89.4 billion or \$1,098 per household.

It would appear then that by 1983 between 3% and 6% of GNP and between 7% and 10% of total gross private domestic investment would be expended to comply with federal clean air and water legislation. By way of comparison, in 1974 about 7% of GNP was allocated to all educational programs in the United States, the same percentage to health, and about 1% to law enforcement.

These estimates, of course, exclude the costs of compliance with state legislation and appear to ignore expenditures on nuclear power plants related to environmental protection. The CEQ, for example, estimates expenditures for environmental controls on nuclear plants at only \$100 million over the 10-year period, even though it is widely agreed that a very large part of the estimated \$65 billion spent on nuclear plants is attributable to environmental pressures.

The magnitude of these figures does not necessarily suggest that they are unwarranted. They do suggest, however, that environmental legislation represents a significant reordering of our national priorities

which will only come about at the expense of other important objectives. It is, therefore, critical to assess whether we are getting our money's worth.

A number of interesting attempts along these lines have been made. For example, the NCWQ tried to assess the social benefits that might result from implementation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The project covered improvements in recreational and commercial fishing and in other water-based recreation, as well as increases in property values in areas surrounding the improved water.

NCWQ's staff estimated that by 1983 the annual benefits would be \$5.5 billion or about \$55 per household per year. While there are many flaws in these studies, our assessment is that they are more likely to overestimate benefits than to underestimate them. In any event, the cost of achieving the gains would amount to some \$40 billion per year or about \$500 per household.

It is hard to justify current programs of water-pollution control legislation on the basis of these returns. This does not mean that some activities mandated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act are not desirable. There may be programs with highly favorable ratios. The results suggest, however, that Congress has constructed a piece of legislation which expends considerably more resources on pollution control than it restores through an improved environment.

There have been similar efforts to evaluate costs and benefits of improvements in air quality. Unfortunately, efforts to evaluate these costs have been, in general, quite separate from attempts to assess the benefits; the twain have rarely met. My colleagues and I have recently been engaged in comparing the costs and benefits of meeting federally-imposed New Source Performance Standards at a plant under construction. We examined the effect meeting the standards would have on ambient air quality in the surrounding area and assessed the likely effect of the changes on human health, materials and crops.

Altogether, the benefits were assessed at approximately \$2.5 million per year over the life of the plant. Here again the cost of achieving the improvements was about \$28.4 million per year—for an 11.4-to-1 cost-benefit ratio. While both costs and benefits will vary from plant to plant, if these results are typical, the costs of mandated clean-air legislation may, like its water counterpart, be grossly out of line with the benefits.

The \$2.5 million annual benefit at the plant we examined translates to about 1.7 cents per pound of sulfur dioxide emissions removed. For the nation as a whole, I have estimated the costs of meeting the new-source standards at approximately 22 cents per pound of emissions reduction. If the extrapolation is appropriate, this would suggest a national cost-benefit ratio of 13 to 1.

Amendments to the Clean Air Act were approved by the Senate last Thursday and are now being considered by the House to protect areas already below federal ambient air standards against further significant deterioration. The cost of meeting the new standards would be approximately 57 cents per pound of emissions reductions, according to my estimates, which means the cost-benefits ratio for the amendments would be 33.5 to 1.

EVALUATING INTANGIBLES

The failure to attempt to balance the costs and benefits in the promulgation and enforcement of environmental legislation apparently reflects the belief that environmental benefits are too intangible to be captured in quantitative terms. This view does not appear to pervade other investment areas. When individuals buy homes, they invest not only in shelter but in a collection of intangibles—security, prestige, neighborhood, etc.—and have no trouble assigning

values to them. Legislators, too, are often faced with the necessity of evaluating the relatively intangible benefits to be derived from expenditures on education, health, law enforcement or defense. Yet we do not hesitate to ask, "Is it going to pay off?"

The environment area poses more difficult problems, but the issues are fundamentally the same. Given the uncertainties of measuring both cost and benefit, I doubt that cost-benefit analysis can, in and of itself, be taken as definitive in the environmental area. Neither can it be ignored. Where cost-benefit ratios of 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 prevail, it can be argued, say, that the costs have been consistently overestimated or that the benefits have been underestimated or ignored. This position becomes more difficult to maintain when we begin to observe, as we have here, cost-benefit ratios of 11, 13 and even 34 to 1.

At least in such cases, the burden of proof should be on the administrator or the legislator pressing a particular program. Without this balancing effort, we are going to find ourselves, in my view, impeding our economic growth and sacrificing other desirable social goals to carry out environmental programs that promise much and deliver little.

TOLEDO IS PROUD OF BRENDA

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Brenda Morehead, a native of my Toledo, Ohio, congressional district, a student at Tennessee State University, and a participant in the 1976 Olympic games.

Toledo is proud of Brenda and rightfully so. She demonstrates a level of achievement and quiet determination we all could emulate. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Morehead, Jr., instilled in her and her sister, Sandra, and brother, Timothy, the values of a champion. August 14, 1976, "Brenda Morehead Day," is their day, too.

Brenda Morehead is an athlete. She is an outstanding broad jumper, holding the national record in the long jump for her age group in high school; she is an accomplished relay runner and dogged competitor. This was demonstrated memorably in the Olympics when, after breaking the Olympic trial record in the 100-meter dash, she pulled a muscle in the qualifying run of that event. True to her character, Brenda entered the event in spite of her injury, running the race on heart, not her legs. Her personal injuries meant little to her as she attempted to finish the race. Brenda pulled up lame, but she left a lasting impression of courage and quiet determination with the millions who watched her effort.

Brenda is only 18 years old now and will undoubtedly be a source of pride to her family, her school, and her country throughout her collegiate career and on to the 1980 Olympics in Moscow. As a Toledoan, and as an American, I am proud to recognize Brenda Morehead today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GOVERNMENTS THAT RULE BY VIOLENCE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Colman McCarthy, in the August 7 Washington Post, writes about "Governments that Rule by Violence."

McCarthy states:

Evidence suggests that a growing number of Americans are either angry or uneasy about the violence of dictators or military regimes, because a degree of complicity exists: Either through tax money used for military aid or economic assistance to ruthless regimes, or through trade relations with those countries, the victimization that goes on in the torture chambers and prisons of a Chile, South Korea, Iran or Indonesia has the appearance of being blessed by America.

McCarthy is right. Our people are uneasy. The anger and uneasiness Americans feel cannot be ignored. The growth of Amnesty International and the involvement of the Institute for International Policy in human rights issues chronicled by McCarthy are salutary.

Congress will ignore these developments only if it wants to be overtaken and left behind public opinion.

GOVERNMENTS THAT RULE BY VIOLENCE

(By Colman McCarthy)

Public reaction in America to stories of torture, jailings and political repression in foreign countries has tended in the past to be muffled. It is understandable. While few have doubted that violence as a means of silencing dissent is the philosophy of government in countries from Argentina to Russia, the problem has been seen as too immense and too distant for outrage to be effective, even if it could be raised and sustained.

This may no longer be true. Evidence suggests that a growing number of Americans are either angry or uneasy about the violence of dictators or military regimes, because a degree of complicity exists: Either through tax money used for military aid or economic assistance to ruthless regimes, or through trade relations with those countries, the victimization that goes on in the torture chambers and prisons of a Chile, South Korea, Iran or Indonesia has the appearance of being blessed by America. One indication of rising concern is the growth of Amnesty International. In the United States, this valuable organization of advocacy has grown in four years from 19 to 100 chapters. Its financial contributor list has increased from 2,000 to 40,000. Another sign is the involvement in human rights of Washington's Institute for International Policy, a group known for its accurate reporting on the methods of dictators and military regimes. The pressure raised by such groups as Amnesty International and the institute has apparently been felt by Henry Kissinger. His June 8th statement in Santiago on human rights contains forceful phrases that could have been run off on the mimeograph machine in the local Amnesty office.

If this rise of concern can be documented, the case can also be made that terror and violence is rising among world governments. One who believes this is Ginetta Sagan, an Amnesty official and a woman who has survived torture herself. Speaking about Latin America, Mrs. Sagan said that "government

lawlessness is worse today than 10 years ago because the military regimes are well coordinated. Last October in Montevideo, Uruguay, the military commanders from more than a dozen Latin American countries met to plan a common strategy and to coordinate their activities in stamping out what they see as the Marxist threat. They call it a "second war for American independence!" The plan is to stamp out all dissent. The United States was represented at this conference. According to information that I consider reliable, the American government, under the form of military aid, provides sophisticated surveillance equipment. For example, if a suspected dissenter travels from one country to another, the computer has him tracked. This wasn't happening a decade ago. Torture and jailing for political beliefs are now anything but isolated incidents. They are common expressions of governmental policy."

Recent news stories from Latin America suggest that Mrs. Sagan's beliefs are sound. The military government in Argentina, seizing power last March, has imprisoned (according to Newsweek) 7,500 citizens for so-called political and economic crimes. In Buenos Aires, former Bolivian President Juan one of several political exiles to be slain, Jose Torres was kidnapped and murdered, with no accounting. In Chile, according to the human rights commission of the OAS, arbitrary jailings, persecution and torture continues. In Brazil, the death squad is active again. The story is the same in other countries, from Uruguay and Paraguay to Nicaragua.

The philosophy of violence that obsesses generals and dictators, whether in Latin America, Africa or elsewhere, is based on a fear of internal revolution. Those in power are unable to recognize that within their countries is a large middle-ground of citizens who do not demand instant economic or social reforms but who want only free discussions, free elections and a free press—the peaceful means that can make an ordered beginning to reforms. In the so-called "free world," any leaning in this direction is interpreted by those in power as part of a vague Marxist-Communist conspiracy. Through torture and imprisonment these governments mimic Sovietism in ways that can only delight Marxist despots.

It is true that terrorists are at work in some of the Latin American countries. But the governments that rule by death lists and torture chambers make no distinctions between terrorists and those who dissent from the official way. Professors, doctors, lawyers, priests, trade unionists, journalists, poets and others often risk their lives and freedom merely by carrying out their professional work. One physician in Uruguay according to Amnesty, has been imprisoned for several years for the crime of treating wounded members of an underground group. He had no regard for their tactics or ideas; but that had nothing to do with their need for medical help. After giving it, his choice was either to report them—knowing they would be tortured—or remain silent. He chose the latter and has been in jail since.

Occasionally, stories of political prisoners receive world attention, as in the cases of Kofi Awoonor, the Ghana poet, Mihajlo Mihajlov, the Yugoslav writer, or Hector Natalio Sobel, an Argentine labor lawyer. But most of the victims remain unknown beyond their families and friends. Governments that jail and torture usually feign wounded pride when newspapers in America or England run stories about their brutality. Denials are issued. If that doesn't work, the line is taken that the current "limitations on democracy" are temporary until "order"

is restored. Censorship is for the public good; martial law is needed for national security, and torture is the way to seek the truth.

For now, the Kissinger statement in Chile is a break from the usual passivity shown by the American government toward government lawlessness abroad. In recent years, America has come to be loathed throughout much of the world. Our military aid to dictators and juntas has not been used merely for security against outside enemies but against the people of a given country itself, those we are allegedly trying to protect but who dissent from the official view. Many foreigners, familiar with American history and its origins in dissent, once looked to America for help. But now we are perceived as being allies of whatever bully can take power, from South Korea to the Philippines to Iran.

As positive as the Kissinger statement may be, it is still only a statement. Some indications of moral pressure backing it up must quickly come forward, otherwise the work of such groups as Amnesty International and the Institute for International Policy will be that much more difficult. They can be dismissed as zealots or romantics who don't understand the intricacies of foreign policy as do the experts in the State Department or Pentagon. But experts aren't needed to understand that death lists, kidnappings, torture and imprisonments are ways of governing that mock the American philosophy of law. The evidence suggests that large numbers of American citizens are demanding that their government no longer look the other way as the Pinochets and Park Chung Hees crowd their prisons with the innocent.

STATISTICS FOR NEIGHBORHOODS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, there is today in this country a growing effort to retain or revitalize "neighborhood consciousness," particularly in our urban areas. Some cities have already enacted statutory decentralization programs in recognition that government even at local levels has become too unaccountable and unable to respond to the needs of its citizens.

As the neighborhood movement grows, so does the need for relevant neighborhood information. As chairwoman of the House Census Subcommittee, I have been particularly interested in assisting neighborhood organizations in their efforts to receive census data in a way that is usable and relevant to their needs. The Bureau of the Census has pledged its cooperation to work closely with these groups, and I hope that the Bureau will now become a major source of information for neighborhoods.

In an effort to help assure that this process works, I am today introducing legislation for myself and Congressman PAUL SIMON which would allow neighborhood organizations which are officially recognized by statute, and which have elected officials, to have the Bureau of the Census provide census statistics for

their neighborhoods. In many instances, census tracts do not parallel statutory neighborhood entities, and this can cause problems in interpreting census statistics for the neighborhoods.

The cost of this legislation would be minuscule, and I believe it would be a welcomed assistance in the effort to save our neighborhoods and improve local government.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 15148

A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that a municipality or a political subdivision of a municipality shall be entitled to receive population census statistics which relate to the area within the jurisdiction of such municipality or subdivision.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter IV of chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 196. POPULATION STATISTICS RELATING TO MUNICIPALITIES AND SUBDIVISIONS OF MUNICIPALITIES

"(a) On the request of a municipality or a subdivision of a municipality, the Secretary shall provide without charge to such municipality or subdivision statistics collected in any census taken under section 141 which relate to the population within the jurisdiction of such municipality or subdivision, as the case may be. Statistics may not be provided pursuant to a request made under this section obtained in any census the census date of which occurred more than 22 years before the date such request was received by the Secretary.

"(b) For purposes of this section—

"(1) 'municipality' means any unit of local government established by or pursuant to State law and which has general governmental powers, and includes the District of Columbia; and

"(2) 'subdivision of a municipality' means any council, board, or other governmental unit—

"(A) which has one or more officials who are elected by voters within its jurisdiction,

"(B) the principal function of which is to advise or assist a municipality in its carrying out of municipal functions to the extent they relate to the area under the jurisdiction of such council, board, or unit, and

"(C) which is established by or pursuant to Federal, State, or local law."

(b) (1) The table of sections for chapter 5 of such title 13 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"196. POPULATION STATISTICS RELATING TO MUNICIPALITIES AND SUBDIVISIONS OF OF MUNICIPALITIES."

(2) The heading for subchapter V of such chapter 5 is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS".

(3) The table of sections for such chapter 5 is amended by striking out the item relating to subchapter V and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS".

"Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the 60th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

BRUCE JENNER—OLYMPIC
DECATHLON CHAMPION

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest and most difficult of tasks are achieving goals we have established for ourselves.

A native of Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District was able to do just that recently and in so doing earned for himself an Olympic Gold Medal and a new world record. Bruce Jenner, formerly of Newtown, Conn., achieved five lifetime bests during the decathlon at the recently completed 21st Olympiad.

I know that I join with many of the citizens of the Fifth District when I offer my sincere congratulations to Bruce Jenner and his family and wish him the greatest of successes in his future endeavors.

Two newspapers which very ably serve the western Connecticut area, the Danbury News Times and the Waterbury Republican-American recently ran articles about Bruce Jenner's amazing achievement and I would like to include them for my colleagues benefit.

Articles follow:

[From the Waterbury Republican-American]

WE'RE PROUD OF OUR ATHLETES

American athletes won many victories and honors in the Olympics in Montreal, but their greatest achievement was the respect they acquired not only from their own countrymen but from viewers all over the world.

The behavior of Americans was exemplary. They showed good sportsmanship. Their enjoyment of the competition showed so markedly that it was contagious. They had a good time and so did the vast audience watching them.

Americans have reason to be proud of the U.S. participants, including the losers as well as the winners. They showed pride in their country and brought honor to it by the way they acted.

Residents of Connecticut and California were thrilled particularly by the championship performance of Bruce Jenner who became the world's "best all-round athlete" when he broke the record for the 10-event decathlon.

Formerly of Sandy Hook and now of San Jose, Calif., Jenner advanced from ninth place at the 1972 Olympics to win the decathlon in Montreal, setting a record with 8,618 points.

Watching the performance of Jenner and the other Olympic stars over television was a treat for millions of viewers. For the younger viewers, particularly those engaged in sports activities, the performers provided inspiration and incentive to work harder. The intensive training and personal discipline of the champions were obvious.

We join in congratulating the U.S. teams. They did well by their country both in personal achievement and as good-will representatives. We are proud of them.

[From the Danbury News Times]

HE DID IT ALL—NEWTOWN COACH REMEMBERS
BRUCE

NEWTOWN, CONN.—Bruce Jenner's high school coach remembers the record setting

Olympic gold medalist as a friendly, gifted athlete who predicted his own victory in the decathlon.

"He would be joking and friendly with other teams no matter how severe the competition was. Everybody seemed to like him," Newtown High School track coach Roger Streeter said Saturday.

"If you invented a new sport, he would excel in it. He was just that kind of athlete. No matter what sport you put him in he was good," the coach added.

Jenner claimed the title of the world's greatest athlete Friday after compiling a record 8,618 points in the rugged two-day contest of strength, speed and stamina. The 26-year-old native of this rural western Connecticut community set five lifetime bests in the 10 event regimen.

Streeter coached Jenner in 1967 and 1968 when the athlete's family returned to town after living in Tarrytown, N.Y., where Jenner attended his first two years of high school.

Jenner pole vaulted, high jumped, triple jumped, threw the javelin and was leadoff man in the relay for Streeter.

"I wish I could have used him in 12 events. He could have done it and won all 12 events," said Streeter, noting state rules prevented an athlete from competing in more than four individual events.

Streeter said the champ also played football and basketball for Newtown but "his enthusiasm just poured over" for track.

In his senior year, Jenner captured the state pole vault title and took seconds in the high jump and triple jump.

"One magazine said he wasn't a very outstanding athlete in high school. That's not true," said Streeter, adding that Jenner finished second only once in the four individual events in which he regularly competed.

Streeter said his teams always had good athletes but none as great as Jenner.

"No matter who takes credit for his development, he was a very gifted athlete," Streeter said.

"He left high school saying he would win the Olympics and he did."

Streeter said his teams usually finish second in the Western Connecticut Conference.

"We have some talented performers but not much depth" to spread over the 17 events contested in Connecticut track and field, Streeter said. He noted that Jenner sometimes had to run in other events besides his four regular competitions.

The coach said he had no secret formula for developing athletes or producing winning teams but he suggested Jenner's success even back in high school helped generate interest in track at the school.

"There was much greater enthusiasm for the sport after Jenner left and we've gotten some talented people to come out for the team," Streeter said.

REGULATORY TURBULENCE

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, deregulation of the Nation's airlines is a vital issue now before Congress, as we all know.

Charles S. Murphy, a former chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and currently general counsel for one of the Nation's airlines, addressed this issue in

Flight magazine's 1976 Local Air Transport Yearbook.

I believe his discussion of the issues makes interesting reading and would be beneficial in considering this issue:

REGULATORY TURBULENCE

(By Charles S. Murphy)

The air transport system of the United States is, in the words of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the "finest in the world." If it can withstand the current onslaughts against it, that will be further proof of the system's strength and vitality. It has survived adversities in the past, but none more ominous, perhaps, than those which now threaten it.

For more than ten years, there were a number of academic economists who have advocated drastic changes in this system of regulating air transport in the country. For a time, few people took them seriously. Within the past three or four years, however, some of these persons by various means have acquired positions of influence in the Federal Government. Their views, which seemed so radical, have now become the official policy of the present Administration and have even gained a foothold in one committee of the United States Senate.

The position of the Administration is reflected in proposed legislation it has recommended to the Congress, "The Aviation Act of 1975." This proposal is being assiduously pushed by the Department of Transportation (DOT) before Congress and elsewhere. Hearings have been held by House and Senate committees, and further hearings are planned.

The proposal is strongly opposed by most airlines, despite the fact that DOT officials persistently assert that the proposal would benefit them. You see, the airlines still have the benighted notion that they know more about their own business than DOT does. The Administration proposal is also strongly opposed by organized labor. Well it might be, for there are clear signs that labor is its chief target. Little support for the Administration has been manifest from sources outside the government.

The position of the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), which is critical in this matter, is not altogether clear as of the date of this writing (April 29, 1976). Its views have been stated to congressional committees, but they remain to be fleshed out in specific legislative proposals not yet presented, and some important gaps are yet to be filled. We will return to this.

The system for economic regulation of air transport in the United States has been essentially the same since enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The heart of the system is route security. Air carriers are given "franchises" in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity which usually authorize operations over specified routes. Protection against competition on these routes is provided to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by the CAB under standards prescribed in the Act. This security of route authority has been thought necessary to provide incentive for carriers to make the investment to develop and operate airline service.

This concert of route security has been recognized by the Supreme Court in *Civil Aeronautics Board vs. Delta Air Lines*, where the Court said that "... Congress was vitally concerned with what has been called 'security of route,' i.e., providing assurance to the carrier that its investment in operations would be protected insofar as reasonably possible" (367 U.S. 316, 323 [1961]). Indeed, this concept seemed to be recognized by everyone as the heart of a highly successful

regulatory system until the "deregulators" came along. They, too, recognized it as the heart of the system, but they wanted to cut it out.

The initial goals of the reformers were publicized as "deregulation." This was a misnomer because their goals have never included relieving the air carriers of the various burdens of regulation, although they did include the complete removal of route security and of pricing regulation. The deregulation label provoked such a hue and cry that the Administration soon backed off from it, and switched the label on its product to "regulatory reform." Now, it is hard to be against "reform." But it is also true that calling a thing "reform" does not make it good. And in this case, there are some people who wonder if the Administration's proposal ought not to be called something else—perhaps "regulatory adulteration" or "regulatory degradation."

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the basic features of the Administration proposal are not essentially different from those initially put forward as "deregulation." Route security would still be destroyed, as would meaningful regulation of pricing. The specific provisions for getting there are more complex, but that's where it ends up. The Administration bill contains several provisions impinging upon route security. In speaking of just one of them, the CAB in its analysis says:

This seemingly innocuous proposal could be the most explosive provision of the Act. It is clear that its passage would be the equivalent of deregulation through the back door. The Board strongly opposes the proposal.

Similarly, the CAB opposes the pricing provisions of the Administration bill, saying that some of them "would impair the Board's ability to remedy discrimination." Another, the CAB says, "effectively eliminates minimum rate regulation" and "could result in rates which are insufficient to enable the carriers to provide adequate service." And after criticizing the provisions permitting upward-pricing flexibility, the CAB says, "There is no reason to believe that the existing carriers will exercise the downward-pricing flexibility afforded by the bill and every reason to expect that they will take advantage of the upward flexibility provided."

In my view, the CAB's opposition to the foregoing provisions of the Administration bill is fully justified.

THE PROMISED LAND

The deregulators do have an argument. They claim we would have more airline service and lower fares if we relied on the competitive market forces resulting from free entry and the abolition of route security instead of relying upon the blend of regulation and competition we have under the present system. I think they are probably wrong, although I cannot be certain of it. But if route security is done away with and it turns out to be a mistake, the damage will be irreversible.

Before taking any such drastic action, the virtues of the present system should at least be examined to see how well or how poorly it has worked and to see if there are not less draconian measures to correct such defects that may be found. I don't believe the deregulators have given the present system its due.

NO THANKS TO "THEM," IT'S WORKING

I'm going to call the CAB again as the witness on this, and I'm going to quote it at length. This is important testimony, and I want you to read every word of it. There are many other witnesses who would testify to the same effect, and the facts would back them up. In testimony before the Senate

Aviation Subcommittee on April 8, 1976, CAB chairman Robson spoke for the Board as follows:

Despite . . . limitations and contradictions in the governing Act, an air transportation system has evolved over the past 38 years which may be fairly characterized as the finest in the world.

It combines a very high level of safety, service, and convenience with a level of fares which are low when measured against fares prevailing in most other parts of the world. Few other industries can match the long-term growth rate that domestic air transportation enjoyed until recent years. From a level of just under a half billion revenue-passenger-miles in 1938, scheduled domestic traffic has grown to 131.7 billion revenue-passenger-miles in 1975.

Since 1938 more and more city-pairs have received new service—58,000 city-pairs are currently part of the domestic route network—and more and more city-pairs have received single-plane, non-stop, and competitive service. The 1938 Act, by Congressional mandate, accorded grandfather rights to 19 then-existing trunk carriers (excluding those in Alaska), ten of which have survived. The Big Four Carriers at that time—American, United, TWA, and Eastern—carried more than 80 percent of the domestic revenue—passenger-miles; in 1975 they carried 57 percent.

By 1975, entirely new categories of direct and indirect carriers had developed—local service airlines, cargo specialists, charter specialists, commuter carriers and air taxis, and air freight forwarders. The smallest of the local service carriers operated over 78 million revenue-passenger-miles in 1974—nearly four times as many revenue-passenger-miles as the largest of the original trunkline carriers in 1939. Today, the local service airlines generate more than 20 times as many revenue-passenger-miles as all the airlines generated in 1938. The commuter carriers and air taxis served more than six and three-quarter million passengers in the year ended June 30, 1975, and provided air transportation to small and large communities throughout the country.

Air fares have gone down when measured against prices in the rest of the economy. While the consumer price index rose by about 275 percent between 1946 and 1975, fares per mile rose by only about 40 percent during the same period. Expressed in 1967 dollars, scheduled fares which in 1946 averaged 9.16 cents per mile had actually decreased to an average of 4.56 cents per mile by 1975, or about half their level at the end of World War II.

Recently, low-cost air transportation also has become increasingly available under new charter rules promulgated by the Board and a wide variety of discount fares and off-peak fares which have been allowed by the Board.

In other respects, too, the consumers, represented by 175 million passenger enplanements last year, have had the benefit of regulations protecting them against various consumer problems—although we cannot say that these are, like environmental problems, continuing areas of controversy.

Through the years the domestic air transport system has achieved great technological progress as it has joined in a profitable partnership with aviation manufacturers and suppliers.

In terms of overall benefits to the Nation's commerce, employment, manufacturing and balance of payments, generated by the air transport industry itself, and as a vital infrastructure service to general commercial activity, our domestic air transport system makes a major contribution.

Are we justified, on the basis of evidence

at hand, in abandoning a system that has worked so well in the uncertain hope of finding something better? I think not. I believe it would be downright irresponsible.

NOTHING'S PERFECT, NOT EVEN THE CAB

The CAB testimony before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee on April 8th, and the accompanying documents, performed an invaluable public service. While it will certainly not dispose of the whole furor about regulatory reform, it seems to me that it should—and I hope it will—make the Administration proposal obsolete. The discussion should be able to move forward now around a more meaningful vehicle. Accordingly, I want to talk some now about the CAB's position. As of now, this must be done with reference to the April 8th testimony as the latest available expression of the Board's position.

It seems to me that the CAB testimony falls into two rather distinct and quite different parts. The first is an effort to support the thesis that "economic regulation should be redirected so domestic air transport is, in time essentially governed by competitive market forces." This apparently looks toward abolishing route security just as completely as the Administration bill would do. The second part of the Board's testimony suggests a number of changes in the Act, short of abolishing route security for scheduled certificated carriers, which the Board believes would be substantial improvements.

At least some of these specific changes seem to be worthy of careful consideration. Unfortunately, the Board presents them as transition measures toward the abolition of route security. This may well prevent these specific proposals from ever being considered on their intrinsic merits. If the Board would present them as improvements designed to perfect the present system for the long run, they might well find support for many of them. But it is hardly to be expected that those who fear that the abolition of route security will result in their extinction will support measures designed to bring about that result in an orderly fashion over a period of time.

I do not find the CAB's arguments in support of abolishing route security to be convincing. In fact, as I re-read the Board's testimony, it appears the Board itself did not find them very convincing. They recognized the "uncertainties and risks" involved, which seems appropriate under the circumstances. They recognized that bankruptcies might result, so they included in their program proposals which "would enable us to authorize expeditiously replacement service if that should prove necessary in the wake of bankruptcy." They recognized that hardship might be caused for "some employees investors, creditors, and suppliers as well as the possible temporary inconvenience for communities and the traveling public."

They also recognized "possible repercussions in the capital markets and aircraft manufacturing community that could extend beyond the failing carrier, because other airlines may find capital more difficult or more costly to raise and long-term commitments to acquire new equipment could become uncertain." Similarly, they recognized "that airport development revenue and financing could be adversely affected."

Another possibility recognized by the Board is "a reduction in the convenience and comfort of air service received by various classes of the traveling public." The Board did indicate, however, a belief that deterioration in service might be offset by lower fares.

Finally, the Board quite wisely said, that the Congress must decide. If the Congress should decide in the face of all this to abolish route security, they can't say the

Board didn't give them fair warning of the risks.

One aspect of the Board's testimony is particularly disappointing—that is its characterization of the present Act as anti-competitive. The Act strongly favors competition, and the Board's own decisions over the years are full of evidence to that effect. The aspect of the Act has just been strongly reaffirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit in the landmark case of *Continental Air Lines v. Civil Aeronautics Board* (519 F.2d 944 [1975]), a case which the CAB very curiously completely failed to mention in its testimony. The Board can move toward greater reliance upon competitive forces under the present Act. It is not in a very good position to ask the Congress to give it greater power to rely upon competition so long as it fails to utilize fully the authority it already has.

The better part of wisdom, it seems, would be to concentrate on the specific legislative proposals suggested by the CAB—divorcing them from the notion that they are transition measures to abolition of route security—and weighing them on their own merits as possible improvements to a system which will continue to be based on route security. This approach could result in significant improvements. Those persons who would * * * markets for a basic economic reason: The CAB did not pay enough subsidy to make it profitable to provide the service. If the time has now come when commuters can serve some markets of this kind better, this should be regarded as a normal and desirable development, and the locals should be applauded for filling their larger role.

We will await the Board's more definitive recommendations on this subject with much interest. Hopefully, they will have merits which will not be nullified by unreasonable conditions. In any event, one should not expect to maintain service to small communities and achieve great subsidy savings at the same time. This particular sleight-of-hand trick is not in the cards, and those who persist in trying it are likely to end up dropping the whole deck.

TO BE OR NOT TO BE, THAT IS THE QUESTION

To return to the larger question of route security, most of the airlines perceive this as a matter involving their very existence. Since they do perceive it that way, they can only be expected to oppose the abolition of route security—strenuously. Airline management people, for the most part, are not the kind one can cajole into suicide. Outsiders can persist in telling them that abolition of route security will be good for their business, but you can't expect them to believe it.

Unfortunately, airline management has been forced to divert much time and effort in recent months to defend their companies and their employees against the attacks of the deregulators. But by now they have taken the danger to heart, and they are fighting back. The Congress cannot help but be impressed by the cogent testimony carrier representatives have presented. And more is to come. This show isn't over by a long shot.

Similarly, airline labor and their brethren in other industries have been aroused to the fact that they are one of the principal targets of all this. As is their wont, they are calling a spade a spade. In a statement issued in February, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, speaking of the Administration bill, said: "This proposal is unsafe, uneconomic and basically anti-labor, and we will oppose it."

Perhaps the Congress can find a path of moderation through this controversy that will improve our situation instead of ruining us. If it does, we will have reason once again to be thankful for the blessings of democracy.

IMPORTED CAR AUTO DEALERS
CLARIFY POSITION ON DINGELL-
BROYHILL (TRAIN) AUTO EMIS-
SION AMENDMENT TO CLEAN AIR
BILL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that the American Imported Automobile Dealers Association has clarified its position regarding the automobile emission control standards as contained in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976, H.R. 10498.

For information to my colleagues I am inserting two documents, today, along with the following explanatory data.

Despite the claim by Representative ROGERS in his July 27, 1976 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insert commenting on the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) auto emission amendment to his bill, which noted "that the American Import Automobile Dealers Association has written to support the committee bill"; the record must be corrected to put that statement in the proper context of the complete AIADA letter to Representative ROGERS.

In the AIADA letter to the Honorable PAUL ROGERS of May 4, 1976, AIADA reprinted the resolution that organization adopted on H.R. 10498 which shows that AIADA supports the retention of the 2 grams per mile NO_x standard contained in the House Commerce Committee (Rogers) bill as ordered reported. And, inasmuch as the same level of 2 NO_x is contained in the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment, but for one additional model year, 1981, it is assumed that the NO_x setting in our amendment passes AIADA judgment, too. However, the committee bill auto emission section unrealistically departs from the 2 NO_x standard beginning in 1981, contrary to the official AIADA position. The committee bill zips to the 0.4 NO_x level in 1981 allowing for possible waivers, which the EPA may or may not grant, up to 2 grams per mile. And, there is no waiver permitted in the committee bill for NO_x at 0.4 gram per mile in 1985, also contrary to the AIADA position paper.

This is a crucial argument regarding 2 NO_x as contained in the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) amendment I will offer on this bill. Congressman JIM BROYHILL and I, with the support and recommendation of Administrator Train of EPA, determine that the 2 NO_x level for 1978 through 1981 model years is most sufficient for those years with safe and documented projections of valuable automobile fuel conservation, consumer savings and air quality improvements. For 1981 and onward in our amendment, the NO_x standard is to be set by the EPA based on available practicable technology, fuel economy, cost, and air quality.

I am sure AIADA rejects the 0.4 NO_x level in the Roger's bill and as AIADA has subsequently written to the National Automobile Dealers Association, "We

certainly do not oppose Representative DINGELL's proposal."

I insert at this point AIADA's letter from its president, Mr. John Cronin, of August 2, 1976, to the president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, Mr. John Pohanka, in which AIADA states its position on the NO_x question:

AMERICAN IMPORTED AUTO-
MOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1976.

Mr. JOHN POHANKA,
President, National Automobile Dealers As-
sociation, 8400 Westpark Drive, McLean,
Va.

DEAR JACK: You have asked for a clarification of the position of AIADA regarding the Clean Air Act Amendment now before the Congress. This position was expressed in a resolution passed unanimously by our Board of Directors on May 4, 1976 and transmitted to Rep. Paul Rogers, chairman of the House Sub-Committee on Health and the Environment, on the same day.

The Board's position is that we endorsed the bill passed by the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (H.R. 10498) as it relates to the extension of the current NO_x levels of two grams per mile until 1981, with the possibility of waivers until 1985. Our reason for this endorsement is, as we stated to Rep. Rogers, that we feel it provides our manufacturers with sufficient leeway to insure the introduction of light diesel-powered automobiles into the United States in the immediate future.

I has been the policy of AIADA throughout its experience to avoid involvement in discussions between the Federal government and our industry in matters pertaining to automobile emission standards. This policy has been based on recognition of the fact that we have neither the necessary expertise or technological capacity to comment authoritatively on such standards. We feel it is the responsibility of the manufacturers to provide information and arguments to the government regarding the practicality and feasibility of proposed clean air standards.

In this instance, however, the imported automobile dealers have a special, vested interest in the level of NO_x emission mandated by the new amendment. Several lines of imported automobiles are expecting the imminent introduction of light, diesel-powered automobiles. Dealers have been told, however, that adoption of NO_x levels as stringent as those in the bill currently before the Senate (S. 3219) will prevent the importation of these eagerly anticipated diesel-engined automobiles into the United States.

The House bill, as amended by Rep. Broadhead's proposal, provides for maximum emissions of two grams per mile until 1981, with the possibility of waivers at that level until as late as 1985. Since current diesel technology apparently can meet a NO_x level of 1.5 grams per mile, the two grams per mile standard would seemingly offer sufficient margin for mass production allowances. The 1985 deadline would seem to be sufficient to allow for technological advances that will improve the NO_x emissions by them.

As far as the Dingell Amendment, which is to be proposed from the floor in the debate scheduled to begin this week, it, too, obviously would provide manufacturers with the opportunity to introduce light, diesel-powered cars. We certainly do not oppose Rep. Dingell's proposal. We do not wish to become embroiled in controversy over the merits of the various proposals before the Congress. Our position is simple:

We wish to have the opportunity to offer the American public the fuel economy, the durability and the cleaner exhaust of light, diesel-engined automobiles;

As good citizens, we desire standards that do the most to provide for a clean environment and are still compatible with technological and economic considerations.

We are in accord with any measure enacted by the Congress that meets these two criteria. With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN CRONIN,
President.

It must further be clarified that under the Rogers clean air bill the NO_x standards drop to 0.4 NO_x in 1981-82 with an EPA waiver possible up to 2 NO_x, and 0.4 NO_x in 1983-84 with a NO_x waiver, if granted by EPA, up to 1.5 NO_x. It is again important to note that H.R. 10498 by ROGERS does not allow any waiver from 0.4 NO_x in 1985 model year, a standard contrary to the AIADA position.

As a further point of reference, no foreign or domestic manufacturer is urging that Congress adopt a 0.4 NO_x standard ever. In fact, the Environmental Protection Agency-Department of Transportation-Federal Energy Administration April 8, 1976, analysis of several specified auto emission schedules—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 27, 1976, pages 11430-11436—including the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) schedule, clearly points out that there is no significant gain in air quality to be achieved by establishing a 0.4 NO_x standard, but there are severe fuel consumption and consumer cost penalties expected to occur if 0.4 NO_x is set into law.

Thus AIADA, it must be explained, has to be very concerned, as am I, with the potential loss of the diesel engine, and other technologies, in automobiles if emission standards are too tight, such as the 0.4 NO_x for 1981-85 in the Rogers clean air bill yet pending for action before the House. Additionally, many foreign manufacturers have diesel engines in their products sold in the United States of America and elsewhere, and others may be coming on line. In the U.S. manufacturing plants, the diesel, and other technologies, are listed as viable approaches if sufficient research and development for application to U.S.-produced autos can be completed. I am informed that three of the U.S. manufacturers are considering diesels as possible additions to their engine model line due to proven fuel efficiency.

At this point I insert the AIADA letter to Representative ROGERS in its entirety including the AIADA resolution discussing 2 grams per mile for NO_x and the potential this allows for the diesel:

AMERICAN IMPORTED
AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1976.

HON. PAUL ROGERS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: On behalf of the members of the Board of Directors of the American Imported Automobile Dealers Association, let me express our appreciation for your most informative talk before the Board this morning. After your departure, the directors commented on how frank and informative you had been and how straightforward was your presentation of the facts about the Clean Air Amendments of 1976.

In answer to your questions about our position on the Amendments, the Board

members unanimously approved the following resolution:

Resolved: That the American Imported Automobile Dealers Association does endorse and urge upon the Congress the adoption of the House of Representatives version of the Clean Air Amendments of 1976 (H.R. 10498) as it relates to the extension of the current NO_x level of two grams per mile until 1981, with the possibility of waivers thereafter, to give opportunity for the introduction of light diesel-powered cars, with the consequent saving in energy and lowered cost to the consumer.

This makes official the position we have taken with our members in urging them to support this Amendment with their Representatives. We realize that there are those in our industry who will disagree with this stance, but we feel that the measure passed by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce serves both the practical requirements of industry and the consumer and the pressing need to improve our air quality.

Thank you again for coming to speak with us and for your willingness to take so much time from your very busy schedule.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. McELWAIN,
Executive Vice President.

CASH DISCOUNTS COME TO D.C.

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, cash discounts have become more available to consumers in all parts of the country since the Fair Credit Billing Act allowing them went into effect last October.

One way I have tried to encourage the discounts is to give public exposure to the ways local consumer groups campaign for cash discounts in their areas. In this space before I have told of merchant directories, education days and group discount plans, all of which are causing cash discounts to be offered on a more widespread basis than ever before.

I was further gratified this past weekend to notice that a D.C. area business has taken the initiative here by using cash discounts as a major promotional vehicle.

When the Market Tire Co. decided recently to have a sale in anticipation of large increases in tire prices resulting from the current rubber strike, they could see the promotional possibilities of offering a 5-percent discount to any customer who pays cash. The cash discounted price of each tire is listed in the newspaper ads that the company is running.

One salesman estimated that in his location alone, some 50 percent of all of those who wanted to charge the new tires thought twice upon hearing about the discount offer and then decided to pay cash. He mentioned the fact that the credit card company charges between 4 percent and 7 percent on every tire he sells by credit card and therefore, by offering cash discounts he can "pass the savings on to the consumer without it costing his business anything."

He was quick to answer a definitive yes when I asked him if he thought his business volume had increased with the offering of discounts.

My feeling is that such cash discount programs are one of the biggest boons to consumer marketing to come along in quite a while. Rarely does Federal law provide for so much benefit for both consumers and merchants at the same time. The Fair Credit Billing Act makes the discounts allowable—it does not require that merchants offer them. But if two or three merchants in each area begin offering them, the competition for increased cash business would encourage local merchants all over town to add cash discounts to their way of doing business. Market Tire's example of how both consumers and merchants can benefit from cash discounts hopefully marks the beginning of their widespread use in the D.C. area.

PRECOCITY OF CLEVELAND CHILD AMAZES PARENTS AND DOCTORS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak to you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives about an extraordinary child who resides in my district in Cleveland, Ohio. Two-year-old Pomfla Watson has shown unusual mental talents far beyond her tender age.

At 18 months of age, Pomfla stunned everyone by reading with considerable fluency and demonstrating a vocabulary of over 400 different words.

When Pomfla was a year old, her parents had her tested and were told by doctors that the child had the abilities of at least a 3-year-old child. She could even work puzzles and draw a straight line. When only 9 months, she could talk and name all parts of the body.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lelia Giles, the child's grandmother has recently informed me that Pomfla can recite the full alphabet, is able to count, knows the days of the week, months of the year and is an avid sports fan. When Pomfla goes grocery shopping with her grandmother, people are shocked to hear her name the different products on the supermarket shelves. She can distinguish the differences between Ajax and Comet, Tide and Breeze, and many similar brands.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that she can even remember the names of every person to whom she is introduced, a feat which we politicians have attempted to master for years.

The extraordinary talents of this child have been recognized by one of the leading newspapers in Ohio, the Cleveland Call and Post. She has also been cited by the Cleveland City Council and the Ohio House of Representatives.

Because of her considerable abilities, the doctors have asked the family not to push Pomfla too much. Recently, they have started to give her books and

other educational reading materials. Prior to this time, Pomfla would read everything she could get her hands on including newspapers, magazines, and even the Sears catalog.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in recognition of Pomfla Watson. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. George D. Watson, and her grandmother, Mrs. Lelia Giles, also deserve our commendations. I am certain that Pomfla's future will be bright and successful.

CURRENT NATIONAL ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues in the House and the Administration, I want to present the results of my annual questionnaire sent to residents of the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio. Thousands of my constituents not only took the time to register their views on these eleven major issues but also added their thoughtful and informed comments as well. I submit for the RECORD the text of my 1976 questionnaire together with the results:

QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

1. In two years (FY 1976 and FY 1977), spending by the federal government will INCREASE by \$89 billion while just the INTEREST payments on the national debt consume \$76.2 billion of your tax dollars. Do you agree that it is past time for Congress to stop taking money from the taxpayers for new and expanded government programs and to permit them to keep more of their earnings to spend as they see fit?

Yes ----- 96
No ----- 4

2. Do you agree with the action taken by the Democrat-controlled Congress to "kill" the President's tax proposal to increase your income tax exemption from \$750 to \$1,000 per year in order to pump more money into government funded economic stimulus programs?

Yes ----- 17
No ----- 83

3. Do you agree with the President's recommendations to tighten regulations governing the distribution of Food Stamps?

Yes ----- 95
No ----- 5

4. In view of Great Britain's experience with nationalized health insurance, do you believe it would be wise for the United States to adopt a nationalized health program?

Yes ----- 20
No ----- 80

5. Legislation is now pending in Congress to break up the major oil and gas companies in the United States. Do you think your interests as a consumer would be best served by such action?

Yes ----- 52
No ----- 48

6. To achieve full employment, do you believe pending legislation should be passed

guaranteeing a taxpayer-financed job for every adult desirous of one and not employed in the private sector?

Yes ----- 14
No ----- 86

7. Do you believe the federal government should provide Child Care Centers to assist parents in rearing their children?

Yes ----- 8
No ----- 92

8. Do you believe detente has been in the best interests of the United States and world peace?

Yes ----- 28
No ----- 72

9. Should we be more concerned over the ever-increasing Communist influence in the world?

Yes ----- 90
No ----- 10

10. Do you believe we should maintain a defense posture superior to Russia's?

Yes ----- 88
No ----- 12

FOR FARMERS ONLY

11. A return to a system of high price supports with acreage and production controls is being advocated by some candidates for national office. Would you favor a return to this type of agricultural program?

Yes ----- 8
No ----- 92

AL GREEN, A CITIZEN'S CITIZEN

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, our Government endures in strength and vitality because of people who dedicate themselves to make our system of representative democracy work.

Such a person is C. A. (Al) Green of Stockton.

For decades Al Green has labored unceasingly and effectively to bring more people into the electoral process and see that it runs smoothly and well.

As a vice president of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, a post to which he has been reelected repeatedly, Al Green also has dedicated his life to improving the wages and working conditions of people in my district, the State of California, and the Nation.

Al Green, Mr. Speaker, is widely respected by people from all walks of life as a humanitarian. Recently, a group of people from throughout California gathered in Stockton to participate in a dinner in honor of his 50 years of service to our Nation and its people.

I particularly want to acknowledge his work to see that good people are elected to office. His has been a deep and personal involvement in the electoral process—the cornerstone of the foundation of our system of government. Without people like Al Green working hard to get people to vote and to help others enter into the process—as candidates or volunteer workers—our system would have faltered long ago.

Our Nation is strong, our society is enriched, and our system is better able to meet the challenges which come before our people because of Al Green's involvement.

His dedication to people and involvement in the democratic process stands as a standard for all who care about our Nation and endeavor to see that the hope the United States offers its people and the world is fulfilled.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMEMORATIVE TRIBUTE TO BICENTENNIAL CANDIDATE FOR SAINTHOOD SISTER MIRIAM TERESA DEMJANOVICH OF NEW JERSEY, 1901-1927

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, as the Eucharistic Congress held in Philadelphia draws to a close, I am pleased to join with the religious and laity of the Slovak community of America and all of our people in supporting the candidacy of Sister Miriam Teresa Demjanovich of New Jersey, a former young novice of the Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station, N.J., for the most blessed and spiritual beatification by the Holy See.

The proposal of sainthood for Sister Miriam Teresa, who was born in New Jersey in 1901 and died 51 years ago on May 8, 1927, at the young age of 26 years, has long had the support of residents of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey. Last week at the Eucharistic Congress her nomination was included in the list of the names of the beatification and those whose causes are under consideration in Rome, which is comprised of candidates for sainthood from North, South and Central America. A Mass in petition and thanksgiving for holiness in the Americas was also celebrated at the Eucharistic Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Miriam Teresa's candidacy for canonization was first called to my attention in 1974 by the Honorable John C. Sciranka, distinguished editor of New Jersey's highly prestigious Slovak news publication of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, the Falcon. At that time he stated, "Sister Miriam Teresa was born in Bayonne, N.J. of Byzantine-Ruthenian Rite parents. She lived the later part of her life in a Latin-Rite parish and died a member of the Latin-Rite Sisters of Charity. Proponents of her cause consider her a tangible link uniting Catholics of all rites in a strong bond of charity."

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress a brief profile of Sister Miriam Teresa that was forwarded to me by Sister Ann Lucille Byrne of the Sister Miriam Teresa League of Prayer, Convent, N.J., and which I would like to share with you and our colleagues here in the Congress. This biographical sketch which explains why Sister Miriam

Teresa's name has been proposed for sainthood is as follows:

SISTER MIRIAM TERESA, 1901-1927

Sister Miriam Teresa (Teresa Demjanovich) was born in Bayonne, New Jersey, on March 26, 1901, the youngest of seven children. From childhood she manifested remarkable talents of nature and grace. At a very early age she ardently desired to dedicate herself entirely to God, and as she grew into girlhood she earnestly sought to know God's will for her.

Teresa completed her grammar school education at the age of eleven; she received her high school diploma in January, 1917, from the Bayonne High School. At this time she wished very much to become a Carmelite, but the lingering illness of her mother kept her at home as nurse and housekeeper.

After her mother's death in November, 1918, Teresa was strongly encouraged by her family to attend Saint Elizabeth College at Convent. Perceiving in this advice an indication of God's will, Teresa began her college career in September, 1919. She received her degree with highest honors in June, 1923. As always, her heart longed for the religious life, but various circumstances made her uncertain regarding which community Our Lord wished her to enter. Meanwhile she accepted a teaching position at Saint Aloysius Academy in Jersey City. Not until December, 1924, was she certain that God wished her to be a Sister of Charity, and with her decision there came an assurance that God had a very special work for her to do in this Community. Just what the nature of the work was to be she did not know until several months after her entrance, February 11, 1925.

Teresa's spiritual director in religion, Father Benedict Bradley, a saintly Benedictine (died December 20, 1945), discerning her remarkable gifts, directed her, with the consent of the Mother Superior, to write a series of conferences which, published posthumously, from the volume entitled "Greater Perfection."

Teresa's life in religion was short, but filled with much work and suffering of both body and soul. Like Therese of Lisieux, she apparently lived a long time in a short space. She died May 8, 1927.

Since her death Sister Miriam Teresa has made many friends all over the world. Favors and cures attributed to her intercession are continually being reported.

In the latter part of 1945 a communication was received from Rome authorizing Bishop McLaughlin of the Paterson Diocese, in which diocese the General House of the Sisters of Charity is located, to institute an ordinary informative process concerning Sister Miriam Teresa's life and virtues. Rev. Stephen W. Findlay, O.S.B., Delbarton School, Morristown, N.J., was appointed procurator, and the official investigation began early in 1946. It was completed in May, 1954.

Reverend Nicola Ferrante, C.S.S.R., was appointed Postulator for the Cause of Sister Miriam Teresa in the Sacred Congregation for the Canonization of Saints in 1967. Rev. Dr. Stephen W. Findlay, O.S.B., continued as vice postulator. His assistants are the Reverend Msgr. Andrew V. Stefan, P.A., V.F., who represents people of the Latin Rite and Reverend George Kandra, those of the Byzantine Rite.

Sister Miriam Teresa's message to us of the critical twentieth century is fundamental and far-reaching. It is addressed to the laity as well as to religious:

"Our Lord's promise, 'If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him,' is held out to every soul regardless of calling, and it is the end for which we pray in the Lord's prayer—"Thy Kingdom come!"

Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a privilege

and honor to join with our people in renewing our dedication to this proposal of Sainthood for Sister Miriam Teresa. The announcement of her beatification by the Holy See during America's Bicentennial observance would be a most climatic landmark of achievement in our Nation's 200th anniversary celebration—bringing great honor to our country and truly the greatest of blessings not only to the family of Sister Miriam Teresa but to all of our people.

ARAB BOYCOTT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the insidiousness of the Arab economic boycott of Israel became very vivid to me when I received the following letter from one of my constituents. This individual, Mr. Walter Bieringer, the executive vice president of the Plymouth Rubber Co. in Canton, Mass., has given me permission to use his name in any way that would be helpful toward the goal of obtaining legislation that would prevent American corporations from aiding and abetting the Arab economic boycott against Israel.

My constituent, Mr. Bieringer, and his corporation have refused to sign the shocking request by the Syrian Government for a promise not to do business in any way with Israel.

Mr. Bieringer has, as a matter of conscience, refused to sign this promise and, as a result, has lost a contract worth approximately \$400,000 to his corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I reproduce here Mr. Bieringer's letter along with the extortory document from Syria.

I also attach a letter which I have written to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Elliot Richardson, on August 9.

It is encouraging to note that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on August 9, 1976, passed a bill which makes it unlawful for any corporation in Massachusetts to submit to that form of blackmail typified by the letter reproduced herewith from the Syrian Government. Many electronic and heavy equipment firms that operate in Massachusetts, after raising some questions about the advisability of the Massachusetts law, raised no objections to its passage by the legislature.

The enactment of this law in Massachusetts is another reason why the Ford administration and the Secretary of Commerce have an urgent duty to recommend the enactment of a Federal law which will not discriminate against corporations in Massachusetts which, unlike their competitors in other States, cannot legally in Massachusetts agree to the blackmail and boycott of the Arab nations.

The documents noted above follow:

PLYMOUTH RUBBER Co., INC.,
Canton, Mass., August 2, 1976.

Subject: Arab Boycott
Representative FATHER ROBERT DRINAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In today's mail, we received an inquiry for material that we manufacture from Syrian Crude Oil Transportation Company, which is part of the Syrian Arab Republic. Together with the inquiry, we were asked to sign the enclosed list of questions.

It was my understanding that it was against the law now to sign such a paper. However, I telephoned the Department of Commerce in Boston, and was informed that we had to do was to notify the Department of Commerce, but that we could do whatever we wanted beyond that.

We have a competitor in Houston, Texas who, in our opinion, will sign a paper such as this without notifying the Department of Commerce. This puts us at a great disadvantage in procuring business. However, we will not sign it. We hope that something can be done about this, and would like to hear from you regarding it.

With best wishes.

Yours truly,

WALTER H. BIERINGER.

Enclosure.

P.S. I live in your district—Brookline.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC,
SYRIAN CRUDE OIL TRANSPORTATION Co.,
P. O. Box 331, Homs, Syria.

You are kindly requested to sign this sheet concerning boycotting Israel and return it with your offer.

1. Our Company has neither a branch of industrialization nor collection in Israel.
2. No rights of industrialization and collection have been given to a company or individuals in Israel by us.
3. No Representative or head office of our company in the Middle East is located in Israel.
4. No investment in any Israeli Company or factories is allowed.
5. No rights to use our company's name are given to any Israeli individual or companies.
6. Our company takes no part in financial aid or technical assistance to the Israeli's factories.
7. Our company takes no part in selling or advertising any Israeli's products.
8. None of our company's responsible is in the combined Israeli's commercial chamber of commerce.

Signature of the boycotting company.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1976.
Hon. RICHARD ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary, Department of Commerce, Commerce Building, 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

DEAR ELLIOT: I write to you with distress concerning the severe financial loss being sustained by a constituent of mine who is also well acquainted with you, Mr. Walter Bieringer, 26 Wolcott Road Ext. in Brookline.

Mr. Bieringer is the executive vice president of the Plymouth Rubber Company in Canton, Massachusetts and has recently refused to sign the attached demand that he agree to boycott Israel in return for the contract worth approximately \$400,000 to his corporation in Canton, Massachusetts.

The company in Houston is Plycoflex, Inc. I know that you will understand the depths of my indignation at this matter after you read the attached copy of Mr. Walter Bieringer's letter and a copy of the boycott demand from the Syrian Arab Republic.

I know that you will admire the mandate of conscience which forbids Mr. Bieringer from signing an agreement to join in the Arab economic boycott of Israel. I know also

that you will see the basic injustice of the United States permitting Mr. Bieringer to be seriously hurt because of his conscience while the Plycoflex Company and other corporations are willing to deny Israel the trade with America which that nation desires and needs.

Obviously there is no way to undo the damage done to one of my constituents, Mr. Walter Bieringer, except by an order of the Secretary of Commerce or a statute enacted by Congress which would make it illegal for the Plycoflex Corporation to reap profits because of its agreement to damage Israel by aiding and abetting the economic boycott inflicted on Israel by the Arab States.

I am, of course, familiar with the position of the Ford Administration in resisting any and all attempts to enforce the spirit and purpose of the Export Administration Act of 1965. I have the hope that the very moving example of Mr. Walter Bieringer and the very severe penalty which he has paid for following his conscience might prompt you to alter your position and recommend immediately to President Ford and to the Congress that legislation be enacted which would prevent the enrichment of American corporation executives who are so unfeeling towards America's ally in the Middle East, Israel, that they are willing to promise that they will not establish a branch of their corporation there, will make absolutely no investment in any Israeli corporation, will not allow any Israeli or corporation in Israel to use the company's name, will give no financial or technical assistance to Israeli industry and will take no part in selling or advertising any of the products of Israel.

You have the power, Mr. Secretary, to prevent American corporations from engaging in such damnable and damaging conduct towards Israel. I hope fervently that at last you will use it.

My constituent, Mr. Bieringer, has expressed a willingness to make every detail of this matter public. I am sharing this letter with him, as I will with the public.

As you may know, I have followed this issue very intently and have filed a bill designed to outlaw American participation in the economic strangulation of Israel which the Arab economic boycott is designed to bring about.

I look forward to your reply and send to you my warm personal regards.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT F. DRINAN,
Member of Congress.

INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING AT ITS BEST

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business has called to my attention that Ed Laborwit, news editor and investigative reporter for the DeKalb News/Sun was recently honored by the editors of Dixie Business magazine as the 24th annual recipient of the Public Service in Reporting Award. Editor Lee presented the award in recognition of Ed Laborwit's hard-hitting series of articles entitled "The Unemployment Ripoff." The series focused on numerous individuals who were drawing unemployment compensation because of loopholes in the State law when they were actually employed or drawing retirement benefits.

They included teachers, retired military and part-time students.

As a result of "The Unemployment Ripoff" series, the 1976 Georgia General Assembly revised the unemployment compensation laws and closed the loopholes to restore the concept of helping people through periods when they could no longer find regular employment through no fault of their own. The new legislation has saved millions of dollars for both taxpayers and individual businessmen who must contribute to the unemployment compensation fund.

Ed Laborwit's persistence in getting the facts to the public is an example of investigative reporting at its best. I commend him for his outstanding accomplishment and Dixie Business for presenting its annual Public Service in Reporting Award.

CHRISTIANS PUT PARK REGIME IN DOCK

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, John Saar continues to file with the Washington Post his excellent reports on the excesses of the Park Chung Hee regime in South Korea. In the Monday, August 9 Post, Saar, in a dispatch from Seoul, analyzes South Korea's most important postwar political trial—the trial of the 18 prominent Christians, all of whom played some role in preparing or presenting the "Declaration for the Restoration of Democracy" read at a March 1 commemorative prayer meeting at Seoul's Myongdong Cathedral. The statement itself appears at page 6382 of the March 11, 1976, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We ought to be outraged by what is going on in this trial. Those being tried are decent, patriotic people. They have the same values as our forefathers who signed the Declaration of Independence 200 years ago. They are concerned about the destruction of democracy in South Korea.

Some believe South Korea will find its salvation under Park and his repressive leadership. But it is clear that Park's methods do great violence to values important to Americans and many South Korean patriots. This House and the Congress are on record as being distressed by "the erosion of important civil liberties in the Republic of Korea."

Mr. Speaker, the trial now going on in Seoul cannot be ignored. These 18 Korean defendants are speaking not only to their Korean oppressors, they are speaking to us.

The Saar article follows:

SOUTH KOREAN TRIAL: CHRISTIANS PUT PARK DICTATORSHIP IN DOCK

(By John Saar)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA.—Though handcuffs and white prison uniforms identify the official defendants in South Korea's most important postwar political trial, the man most often accused is their accuser—the country's dictatorial ruler, President Park Chung Hee.

While absolutely denying charges that they plotted to overthrow the government, the 18 defendants—all prominent Christians—have used their trial to mount a fearless and searing assault on Park's 15-year stewardship. Under the eye of a scowling prosecutor, in a courtroom cordoned off from downtown Seoul by agents of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, they have accused the president of destroying democracy, repressing freedoms, oppressing the poor, encouraging prostitution for foreign-exchange earnings, "selling" the country to Japanese business interests and endangering South Korea's survival by perpetuating dictatorship.

The trial is now in its fourth month, and defense sources say it represents possibly the last opportunity to salvage the democracy the United States has attempted to establish in South Korea at a cost of 33,000 lives in the Korean War and \$10 billion in economic and military aid.

[In an apparent effort to bring the trial to a speedy close, prosecutors demanded last week sentences ranging from three to 10 years in prison. Defense efforts to give a summation of its case were denied by the court.]

Conducted in an atmosphere of intimidation and hostility, the trial has consummated the polarization between Park's government and its politically moderate critics.

In one session white-haired Hahn Suk Hun, 75, revered for his Quaker beliefs and record of patriotism, gestured at his fellow defendants and told the three judges: "I consider these people the best of our intelligentsia."

"They're fine people, the cream of the crop," a western diplomat concurred. They include former President Yun Po Sun, 78; former presidential candidate Kim Dae Jung; former foreign minister and opposition lawmaker Chung Il Hyung and his wife, Yi Tae Yung, the country's first woman lawyer; five Catholic priests and four Protestant pastors.

Eleven have been held under arrest and all 18, according to the prosecution, played some role in preparing a "Declaration for the Restoration of Democracy" read during an ecumenical Mass at the Myongdong cathedral in Seoul on March 1.

The document asked President Park to resign, to revoke the "revitalizing" constitution he promulgated under martial law in 1972 and to restore freedom of speech, press and assembly. The government says the document was a plot aimed at arousing popular uprisings.

The trial has engendered bitterness on both sides. "We hope they will be found guilty," said Justice Minister Whang San Duk. "They claim they are not Communists but they are siding with the Communists in their attempt to overthrow this government and their activities violate a provision of our anti-Communist law," he said.

Equally extreme is the view of Chung Kyun Mo, a South Korean journalist and supporter of Kim Dae Jung who lives in self-exile in Japan. "Park Chung Hee is a traitor trying patriots as criminals," he said.

The defendants themselves, although occasionally impassioned while testifying, have been determined, calm and philosophically cheerful.

Behind the trial is a history of struggle between Park, a former general who seized power in a 1961 coup, and a mixture of Western-influenced church and political leaders who have opposed his gradual eradication of democracy with obstinate ferocity. As architect of the country's dynamic economic growth, Park has shown an increasing intolerance with those he sees as impeding his nation-building mission. Since the 1972 constitution granted him unlimited power and tenure as president, the pursuit of national unity has intensified and the margins of permissible opposition have narrowed.

An American missionary—turned into what he termed "a professional trial-goer by the

Myongdong and other politically flavored prosecutions—believes that the government is headed for moral defeat. "The statements these people are making are brilliant and devastating. They are challenging the whole system of government and ripping it to shreds," he said.

From his regular courtroom seat, the priest vastly overestimated public awareness. The sympathetic spectators nod, smile and clap their approval, but very little of the criticism they find so satisfying filters out into South Korean society.

Symbolically, the defendants are denied a microphone. Their voices are audible in the confines of the courtroom, but the general public hears only muffled whispers. Admission to the courtroom is limited to about 200 ticket-holding friends and relatives and the brief, flatly worded reports carried by the censored news media reduce a momentous national debate to police blotter dullness.

The judges have been tolerant in allowing the defendants to deliver long orations, often including opinions that would warrant immediate arrest outside the court. This is done, according to some observers, so the government can allow the appearance of an open trial.

Most people close to the case believe convictions are certain. Speculation in Seoul is already running way ahead of the verdict, with many predicting light or suspended sentences to avoid the risk of unwelcome U.S. publicity.

Westerners stress the overt political nature of the trial. "These aren't legal proceedings," a diplomat declared. "They remind you of showcase trials in Communist countries."

Oppositionists share the conviction that the outcome of the trial is prearranged. "The defendants know that," Chung said in Tokyo. "They are making their statements for history."

Partial transcripts of the trial are eagerly sought, and there seems little doubt that future generations here will turn to this trial as one of the few sustained, articulate critiques of the Park government on the public record.

The 27 defense attorneys have argued, objected and walked out in efforts to improve trial conditions for their clients who are being charged under a catch-all law titled "Emergency Measure No. 9," (EM9) that President Park proclaimed 14 months ago. The law prohibits criticism of the constitution or the emergency measure itself, an injunction that prevented the lawyers from arguing that the measure itself is illegal, as many of them privately believe.

The same ubiquitous measure has allowed the prosecution to quote passages from the March 1 statement supportive of their case, but the defense cannot provide the context of the quotes because the document itself is prohibited. Mere possession of the democracy declaration could put the lawyers in the dock too. It produces such results as this courtroom exchange:

Defense counsel: "According to the indictment you claim government does not have support of the people?"

Defendant Mun Dong-Whan:

Prosecutor, interrupting, "Stay away from the reasons!"

Mun Dong-Whan: "Why so upset about a few people if the government has the solid support of all the people? How come this enormous reaction to a piece of paper?"

Kim Dae Jung testified for a full day, disclaiming any plan or thought of removing President Park by violence. He charged that the president was economically subjugating South Korea to Japan and dangerously weakening the country in its confrontation with North Korea by repressive policies.

The prosecutor asked no questions, saying all of Kim's statements were violations of law.

Kim Dae Jung replied: "That makes no sense. I was denying what you accused me of. Now you say my denials incriminate me. How unfair can you get?"

The prosecution opened its case promising to prove an elaborate conspiracy among the defendants; however, the questioning of the defendants seemed to suggest a loosely organized enterprise in which disparate people cooperated for different motives. Kim, narrowly defeated in the 1971 presidential election, gave his reason: "I was a politician, active in trying to get into power. The religious folk here, of course, are different . . . The mutual desire of the signers was to say something that had to be spoken."

Lee Woo-Chung, a college professor until her resignation was forced by the KCIA, testified that her efforts to stop organized prostitution were hindered by KCIA men who told her the country needed the dollar income. "Without moral values our government becomes the rule of gangsters," she said in an emotionless, staccato voice. "We complain about denial of human rights in North Korea but sell our society for dollars at the same time."

WATERGATE REFORM ACT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the Judicial Conference of the Ninth Circuit recently held its annual meeting in Spokane, Wash., and adopted a resolution regarding S. 495, the Watergate Reform Act of 1976. Because this bill includes the judicial, the conference adopted a resolution expressing its concern over various provisions.

For the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by the Federal judges in the ninth circuit and their lawyer delegates:

RESOLUTION RE TITLE III, THE WATERGATE REFORM ACT OF 1976

The Watergate Reform Act of 1976 has passed the Senate (as S. 495) and is now pending before the House. Title III of that Act imposes on various officers and employees of the Government public reporting and disclosure requirements concerning their fiscal affairs which are extremely onerous and burdensome. These requirements apply to:

The President and Vice-President.
Members of Congress.

All Federal Judges and Justices.

All government employees paid at grade level GS-16 and over.

All members of the military paid at grade level O-7 and over.

Those subject to the Act are required to file annually for themselves and their spouses and their dependents, a report, which becomes public on filing, setting forth the following matters:

Each item of income, reimbursement or gift over \$100, including each honorarium.

Each asset owned worth over \$1000, other than personal cars, furnishings, clothing, etc.
Each liability over \$1000.

Any item received in kind (except from immediate family) worth over \$500.

Each security transaction in excess of \$1000.

Each real estate transaction, whether a purchase or sale, involving over \$1000.

A list of persons who have paid the officer or employee more than \$5000 in any of the past five years.

For willful failure to report any information required to be reported, an officer, judge or employee may be prosecuted criminally and imprisoned for up to one year and fined up to \$10,000. Additionally, the Attorney General may bring a civil suit against any officer, judge or employee who fails to report any required information, in which a penalty may be assessed up to \$5000. There is no scienter requirement for such civil penalty.

The Judicial Conference of the Ninth Circuit RESOLVES as follows with respect to Title III:

Title III is bad legislation, not in the public interest, and its enactment should be opposed. It is particularly bad as it applies to the Federal Judiciary.

As applied to all officers and employees, Title III imposes reporting requirements, the administration of which will prove to be complicated, expensive and in some respects impractical, and which are greatly in excess of those reasonable disclosures that may be necessary to the proper performance of the duties of such officers and employees.

The requirement of keeping such detailed records on so many subjects can become a trap for the unwary. Less than total and meticulous accuracy may make a criminal or civil defendant out of a totally honest and careful public servant.

Title III by its concern with insignificant financial details impugns the integrity of thousands of honest and dedicated officers and employees and demeans the positions they occupy and to which, for the good of our country, the best should be attracted.

Title III further increases the existing disadvantages of public service without a corresponding increase in the confidence of the public in their government.

As applied to Federal Judges and Justices, Title III should be opposed because:

I. There is no crisis of public confidence in the Judiciary which requires such draconian measures to assure the public of the honesty of the Federal judges.

II. The Federal Judiciary has already adopted a system for public reporting of any income earned from non-judicial services and all positions held in charitable and business organizations. The Judiciary has also adopted for itself a stringent code of ethics with machinery for its enforcement. These self-imposed requirements apply to all Federal judges other than Supreme Court Justices.

III. To subject a Judge or Justice to a civil suit by the Attorney General may well be contrary to the doctrine of separation of powers. Such suits also may be used to make the Judiciary subservient to the Executive branch.

IV. Imposition of such new rigid reporting requirements on the Judiciary by the Legislative branch, requirements far beyond the constitutional power of impeachment, may well constitute an unconstitutional intrusion by the legislature on the independence of the Judiciary.

And it is further resolved That Title III should be deleted from the Act in its entirety. If it is not so totally deleted, it should be amended so as not to apply to the Judiciary.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, having been counseled by senior colleagues, and seeking to avoid the wantonness of power, and seeking to preserve

the order, decency and regularity prescribed in section I of Jefferson's Manual, I request the explanation of my votes entered on page 26478 of the RECORD be corrected to read as follows:

Rollcall No. 579, recorded quorum, "present."

Rollcall No. 580, recorded quorum, "present."

Rollcall No. 590, recorded quorum, "present."

Rollcall No. 592, recorded quorum, "present."

Rollcall No. 595, recorded quorum, "present."

Rollcall No. 597, recorded quorum, "present."

WITH ALL DELIBERATE SPEED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, an entire generation of Americans has grown up since the historic 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education of Topeka, Kans. For many of the blacks among these, educational opportunities have been equal to those of whites, as the decision mandated them to be. But for many others the ruling remains merely a symbol. As such it was admittedly important, for it constituted a long overdue recognition of the evil nature of the "separate but equal" doctrine, and hence a major step forward for blacks and whites alike.

But symbols cannot generate hope forever. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights wrote in a 1974 report, that the Brown case was "instrumental in generating legitimate expectations among minorities and women" for opportunities in education and the economic field. The deprivation which has followed in the wake of these expectations has resulted in the violence of the 1960's and now, in a profound dissatisfaction with the American political system.

Our Bicentennial celebration has been a time for remembering many symbols, and the 1954 decision, no less than any others, stands as a monument to how far we have come and how far we have yet to go. We must not forget our obligation to carry out the spirit of this decision still today and thereby insure the right of all our citizens to full educational opportunities.

The following article provides a thoughtful and personal look at the decision and its ramifications. I recommend it to my colleagues attention:

WITH ALL DELIBERATE SPEED

(By Benjamin L. Hooks)

In June CBS held a preview showing of a dramatic documentary, With All Deliberate Speed. The title was taken from the Supreme Court ruling a year after the historic school desegregation decision of 1954. The film stirred poignant memories and vividly underlined why the struggle for equal educational opportunity, through busing, or whatever means, must not be deterred by bigots who would turn back the clock or the "Sunshine

soldiers" who duck for cover at the slightest hint of an opposing rain.

It was, indeed, a painful recounting of two men, one Black—the Rev. Albert J. DeLaine, played brilliantly by Paul Winfield, and the other white—Federal District Judge J. Walties Waring, staunchly portrayed by John Randolph—who struggled and plotted to end segregation in Clarendon County (S.C.) schools in the 1940's.

The case was lost, with Judge Waring issuing the lone dissent in a three-Judge court decision. Nevertheless, the case, *Briggs vs. Elliot*, became one of five consolidated in the famous landmark *Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, decision which ripped forever from the American fabric like the gangrenous sore, the separate but equal dictum that had been canon law since 1895.

To many of us it was a slice of real life racing across that silver screen. The story was told in the sensitive faces of those Black, saintly children as they stood forlornly while white kids boarding the familiar (now embattled) yellow school bus stuck out their tongues, cruelly as children will, and taunted, "You can't ride this bus." It was a blatant statement of fact.

Black children could ride no school bus. They had none. They trudged miles to school, past comfortable white well-equipped schools to ill-equipped one-room shacks that barely masqueraded as school rooms. There, huddled together in freezing ill-heated rooms, or sweltering in torrid temperatures, they scratched for the dribs and drabs of a wretched and woefully inadequate education they managed during a shortened school term.

Is there any wonder that many see the truth in what that wry old Black observer once said, "White folks sho' know that us Black folks is superior. 'Cause it takes 10 times as much money to educate them as it do us."

We who lived in the south saw much of this. Not so much in the larger urban areas, but in the rural and the poorer backwoods areas of the south, where those of us who worked with Dr. King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the NAACP confronted it head on.

How many Clarendon County, South Carolinas were there? Too many. They stretched like an infinity of mirrors in a mad house of unending reflections. Although one would have been too many, they were everywhere in the south, the midwest, the far west, indeed in many areas in the north.

Judge Waring died in the '60's in New York, an exile from his home where he was born to privilege and comfort. The Rev. DeLaine died in the 1970's in North Carolina also an exile, driven like Waring, by the cretinous white bigots of that day.

After desegregation, Clarendon County schools today have become all Black. Nevertheless, these schools are a far greater improvement over those wretched wrecks Black children earlier attended.

And, it seems to me, there are three hopeful lessons to be learned from the devastating experience: (1) that there are whites who are ready even now to lay their all on the line for decency, justice, equality, humanity, and indeed, are doing it; (2) young Blacks, so impatient for change, who see the revolution as having begun sometime in the early 1970's, must see from this film how much enduring time, effort, and suffering went into just this wee vignette of human struggle for school desegregation, the denouement of which is still out there somewhere in a distant time warp; and (3) the long, historic leadership role of the Black minister and the Black church in the struggle for human dignity, freedom, and the keeping alive of a sense of community, personhood, and spirituality among our people.

A curious twist to this, also, is the fact

that hundreds of thousands of Black victims of this shamefully inadequate educational system made their way north to the auto plants of Detroit, the tractor works of Moline, Ill., etc., and with their third grade learning, worked to make a better life for their children.

These are the present-day generation, many of whom look like disdain at historic Black sacrifice and scorn all past civil rights struggles as "irrelevant". What will life be like for their children? (NNPA)

HANDGUNS IN THE STREETS AND SUITES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last week in Chicago, newspaper headlines reported a tragedy that took the lives of four persons. A trusted employee of a Chicago company came to work as he had on other mornings, except this time he apparently brought with him two readily concealable pistols. Hours later he used those pistols to kill three of his coworkers, wounding two others and then killing himself. We saw one more example of people killing people—using handguns.

This senseless loss of human life shocked the community. But it is all the more shocking—and tragic—to realize that as long as easily concealable pistols and handguns are available to most anybody who wants them, newspaper headlines will continue to report the inevitable consequences.

There are two dimensions to handgun-related violence in this country. One involves the use of handguns in street crime, a use which has become common enough so that many law abiding citizens have given up the streets of their cities to the fear of gun-totting criminals.

But most handgun murders in this country—now more than 10,000 annually—do not occur when a criminal shoots a stranger on a darkened city street. Most handgun victims are killed by someone they know—a friend, a neighbor or perhaps a fellow worker. These are the so-called crimes of passion that in most cases would probably not have resulted in death if only a handgun or pistol had not been so readily available.

Mr. Speaker, handguns and pistols are as deadly whether they are used in city streets or office suites. The prime purpose of these concealable weapons is to kill a human being. These weapons are, as we saw again in Chicago last week, hidden death.

How many more newspaper headlines will there be about handgun murders before we see the headline, "Congress Passes Strong Handgun Controls?"

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun Times of July 31, 1976, an editorial which asks that Congress finally reflect the will of the majority of Americans and enact strong handgun control legislation:

BETTER SECURITY: GUN LAW

Albert Keller, a toy designer for Marvin Glass & Associates, went to work Tuesday carrying a grudge and two loaded pistols. He had no reason to be concerned about the elaborate security system at his place of work. The system was installed to protect the company against the theft of toy designs by outsiders, and Keller had been a trusted, bonded employee for four years. As a company spokesman said later, Keller "never gave anyone any indication of a problem."

But Keller had problems, of course. He had written himself notes that hinted at revenge against fellow employees and neighbors. Those problems exploded Tuesday when Keller shot three persons to death, wounded two others and killed himself.

His senseless act proved, among other things, that even extraordinary security systems contain fatal flaws. The system at Marvin Glass & Associates failed because it didn't scrutinize employees. Other systems have other flaws. These systems can be made stronger if they are made to search closer and more widely. But in doing that, they destroy the privacy of everyone. They become the instruments of dictatorships. And even then, they don't work. There are murders in the Soviet Union, too.

One way to make murder less frequent is to outlaw murder weapons like handguns. The enactment and vigorous enforcement of a national law prohibiting everyone but police officers, military personnel and others from owning a handgun has been urged repeatedly by law-enforcement officials. It was urged Wednesday by Comdr. Joseph DiLeonardi of the police homicide unit. It has been urged by the Combined Counties Police Assn. (some 2,500 Chicago area members). Police Podium, the official publication of the association, points out in its current issue that between 1963 and 1973, when some 46,000 Americans died in battle in Vietnam, some 60,000 Americans were killed by handguns back home.

Members of Congress and the public finally demanded an end to the slaughter in Vietnam. While opinion polls show the public wants an end to the continuing slaughter at home, Congress continues to surrender to groups like the National Rifle Assn., which dangerously and foolishly opposes all handgun curbs.

It is one thing for the NRA to oppose gun laws. When Congress does it, it becomes an accomplice in the kind of horror that transpired on Chicago's North Side Tuesday. The public doesn't expect members of its Congress to be accomplice in murder; it expects them to fight murder.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 15082

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) the bill, H.R. 15082. This bill if enacted would suspend, pending review, the effect of the Federal Trade Commission's rule concerning limitation of the use of holder-in-due-course defenses in connection with the sale or lease of goods or services to consumers; would require the General Accounting Office to conduct a study of the effect of this rule on the consumer market; and would require formal rule-

making by the Commission respecting this rule.

My concern in respect to the Federal Trade Commission's Trade Regulation Rule on Preservation of Consumers' Claims and Defenses has long been of record. On November 18, 1975, I joined 21 of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 483. This House resolution stated that Congress has not delegated to the Federal Trade Commission any authority to preempt the laws of the States and their political subdivisions in respect to the subject matter of this rule. This assertion is based upon the fact that the report of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—House Report 93-1107—on the Magnuson-Moss warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act stated that the amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act made by title II of that act were not intended to preempt State and local jurisdiction. However, when the Federal Trade Commission issued this holder-in-due-course rule, the following statement was made "it is the Commission's intent in issuing this proposed rule to override contrary State and local law."

My principal concern over what the Federal Trade Commission has done is twofold. First, the Commission by rule has attempted to preempt numerous State laws which adequately protect the consumer and by such action has promulgated a rule contrary to the intent of Congress.

Second, the Commission has issued a rule whose terms in some instances are so loosely defined as to raise serious questions due to this ambiguity. One such term which comes to mind is that of a "purchase money loan."

This rule as presently drafted will have a pervasive effect upon all participants in the consumer credit community of these United States. Adverse ramifications may abound for marginal and low-income consumers due to the fact that the financial institutions of this Nation may be exposed to inequitable and innumerable legal actions. I am concerned about these consumers who principally seek credit in order to purchase an appliance, automobile, mobile home or recreational vehicle.

The Federal Reserve Board has received approximately 1,140 letters stating that this holder-in-due-course rule may have a disruptive effect upon the Nation's economy. On May 5, 1976, Chairman Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve Board wrote Chairman Calvin Collier of the Federal Trade Commission conveying the Board's urgent concern in respect to this rule, urging that the effective date be deferred, and requesting the Commission to clarify and refine the rule. This appeal fell upon deaf ears and the rule pertaining to sellers went into effect May 14, 1976. On July 27, 1976, Chairman Burns stated before the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing that this rule "seems to have come at an unpropitious moment" and may reduce consumer credit. On August 3, 1976, as the ranking minority member, I wrote Chairman Burns voicing my

concern and requesting him to amplify by letter why the Federal Reserve Board is of the opinion that consumer credit may well decrease due to the Federal Trade Commission's "holder-in-due-course" ruling.

My colleagues, I urge each of you to review this rule which appears in the Federal Register, volume 40, number 223 at page 53506. After review I believe you will concur that this rule needs to be suspended, and that a thorough study be conducted as to the effect this rule may have upon our Nation's consumer credit community.

THE FUTURE OF THE INDUSTRIAL MIDWEST: A TIME FOR ACTION

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1976, Ralph Widner, president of the Academy for Contemporary Problems in Columbus, Ohio, spoke to the Ohio Planning Conference on the subject of "The Future of the Industrial Midwest: A Time for Action." This remarkable analysis of the declining economy of the Midwest sets forth the problems we will attempt to deal with through the proposed new Northeast-Midwest Economic Advancement Coalition, and it should be required reading for all public officials and leaders of industry throughout the region. I wish to insert the body of Mr. Widner's address at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues and all those affected by the shift of population, wealth, and industry from the industrial centers of the Midwest and Northeast to the southern tier of States known as the Sunbelt:

A PROFILE OF PROBLEMS

Together with the Northeast, the Industrial Midwest has been the economic core of the country since it first began to industrialize. The Industrial Midwest produces three-fourths of the nation's steel; four-fifths of its automobiles; and most of its tires, machinery, and fabricated metals. It is also part of the country's agricultural heartland—preparing more meat; dressing more turkeys; growing more oats; and processing more cheese, butter, and milk than any other comparable region of the country.

But, like its sister Northeastern region, the Industrial Midwest now faces some very troublesome problems of transition because of three basic shifts in our national economy:

1. A structural change as the nation shifts into what some have called a "post-industrial" economy;
2. A spatial shift as industry, services, and population disperse away from this old core area into other sections of the country; and
3. A resource shift as the energy and resource-rich regions of the country acquire significant comparative advantages over the regions that must import them and as actual constraints in energy and resource supplies undercut the old advantages this region once possessed.

THE STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Our national economy has advanced beyond the stage in which most jobs were in manufacturing. Instead, the number of

manufacturing jobs has held steady while jobs in the so-called service and knowledge-based sectors have increased dramatically.

In 1970, the Industrial Midwest had one-fourth of all the jobs in the country, but it had 31.6% of all the manufacturing jobs. Having risen to economic dominance on the base of its manufacturing, its economy is now over-specialized at a time when the job-mix of the country is shifting. Many of its cities are highly specialized in only one or two industries.

TABLE 2.—Single-Industry Cities

INDUSTRY AND CITIES RELYING PRIMARILY ON ONE INDUSTRY

Machinery, except Electrical: Racine, Dav-
enport-Rock Island-Moline, Decatur, Rock-
ford and Muskegon.

Paper and Allied Products: Green Bay and
Appleton-Oshkosh.

Electrical Equipment and Supplies: Mans-
field and Port Wayne.

Primary Metals: Huntington-Ashland,
Steubenville-Weirton, Youngstown and
Pittsburgh.

Fabricated Metals: Rockford.

Rubber and Plastic Products: Akron.

Transportation Equipment: Lima, Flint,
Ann Arbor, Detroit, Fort Wayne, Indian-
apolis, Muncie, South Bend, Lansing and
Saginaw.

The manufacturing economy of the Industrial Midwest is highly interdependent. Declines in some of the region's basic industries can trigger a ricochet effect throughout the region from one city and state to another. As an example, consider one of the basic industries of the region: automobile production. Some economists have projected potential reductions of over 20% in auto production over the longer term. Using a regional model of inputs and outputs in the Industrial Midwest economy, the Academy for Contemporary Problems projected the results of a 25% reduction in auto production. The model projected that such a reduction could cause a loss of 408,000 jobs directly or indirectly related to auto production. Of these 408,000 auto-related jobs in the region, 122,000 would be in the auto industry itself and 286,000 in other related regional industries. A cut of this magnitude in auto production would reduce industrial output in this region by \$17.7 billion, \$6.1 billion in automobiles and an additional \$11.6 billion in non-automobile related goods and services. Thus, this example shows what the impact of change can be when a regional or state economy is highly specialized.

The Industrial Midwest also specializes in the production of products other than autos, such as steel, machine tools, and metal working equipment. However, projected growth rates for these industries are much lower than past rates. Worse yet, even though these industries dominate in the region, new plants are unlikely to locate here. They will locate in other parts of the country, closer to new expanding markets where the industry may lack facilities. Any significant growth in manufacturing employment that the Industrial Midwest might gain is unlikely to come from the slow-growing sectors in which this region has been dominant.

Instead, new job opportunities in manufacturing are more likely to occur in growth industries in which the Industrial Midwest has a lower-than-average share nationally—industries that are high technology, growing in employment, footloose in terms of location, and attracted to regions where their workers can enjoy the fruits of modern life: good recreation, cultural opportunities, good climate.

Recent studies of innovative, high technology enterprises provide some impressive evidence that employment growth in these industries is ten times higher than in the

mature industries in which the Industrial Midwest dominates. But the location of such industries is shaped by the availability of venture capital and the attractiveness of an area to the required labor force. They are far more footloose than the manufacturing industries of the past. Their requirements are not normally addressed in the traditional smokestack chasing, industrial development program. Efforts to encourage the development of such enterprises in the Industrial Midwest will have to deal with the availability of venture capital and the attitude of lenders in the region toward such enterprises. Programs would also have to deal with more intangible issues such as community environment and the availability of cultural and recreational amenities.

Because the service and knowledge-based sectors account for the greatest increases in employment, any economic development program that ignores those kinds of jobs is going to have only a small impact on improving the economic situation in this region. Thus, the Industrial Midwest is in tough competition with other sections of the country for those kinds of jobs.

THE SPATIAL SHIFT

Ever since the second decade of this century, relative decline in the Northeast-Midwest share of national population and employment growth has been evident. A relative change in favor of the South and West was inevitable as conditions improved and population increased in those areas of the country.

But recently we have begun to see not only relative but also absolute changes in the economic core of the country. The economic and population growth of the Industrial Midwest and the Northeast has slowed or stagnated.

The population shift can be traced to three changes:

1. The migration of rural poor out of the South and into the North has nearly come to an end;
2. The natural increase of population has dropped to levels far below those of previous decades; and
3. The rate of out-migration from the Midwest toward the South and West has increased.

The impact on the urban areas is particularly noteworthy. It was common in previous decades for many of the central cities of industrial communities to be losing population. But now whole metropolitan areas, and not just central cities, are losing people.

Absolute losses in population have been estimated since 1970 for Akron, Buffalo, Champaign-Urbana, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dayton, Duluth-Superior, Pittsburgh, Rockford, St. Louis, Springfield (Ohio) and Terre Haute. By themselves, population losses are not necessarily a problem. In fact, sometimes they can be an advantage. But these losses are important problems if they:

1. Represent an outflow of the region's highly skilled talent;
2. Undercut the vitality of the local tax base making it even more difficult to meet the rising costs for public services; and
3. Affect the various distribution formulae for federal funds.

The condition of the cities of the Industrial Midwest is a reflection of their historic specialization in manufacturing. The vast majority of the 57 metropolitan areas in the region have an employment percentage in manufacturing higher than the national average. Of the eleven cities that do not, nine are state capitals and/or university towns. The state capitals and university towns are the same cities having the fastest growth rates, the highest percentage of new housing, and the lowest unemployment rates in the Midwest. That is no coincidence. These cities

mirror the economic and social profile of the post-industrial economy into which we are now moving.

But the majority of the manufacturing-based cities in the Industrial Midwest are in trouble. They are burdened with obsolescence and blight. They have inherited a large population of poor from the South-to-North migrations of previous decades. They are required to provide public services at increasing cost at the same time that their local tax base is beginning to decay.

Two-thirds of the metropolitan areas in the Midwest had more housing built before 1939 than the percentage for the nation as a whole. However, they are now suffering from the so-called "doughnut effect": large concentrations of poor in the central cities while the better off live in surrounding suburbs. Now, a hole is beginning to appear in the doughnut. Entire inner-city areas are being abandoned as population moves out and no new influx of people comes in to take up the vacated dwellings.

This emptying out, like population loss itself, would not necessarily be bad if these vacant areas became attractive to new investment and redevelopment. But the combination of the structural, spatial, and resource shifts in our national economy—together with the high crime rates, bad schools, and a deteriorated environment in these areas—has deterred investment, leaving them in much the condition of war-torn Warsaw after World War II.

Instead, investment flows south and west where the legacies of past problems are less burdensome and expensive to correct. While the Industrial Midwest and Northeast are losing population and employment, the South is gaining both.

Clearly, strategies for surmounting these new challenges to the Midwestern economy will have to be considerably more sophisticated than the promotional programs of the past. The region will have to look beyond manufacturing jobs if the conditions are to be restored to balance. The evidence clearly indicates the need to examine different approaches to state and local taxation, perhaps different approaches to delivery of some public services, and a skillfully designed regional strategy for creating the physical and cultural environment in the Industrial Midwest that the enterprises of a post-industrial economy will find attractive.

THE RESOURCE SHIFT

In accomplishing this, however, the region faces a third and equally perplexing shift in the national economy: the resource shift.

In prior decades, the region's industry and economic development were founded on cheap energy and the ready availability of nearby resources. These gave the Industrial Midwest a strategic locational advantage: convenient to resources and uniting the main arteries of the nation's commerce.

Now energy is expensive and much of the energy the Midwest consumes comes from other regions. It may prove convenient for many industries to locate in the energy-exporting, rather than energy-importing, regions. This will require two-pronged development strategies in the Midwest: one devoted to developing the region's energy resources and facilities and the second devoted to conserving energy wherever possible by promoting less energy-intensive community and economic development.

The capital requirements for accomplishing this together with the capital the region will need to modernize community facilities and industrial plants may, if some forecasts can be believed, put heavy pressure on the nation's capital markets. The cost of money may be high and the availability of money may be tight in the next decade with the

public and private sectors potentially in competition for scarce resources.

It would be dangerous to think that the government will be able to spend its way out of these problems in this part of the country. It will take far more ingenuity than that. The region will have to find new ways to harness public and private needs together. It will probably have to emphasize capital formation over consumption in order to afford the basic improvements required to ensure the future economic health of this region. This will require some new departures in our approaches to community development. The states of the Industrial Midwest will also have to cooperate on several key fronts: transportation, energy, and recreational development—to name only three. Regional cooperation with respect to federal policy may also prove vital, particularly with respect to energy policy, distribution formulas, and the possible federalization of all welfare programs.

The states of the Industrial Midwest pay in more to the Federal Treasury and get back less than any other section of the country. In the days when this region was the dominant economic center of the country, that might have been appropriate. Tax dollars from the Industrial Midwest, funneled through Washington, helped the South solve its problems. But the abandoned cotton fields of today are no longer in the farm lands of the South but in the hearts of our industrial cities.

Unless the planners, the public officials, the civic leaders, the Congressional delegations of this region quickly grasp the drift of events and attempt to consciously alter them through active regional cooperation and intervention, the region's economic leadership will be lost.

The time for action is now.

THE COSTS OF PAYING UP EARLY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, new lending disclosure laws are making it easier than ever before for consumers to understand the finance and interest rate charges which accrue as they pay back a loan. But for those who pay off earlier than expected, the law is not nearly as protective and the result is much confusion.

One case which has come to my attention recently required the combined efforts of five House officers, two senatorial offices and a Federal agency before one bank and a consumer could reach an agreement on the early payment terms of a mobile home loan.

Prepayment charges are common, however. And I do want to make it clear that I am not disputing their legitimacy. Lenders claim it costs them money to open and maintain a loan and that if a consumer pays up early, there should be some compensation for the time and money costs.

As I see it the fault with prepayment charges lies in the fact that the formulas used to compute these amounts are so complicated no consumer short of a mathematician can understand clearly. One banking agency staff member re-

cently told me that often, the banks themselves do not understand exactly how the formula works. "They just program the computers and let them do all of the work," he said. "If the computer is off a little, then every account figured on that program can be incorrect and the bank does not have the knowledge to check its own figures, much less the consumers."

Naturally, this creates difficulty when a consumer asks to have the rebate formula explained to him and the result is that many walk away from prepaying a loan with the feeling that they have been taken. An example was the consumer who decided to pay back a year-long loan in 6 months and found that the amount of finance charges he had to forfeit were more than 50 percent. He asked why and was told the following:

In a 12 month contract, the creditor retains 12/78's of the total finance charges on prepayment in the first month, while the customer would receive a refund on the remaining 66/78's of the total. On prepayment after six months, the amounts to which the creditor and customer are entitled are 57/78's and 21/78's, respectively.

As unbelievable as it sounds, this formula, called "The rule of 78's" is the only method of computing the refund of unearned finance charges on the prepayment of a loan that some States will allow. It is the most common formula but of late has come under considerable criticism. One large and influential California bank, Wells Fargo, has recently adopted a policy by which the rule of 78's is no longer used. Due largely to the kinds of misunderstandings I have described here, this bank has decided to compute the rebate amounts on a simple interest basis using the original annual percentage rate.

The Federal Government itself does not set any regulations on the kinds of prepayment charges that may be imposed; the Truth in Lending Act requires only that the formula be identified somewhere in the loan contract. No mention need be made of what these terms mean. No mention need be made of when and how the rule of 78's will come into play. And no explanation of why it will cost the consumer more than 50 percent of the total finance charges if he or she pays off in 50 percent of the time, need be made.

For all its well-intentioned attempts to assure disclosure to consumers, the Truth in Lending Act falls short in this one area. The Federal courts have ruled that the Federal Reserve Board's interpretation of the Truth in Lending Act is adequate despite the fact that it had to overturn a lower court ruling which found that consumers should be better informed of the meaning of the rule of 78's. The superior court ruled that it would be too burdensome to require that a full explanation be given to the consumer prior to the signing of the lease.

My feeling is that we can do better for consumers than this. Even former Federal Reserve Board Vice Chairman, J. L. Robertson felt that the regulation Z disclosure requirements for prepayment terms represent only "the best of the worst" among the choices available. Full

disclosure of the rule of 78's would no doubt confuse the consumer to some extent at a time when the disclosure of other aspects of the loan contract are more important. But on the other hand, how can consumers sign a loan without knowing what kinds of charges they will be responsible for?

The burden of clearing up the confusion apparently rests with Congress. Perhaps the rule of 78's is the best method for computing rebate amounts. But if one large and stable bank long involved in consumer lending decides to make a major policy change away from it, I feel it is worth some looking into. As chairman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking, I am planning hearings on prepayment charges as soon as the 95th Congress convenes, in which a study will be made of the various State experiences, both among those which require the rule of 78's and those which disallow it, to determine whether another method, such as the actuarial or the simple interest method, might be more in line with today's consumer borrowing market. Then, if warranted, I will propose an amendment to regulation Z in order that consumers be provided with a clearer description of prepayment charges, the conditions under which these formulas come into play, and a demonstration of the method and relative cost to the consumer if such stipulations appear in the contract he is about to sign.

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER PROPOSES ACTION PLAN TO END OCEAN POLLUTION

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1976, an official congressional hearing was held in the Hempstead Town Hall on the problems of pollution of our ocean beaches. I was invited to be the lead-off witness that day, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Oceanography, and urged immediate action in two areas:

First, on my recent legislation to provide for sludge disposal by new methods other than ocean dumping; and

Second, to require that any future Federal loans to the city of New York be made on condition that the city completes on schedule sewer plants in Red Hook and the North River.

These two steps are critical to the success of any program to clean up the problem that exists on the Long Island beaches. The recent action by the Environmental Protection Agency, which will stop the dumping of sludge by 1981, requires that there be an alternative method available.

PROPOSES SLUDGE DISPOSAL LEGISLATION

There is no present law which concentrates on the problems of sludge dis-

posal. My new bill, H.R. 14755, would specifically provide Federal help to local governments, who are presently dumping sludge in the ocean, so that they could dispose of the sludge by other alternative methods.

My sludge disposal bill is so written as to specifically apply to the problems of the disposal of sewer sludge. The bill has been referred to the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the House.

I will press for action at the earliest possible date in view of the recent EPA action.

CALLS ON CITY OF NEW YORK TO END DUMPING OF RAW SEWAGE

I have called upon the Congress and the administration to take action to require the city of New York, as a condition for receipt of any further Federal loans, to continue on schedule the construction of two sewer plants at Red Hook and North River. These plants are intended to treat the 300,000 gallons of raw sewage that is presently being dumped by the city into the Hudson River each day and flushed out to the ocean.

These plants are behind schedule and the city is balking at giving out new contracts for their construction. They are absolutely essential and should be given top priority by the city administration. I will ask the Congress and the administration to condition any further loans to the city upon guarantees that the construction of these two plants will be resumed and expedited.

I am pleased to announce that my proposal for action by New York City on its sewer plants has been acted on by the entire New York congressional delegation. I serve as vice chairman of this bipartisan group. All 39 Congressmen approved of a letter I suggested to Mayor Abraham Beame urging him that, in the next capital budget to be adopted by the city, a priority be assigned to the completion of the sewage plants now under construction. This kind of bipartisan action will insure that the problem will receive the proper attention from those officials who are responsible.

ARRANGES FOR COORDINATED FEDERAL MONITORING OF OCEAN WATERS

I recently held an important inter-agency meeting to arrive at a comprehensive program to monitor short- and long-term effects of pollutants in the New York bight. Representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Coast Guard appeared in my congressional office at which time I presented guidelines for a satisfactory monitoring program.

This meeting culminated 9 months of information gathering and study by me, an effort focused at erecting the framework for Federal coordination and Federal cooperation with local authorities. All of the agencies and local groups have roles to play, but it is time for formal planning to assure that the vital ingredients for comprehensive monitoring are included.

My main guidelines for a formal program include: First, assignment of a lead

agency role to EPA; second, selection of project managers by NOAA, NASA and the Coast Guard for interagency liaison; third, designation of local points of contact for interaction with the Federal agencies, and fourth, an outline of technical goals and scope of such a program. I also expect additional commitments of resources from the agencies over and above their present efforts in the Bight. I can assure you I will do everything I can to see that these resources are made available.

My extensive correspondence with agency heads began last December. I have battled for several years to move ocean dumping sites further from Long Island, while encouraging communities to settle on sites for land-based disposal.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Technology, I have been pushing for rapid implementation of advanced technology in the battle to protect the marine environment. I see some hopeful signs, but I am concerned that some very good capability might leak through the cracks.

I expect the agencies to come back to me with a program plan, including resource requirements, within 30 days. From the positive nature of agency responses, I expect that they should be able to hammer out a very firm program that will provide continuous monitoring so that people are not simply reacting to emergencies. I am particularly pleased that I have been able to catalyze cooperation on the executive side. That is what a legislator should do.

SHIPBUILDING FOR U.S. NAVY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), has circulated to the Members of the House a brochure on "The Trend in the Naval Balance." The main theme in it is that the trends in the U.S. naval shipbuilding are up and the trends in the Soviet naval shipbuilding are down, and that the basis for an expanded U.S. naval shipbuilding is no longer present. I cannot agree with the conclusions of that brochure.

The United States depends upon its imports and exports as major portions of its economy. The greater part of these are carried by sea. The United States depends upon its overseas sources for strategic material—68 or the 71 most critical materials come from overseas, with 50,000,000 tons of critical material being imported yearly. Over 45 percent of our petroleum is imported from overseas. With this dependence upon foreign sources for the goods which keep our country running, we must be able to keep our sea lanes open to the sources of these materials.

Furthermore, we have mutual defense commitments, formally signed and ratified by the Senate with 42 countries in

one form or another. These, too, give us a responsibility for keeping our sea lanes open to these countries as well as assuring us of the strategic materials we need and do not have in adequate amounts.

Moreover, the United States has traditionally relied upon a "forward strategy." This means that we try to keep our naval vessels going to the other continents so we will be prepared there in case of need. This is a long-standing and deliberate part of our strategy—to carry the fight to any potential enemy before he can bring it to our home shores. This is a sound policy.

As a further factor, we have to design our ships so that we can retain our trained personnel—we do not have a draft or a mandatory governmental dictate of where people will work. To retain service personnel we have had to give more thought to the habitability of our ships.

Tied in to the entire picture is the statutory mandate of title 10 of the United States Code which requires that the Navy be "organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations at sea."

On the other side of the coin is the question of what the forces are which might be used against our Navy. Because we have let our fleet drop in size, from 974 to 473, our total force is now smaller than the Soviet force. There are several items about which to be concerned with the Soviet forces. In the first place they have a very large submarine fleet—about 325 ships to about 115 of ours. About 50 of the Soviet and 40 of our submarines are ballistic missile submarines. This means that the Soviet attempts to cut our lines of communication have nearly four times as many attack submarines to use against those lines as we have to defend those lines. And defense is a much harder task.

In the surface fleet the Soviets have about 250 ships while we have about 175. In addition, the Soviets have a large number of smaller combatants which can provide capability in or close to their home waters, or in or close to home waters of their allies—thus making our problems of operating in distant seas even more difficult. And the ships which the Soviets have been building even when small, are loaded with first quality fire capability, and with high naval capability.

What all of this means is that the U.S. Navy needs its new ships—it needs them primarily with the capability to be able to cross the oceans and fight on the other side with minimum support. It also needs them in numbers of capable ships so that they can meet a capable enemy and win—on the other sides of the oceans.

Mr. ASPIN raised vigorously the issue of relative ages of the two fleets. The U.S. Navy in the past 5 to 8 years has reduced the size of its fleet to less than 50 percent of its 1968 size. This has resulted in a healthy average age. Thus, as Mr. ASPIN states the average age of Soviet ships is now a little higher than that of U.S. ships, at a little less than 14 years to about 12 years. While this is true he

seems to indicate that by 1983 the Soviet ships will age somewhat rapidly while U.S. ships will not. Of course, all such calculations require a number of assumptions; however, our calculations indicate that in 1983 the Soviet age will be a little less than 14 while the United States will be a little less than 13. As fleets go, this is a relatively young and healthy age in either case.

Now let us turn to the more general trends in the two navies. The historic data provided by Mr. ASPIN—to the present time—is essentially correct. There is no wish to take issue with that. The concern is with the choice of data and the manner in which he organized it.

As a result of the selection and organization of the data, he arrives at totally in correct conclusions. For example:

In nuclear submarines, he does not consider SSBN's. He picks the period 1966 to 1975, and finds the United States built more nuclear submarines—45 to about 40. This is misleading. The United States finished its SSBN crash building program by 1966 and shifted its emphasis to SSN's. On the other hand the Soviets shifted emphasis to SSBN's during this period. As a result, the Soviets outbuilt us in SSBN's by about 50 to 8 and in total nuclear submarines by around 90 to 53. To call this shift in emphasis a change in long-term Soviet trends is misleading since we doubled our building rate of nuclear attack submarines when we finished building SSBN's.

In surface ships, he arbitrarily limited surface combatants to 1,000 tons displacement—omitting, for example, such ships as the 960-ton *Nanuchka* which carries SSM's, an SA-N-4 AAW missile system, a twin 57-millimeter gun system, has a speed over 30 knots, and has the ability to travel nearly 2,000 nautical miles. Later he shifted to 3,000 tons for another purpose. An appropriate chart would show the futility of such comparisons. By selecting the cutoff tonnage appropriately the ratio of numbers of ships can be made to shift from 5 to 1 for the Soviets to at least 7 to 1 for the United States.

Mr. ASPIN's selection of the 5-year period 1971-75 was most fortunate for his argument. Had he stayed with long-term trends, the building advantage would have been with the Soviets and not the U.S. Navy. In addition, had he chosen to go back only 4 years or 3, or 2, or 1, this would also have been the case. This results from the peculiar fact that in 1971 two U.S. shipbuilding programs end with a big year: the FF-1052, with 11 ships; and the SSN-637, with 7 ships. For example, the data for surface combatant construction shows that during the period 1971-75 the U.S. Navy outbuilt Soviets 32 to nearly 30 units—as Mr. ASPIN says; however, from 1972 to 1975 the Soviets outbuilt us about 25 to 21. The corresponding data for attack nuclear submarines shows for 1971-75 United States outbuilt Soviets 18 to about 15; for 1972-75, the Soviets outbuilt us nearly 15 to 11.

Another failing is that he compares only forces that are alike. As a result, comparative trends lose real meaning. For example, he shows that although the

Soviet Navy now dominates in antiship missiles—ASM's—the United States will deploy Harpoon and in a number of years have more ASM's than the Soviets. He implies that at that time all will be well. Not so. ASM's attack surface ships only. For the United States this includes the carriers—the heart of our Navy—as well as the supply ships that bring to the carriers the fuel and ammunition without which they become inoperative. On the other hand, the ASM's are useless against the major threats from the Soviet Navy—the submarines and aircraft.

Let us make a more general point concerning trends. The whole tone of Mr. ASPIN's paper accuses the Navy and OSD of falsely claiming that the Soviet Navy is growing in size. Such criticism, in my opinion, is not substantiated by the facts. For a number of years, the Navy and OSD have been trying hard to draw public attention to the rapidly growing Soviet naval threat. The growing threat stems not from numbers which have been decreasing somewhat, but rather, from rapid and steady increases in capability. These increases continue today. For example:

Surface ships are increasing in: size, range sophistication and numbers of ASW and AAW systems.

The submarine force has a growing number of nuclear-powered attack submarines, many of which can fire antiship cruise missiles as well as a large number of torpedoes.

The older Badgers of the Soviet Naval Air Force are being replaced by the new, long-range, supersonic Backfire bombers. Addition of aircraft carriers.

To tie these forces together they have developed a worldwide ocean surveillance system which is still improving.

One must always remember in estimating the naval balance that one cannot merely compare numbers of tonnage, or perhaps even the capability of individual ships. One must consider the missions of the two navies. For example, the U.S. Navy is committed to the resupply of its overseas allies in case of war. The Soviet Navy mission would be to interrupt these seaborne supply lines at times and locations of their choosing. The Soviet mission is clearly easier and thus if both navies had identical forces, the balance in this case would decidedly favor the Soviets.

Another aspect of missions affects the size of ships a navy chooses. The United States has always had major interests and allies overseas and, hence, required a Navy on distant deployment and in a constant state of readiness. This requires big ships. Traditionally, the Soviet Navy missions were defensive, involving coastal action of relatively short forays to sea.

Direct side-by-side comparison of United States and Soviet ships is really not very meaningful and in fact can be a source of confusion even when ships of the same designation, that is, cruisers, destroyers, and frigates are compared.

There was a time when it was not unreasonable to use the ship type name—or symbol—as a rough indicator of capability. However, the days when the de-

sign of even one class of warship remains uniform from the first ship to the last are gone. Rapid technological advances and changing naval requirements result in a constant stream of changes. The tendency is for each successive ship of a particular class to be better and more advanced than her sister ship. This fact is more pronounced between classes of a single type, and still more between the same types of different navies.

Thus ship type is not a valid criterion for comparing ships. As Admiral Gorshkov points out in an article for his "Navies in War and Peace" series:

The qualitative transformations which have taken place in naval forces have also changed the approach to evaluating the relative might of navies and their combat groupings: we have had to cease comparing the number of warships of one type or another and their total displacement (or the number of guns in a salvo or the weight of this salvo), and turn to a more complex, but also more correct appraisal of the striking and defensive power of ships, based on analysis of their capabilities and qualitative characteristics.

We build ships for a specific mission and task to be accomplished. Thus "our cruisers" may not be comparable with "their cruisers" because the role of these ships and the manner in which they will be employed tactically is in all likelihood quite different.

The observations of Mr. ASPIN, who is an able Congressman, have been helpful in bringing these matters up for discussion, and action. To me, it is crystal clear that the U.S. Navy has an urgent need for a more adequate program of shipbuilding than now in effect. That is the bottom line of this matter.

PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF RAPE VICTIMS

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased, recently, to join my colleagues, Congresswoman HOLTZMAN and others, in the cosponsorship of a bill designed to protect female rape victims from demeaning and irrelevant questions in sexual assault court cases. I hope that this legislation will establish a national standard that will soon be reflected in State laws. I would like to share with my colleagues my testimony on H.R. 14666 to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HERBERT E. HARRIS II, JULY 29, 1976, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H.R. 14666, THE PRIVACY PROTECTION FOR RAPE VICTIMS ACT

I strongly support H.R. 14666 which would limit the admissibility of prior sexual history of rape victims and urge the committee to report this much-needed legislation to the full House for a vote. Rape is the fastest rising and most underreported crime of violence in the nation, according to the

F.B.I. It is time that this Congress came to grips with this growing problem. This nation needs a more responsive, more humane system for dealing with rape victims.

When a rape case goes to trial, judges decide on a case-by-case basis whether a woman's prior sexual history is relevant and can be used in the trial. All too often past sexual activities are not relevant to the facts of the case. The trial turns into an inquisition of the woman's character and behavior; the victim rather than the defendant is "put on trial." This bill severely restricts the use of evidence about a rape victim's past sexual conduct. By setting strict, procedural guidelines, the victim's right to privacy is more fully protected. So is her reputation.

When the victim fears that her life history and particularly the more private and personal aspects of her life will be made public, in the worst possible light, she is reluctant to seek prosecution of the rape. National statistics indicate that only one out of three victims report assaults to the police. And this figure may only be a fraction of the actual number of sexual assaults. Not only will this bill encourage more reporting rapes, it will also mean that victims will suffer less additional trauma since they will be more secure in the knowledge that they will be questioned only on material determined by the judge to be relevant. The experience of a rape is bad enough as it is. To be put through the degradation of irrelevant questions about one's past private activities only aggravates what must be a most agonizing experience.

F.B.I. statistics indicate that forcible rapes are on the rise, going from 41,230 in 1973 to 55,210 in 1974. This means that there is one rape every ten minutes. In one jurisdiction in my district, the city of Alexandria, rapes increased 65 percent from 1974 to 1975. Rapes occur most frequently in low income areas and usually in the early morning hours. Almost half of all rapes occur in a home, usually the victim's. In my district and nationwide, women in their twenties are most subject to this crime. The problem of rape is not going away; this Congress should approve this bill—a first step toward curbing one of the most dehumanizing crimes.

There are other related issues we must address as well. Counseling programs for rape victims have not given sufficient attention to the victims mental health needs after the rape. The cost of the physical examination—should it be borne by the victim or the government? Women who are legally separated from their husbands cannot prosecute their husband for rape. Our state laws and procedures vary widely. There is a low rate of rape convictions. Very important also, in my view, is the offender. We do not know why someone commits rape; nor do we know how to successfully rehabilitate the rapist. We must have effective laws, effective programs, and effective procedures to make sure that women can move about as freely and with as much peace of mind as men.

These questions and these unresolved issues led me to cosponsor and support the creation of a National Center for the Control and Prevention of Rape to conduct research into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment and control of rape. I am pleased that this bill was incorporated into the Public Health Service Act which is now Public Law 94-63. And I gave my support to funding this center at \$3 million for fiscal 1977, although the President recommended no funds for the Center. This amount is one of the items the Labor-HEW appropriations conferees are now resolving, since the Senate approved \$6 million.

Again, I commend the subcommittee for giving this bill its attention and give my full support to this effort to end this horrible crime.

JUDGE FRANK J. BATTISTI CHOSEN
AS AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING
TRIAL JUDGE

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Honorable Frank J. Battisti, judge of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Ohio, was named "The Outstanding Trial Judge in the United States" by the 25,000 members of the Association of Trial Lawyers in America. He received the annual 1976 award of merit at the ATLA convention in Atlanta on July 27. Each year, the association selects the jurist that it feels has done most to preserve and strengthen the adversary system and who most consistently has discharged his responsibilities to the law in this era of rapid social and technological change. Last year's winner was Judge John J. Sirica.

Judge Battisti has risen to meet the challenges of the difficult and controversial cases he has heard over the years. His presidency of the Federal District Judges Association of the sixth circuit indicates the respect and esteem of his peers.

He is a native of Youngstown and a graduate of Ohio University and Harvard Law School. Judge Battisti has worked as an assistant attorney general in Ohio and as an attorney-adviser in the U.S. Army. Following service as a law instructor at Youngstown University and as a judge of the Mahoning County common pleas court, he was named a judge of the northern district of Ohio on September 11, 1961. At 38, he became the youngest Federal judge in the Nation. In 1969, he became chief judge of the district.

I join with Judge Battisti's many friends and colleagues in saluting his lifetime of achievement and congratulating him on his most recent honor. His scholarship, fairness and dedication are well known in Ohio and throughout the United States.

At this time, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Judge Battisti's award, which outlines the characteristics of the "Outstanding Trial Judge in the United States":

"We must preserve the vital keystone of our system—a law capable of justice in a new and everchanging age."

In recognition of the principle echoed in these words and in tribute to the jurist who has consistently embodied this principle in the discharge of his responsibilities in the United States District Court, Cleveland, Ohio.

The Association of Trial Lawyers of America proudly presents this Award of Exceptional Merit for 1976 to Judge Frank J. Battisti as: Outstanding Trial Judge of the United States of America; Conscientious and Capable in the determination of solutions to formidable trial issues, drawing upon insight gained as an instructor of the law, Youngstown University; and, Forward-looking and Stalwart in his advancement of our adversary system, the bedrock underlying our system of justice; and, Esteemed by his peers, as

demonstrated by his election to the Presidency of the Federal District Judges' Association, Sixth Circuit.

Awarded this 27th day of July, at the annual meeting of the Association in Atlanta, Georgia.

Attested by the Board of Governors of the 25,000 member Association of Trial Lawyers of America.

NEW SALT DEAL GIVING UP CRUISE MISSILES IS PLANNED

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 9, 1976, the highly respected political columnists Evans and Novak wrote in the Washington Post that Henry Kissinger has proposed a new SALT agreement with the Soviet Union wherein the United States would agree to count cruise missiles under the 2,400 ceiling on strategic delivery vehicles even though the cruise missiles under consideration are not strategic in their range. Also, the Kissinger proposal would permit the Soviets to deploy their new Backfire super-sonic bomber without counting it in the limit.

This proposal has been strongly opposed by Defense Secretary Rumsfeld and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What alarms me most, however, is that it is reported that President Ford is siding with Kissinger and the State Department over the advice of Secretary Rumsfeld. This agreement, if finalized, would eliminate the cruise missile as a supplement to the U.S. Strategic Triad—a supplement we badly need in light of the advantages given to the Soviet Union in the 1972 SALT accord by Dr. Kissinger. Furthermore, it is a terrible mistake, I think, to allow the Soviets to deploy the Backfire bomber without having to count it in the ceiling agreed to.

Most noteworthy and disturbing is that the details of this agreement are being kept quiet until after the Republican National Convention next week. It is obvious that if the American people and the delegates to the Convention were to know what is going on in the SALT negotiations, it would be a tremendous boost to Gov. Ronald Reagan in his campaign for the Republican nomination. Reagan has consistently criticized the Kissinger negotiating posture in the SALT talks.

The Evans and Novak column follows:

SALT II STRATEGY

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

President Ford has quietly changed from impartial arbiter of arms control disagreements within his administration to forceful advocate of the State Department's latest SALT option, which hardliners claim flirts with disaster for the U.S. and the west.

Assuming Mr. Ford's nomination and subsequent freedom from Ronald Reagan's restraining influence, he is expected to press hard for another strategic arms limitation (SALT) treaty with the Soviet Union before the Nov. 2 election. What's more, it is now clear that Mr. Ford is prepared to buy that treaty at high cost: sacrificing U.S. cruise

missiles while the Soviets keep their new Backfire bomber.

The last line of resistance is held by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In recent top secret meetings, they have been unusually tough and plucky in standing up to the President and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. But Mr. Ford seems so determined to have a SALT II agreement this fall that there is little optimism the Pentagon will prevail.

A SALT II treaty has been prevented for 18 months by two new weapons systems considered to be in the gray area of strategic weapons: the Soviets have the Backfire bomber; the U.S. has miniature-motored cruise missiles, which can be launched from planes or ships and which Moscow cannot duplicate today. The question: shall they be included in the limit of 2,400 offensive delivery vehicles each for the U.S. and the Soviet Union agreed to by Mr. Ford and Secretary Leonid Brezhnev at Vladivostok in 1974?

Several options were before the National Security Council (NSC) July 30 when it considered arms control for the last time before the Kansas City convention. But the option generating attention is Dr. Kissinger's latest proposal, regarded by many experts as certain to win Soviet assent.

It would limit cruise missiles by counting them under the strategic ceiling, delivering a fatal blow to the weapons system the Pentagon considers vital for conventional warfare. But the Kremlin would be permitted to go ahead producing (under a meaningless special ceiling) Backfire bombers, air refuelable and possessing obvious strategic potential.

In return, the Soviet Union would be forced to make this supposed concession: a reduction in the 2,400 strategic vehicle ceiling—perhaps by 100, perhaps 200, perhaps even more. The argument for the Kissinger option boils down to this: if Moscow is really prepared to reduce its overall nuclear war-making ability, why quibble over a few gray-area weapons?

To make this argument, it is necessary to prove that the Backfire is not and could not become a strategic weapon. Accordingly, Kissinger's position is strengthened by a top secret study of the Backfire, performed by McDonnell-Douglas Corp., under contract to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), showing a Backfire one-way range of only 3,400 miles.

Furious Pentagon experts, cursing both the CIA and McDonnell-Douglas, call the study worthless and claim the Backfire is a true strategic weapon with a 6,000-mile range.

Moreover, the Kissinger option does not even consider yet another gray-area weapons system developed by ingenious Soviet technicians: the SS-20 missile. While claimed to be just short of intercontinental range, it could be hastily converted into a strategic weapon. Thus, the Kissinger option would permit development of two potentially strategic Soviet systems, the Backfire and the SS-20, outside the strategic ceiling—no matter how low that ceiling goes.

The military chiefs, more passive than Pentagon civilians in recent years, are now fighting hard over SALT II. The estimable Gen. Frederick Weyand, lame duck Army Chief of Staff and long the toughest of the chiefs, has been joined by Gen. George S. Brown, recently confirmed for another term as chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Brown's conversion may have been influenced by the prodding in secret confirmation hearings by hard-line Sen. Henry M. Jackson, who ended up voting for him.

The real hopes of the hard-liners rest with Secretary Rumsfeld. Normally a trimmer, he is now talking plain and hard: the Backfire is a strategic weapon, no matter what the CIA says, and it is intolerable to permit the Backfire while sacrificing cruise missiles. That's what Rumsfeld is saying not only privately but in high-level meetings.

Were Rumsfeld and Kissinger in a great debate for the President's mind, the issue would be in doubt. But the Gerald Ford of 1976, after so much time at Dr. Kissinger's side, is not the strategic arms neophyte who entered office 24 months ago on Aug. 9, 1974. "It would be wrong to call Ford a puppet of Henry," says one well-informed hard-liner on Capitol Hill. "I think he is now a convinced and committed disciple."

If this is correct, it is difficult to imagine the Pentagon staging a real revolt. That is why the Ford administration, in what could be its final major act, may exchange reduced overall strategic limits for clear Soviet advantages in gray-area systems—a cost military experts say is much too high to pay.

Also, there is apparently no effort being made by Dr. Kissinger and the Ford administration to redress the asymmetry in missile throw-weight that so heavily favors the Soviet Union.

In view of the fact that Jimmy Carter and Henry Kissinger apparently see eye to eye on general foreign policy, it becomes very clear of the importance of the electoral process in 1976, as well as the importance of congressional inquiry into these matters.

MEDICAL SERVICE SUCCESSES

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attached editorial from the July 20, 1976, edition of the Lynchburg News to our colleagues:

MEDICAL SERVICE SUCCESSES

During this year's presidential campaign bureaucrats and federal spending programs have come under severe criticism. While much of this criticism has been justified because of the waste and inefficiency of many programs, some of it has resulted more from fact than fact. There are some governmental programs that perform a useful function. The key difference between the wasteful programs and those that accomplish their purpose and perform a useful function seems to be the persons administering the program.

The Moneta area of Bedford County was in need of additional medical service. Through a combination of citizen involvement, dedicated public service, and the effective use of federal grant programs, the Moneta medical center was dedicated Sunday afternoon.

The medical center will provide medical equipment and two doctors for the Moneta area. This success story is not unique. It is not even unique in Bedford County. Because of similar efforts the Big Island area is benefiting from the services of Dr. Teristo S. Serate.

These two areas have medical service largely because of the efforts of the Central Virginia Health Planning Council. The council served as the coordinating agency to bring together the efforts of concerned citizens of the areas and federal programs to help provide the necessary funding.

After making the initial presentations to civic groups in the areas, citizens from the areas took the initiative, but the planning council continued to provide direction. The Moneta area citizen efforts took the form of the Moneta Medical Center Inc., a non-profit corporation. The council steered the corporation toward the agencies that could provide the needed services.

Using a program to provide the initial funding from the National Health Service Corps the start-up money was obtained. The corporation is seeking a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with the Moneta area residents providing about \$34,000 of the funding. The building itself became possible through a loan from the Farmers Home Administration.

The medical centers at Moneta and Big Island are the results of cooperating efforts by private citizens, non-governmental organizations, local state and federal governments—our Republic at its best.

SMALL BUSINESS PLATFORM RECOMMENDATIONS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Convention has received most significant testimony from the National Small Business Association on the needs of the small business community.

The testimony for the association was presented by an outstanding representative of the small business community, Mr. Carl A. Beck of King of Prussia, Pa. Mr. Beck is President of the Charles Beck Machine Corp. which has been in existence for more than 100 years. A pioneer in the application of electronic data processing methods of inventory, manufacturing, and engineering problems affecting small businesses, the firm manufactures machinery and equipment for the packaging and converting industries in both domestic and export trade.

Mr. Beck serves with distinction as chairman of the Legislative Action and Policy Committee of National Small Business Association, and is a past president of the organization.

In testimony before the Temporary Committee on Resolutions of the 1976 Republican National Convention, Mr. Beck reviewed the small business planks of both major parties in the last 20 years. During the period 1960-72, Mr. Beck pointed out, the small business share of assets in manufacturing had declined from 50 to 30 percent, and the amount of profit share by small business has been reduced from 41 percent in 1960 to 28 percent in 1972.

In Mr. Beck's opinion the American Republic has survived 200 years because the United States did not have a ruling class and a ruled class, but a large middle class:

If this middle class is to survive, it demands the preservation of the small business community. It demands recognition that private enterprise is the embodiment of the value system of the small business entrepreneur. It demands a recognition of a two-tier approach to laws and regulations, the overt recognition that "General Motors and Joe's Machine Shop are not the same" and that "equal treatment of the unequal is the greatest inequality of all". What we are asking for is the survival of small business. And in doing so, it is neither exaggeration nor equivocation to say that we are also asking for the Preservation of America.

The National Small Business Association platform statement was presented in precisely the same form to both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions.

I have long been a faithful and loyal supporter of the small business community because of its contributions to the economic and social well-being of this country. If small business is to recoup the ground it has lost to big business and big government, there must be established as a high priority of Government a central program to provide not only for its survival but its growth. The "Small Business Commitment Check List" presented by Mr. Beck for the National Small Business Association is a commendable step and deserves careful consideration by both parties, and the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

Mr. Carl A. Beck's statement follows: STATEMENT OF CARL A. BECK, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATIVE ACTION AND POLICY COMMITTEE, NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

Our purposes in appearing before you are:

(1) To present to you a draft of a suggested "Small Business Commitment Check List". We plan to make it available to each of the major parties' candidates for the Presidency, the Vice Presidency and the Congress;

(2) To urge you to compare what both major parties have said about small business in their last five National Platforms—and what has actually happened to the position of small business in our economy during that same twenty-year period;

(3) To offer to assist you, or any Subcommittee or individual you may designate, to relate any proposed small business platform position to our view of small business' needs in the next four years as reflected in our draft "Check List";

(4) To advise you that we are making these same comments to both major parties in precisely the same form. We plan to publicize to small business generally the relevant sections of both major party platforms, our own suggested "Check list", and the response to it.

Five times in the past 20 years each of the major parties has described in the attached excerpts its proposed small business policies. General assertions were made in support of small business and the enterprise system in every one of those platforms. Pledges were also made for more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws in every one of those platforms. Yet, what has happened to the American economy during those 20 years is only too familiar a story to all of us. By 1960, the share of small and medium sized companies was down to 50% of the assets in manufacturing and 41% of the profits. By 1972, this had declined still further to 30% of the assets and 28% of the profits. In two-thirds of the manufacturing industries for which figures were available, the 8 largest companies account for 40% or more of the value of their industry shipments. Two-thirds of all manufacturing assets in the country are controlled by 200 giant corporations. In fifteen of the twenty years covered by these five party platforms, a sharp acceleration of employment concentration took place. Fifteen years ago, one of every four Americans was employed by one of the 500 largest industrial companies or some level of government. Today, that number is one out of every three. Despite platform plety, mergers and acquisitions of companies have skyrocketed, paused and skyrocketed again.

More and more during the past 20 years small business and the rest of the independent sector have been squeezed into a shrinking segment of the economy by the growth of government on the one hand and

big business and labor on the other. And it is the biggest big businesses—the top 50—which have most outgrown the rest of the economy.

It is our profound conviction that this has not happened as a result of marketplace economic factors. It is the result of the cumulative impact of mistaken Federal tax, spending, regulatory and other policies. Government policy—or lack of it—provides more fuel for economic concentration than anything else. And those policies have been fostered under administrations of both parties with the support of both parties, congressional majorities and minorities.

Some of the past platform language is too general for anyone not to be able to claim compliance with it. Some of the past language can be deemed to have applied only to the parties' national candidates in the event that they were elected to control of the executive branch. Some of the past platforms have apparently been construed to have implied to the parties' leadership only when it was in control of the Congress.

But in the large, someone from another planet reviewing the small business planks of both parties for the past 20 years and then contrasting it with what actually happened to the economy—would have to conclude that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans had much to do with running the country! If, that is, they meant what they said in their party platforms.

A 4-YEAR YARDSTICK: CATCH-UP GROWTH FOR SMALL BUSINESS

For small business the ultimate measurable test of the success of the next Administration and the 95th and 96th Congresses will be whether the independent sector of the economy outgrows government and big business between 1977 and 1980. Small business, the small farmer, and the independent professional have much ground to recoup if they are to catch-up with the growth of government and big business during the past 20 years.

Achieving that catch-up growth will take a better combination of Federal tax, spending, regulatory and other policies than we have yet had. A commitment to that catch-up growth means a readiness to measure success by whether the independent sector has a larger share of assets, employment, revenues, etc. at the end of the four years than it does now.

A HIGH PRIORITY FOR FEDERAL SMALL BUSINESS ACTION

If catch-up growth is to be achieved by the independent sector, it must be given as high a priority in national economic policy as all other national economic goals. These include full employment, inflation control, a balanced budget, rising standard of living, and effective competition in world markets. Catch-up growth for the independent sector need not, nor cannot, be sacrificed to any of these.

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND TRAINING INCENTIVES

If government is to be viewed as the employer of last resort, small business should be viewed as the employer of next-to-last resort. A system of tax credits and job training incentives, keyed to small companies, should be tried as a last step prior to resort to public employment.

A GRADUATED BUSINESS TAX SYSTEM

The economic justification for business size is alleged to be economy of scale; the public is entitled to share in those benefits of scale and benefits of size by having large enterprises bear a larger share of the cost of government than small ones. Graduated business taxes make just as much tax equity sense as graduated personal taxes. Among the taxes which should be graduated: corporate income tax; the investment tax credit; the

CXXII—1701—Part 21

capital gains tax; estate and gift tax; depreciation allowances.

FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY

When large and small companies are asked to bear the same regulatory burdens, they are not being treated equally. With respect to both substance and procedure of regulation, small enterprises should, in every case, bear a far lighter burden. This is true of antitrust laws and regulations, labor standards (including OSHA), consumer requirements. Because of their lesser ability to defend themselves, small business has, in fact, become the leading target of many regulatory agencies.

SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT POLICY

For decades now, Administrations of both Parties have promise a "fair" or an "adequate" share of Federal procurement (now running close to \$50 billion a year). The share of small business has ranged from 16% to 23%. A firm minimum goal of 50% should be achieved by the end of the next Administration.

Federal Research and Development expenditure is even concentrated against small business; less than 5% of the Federal total goes to small business. A five-fold increase in R & D share for small business should be achieved within the next four-year period.

FEDERAL ANTICONCENTRATION POLICY

(a) Companies with more than a billion dollars in assets should be precluded from making acquisitions or mergers except if they dispose of assets at least equal in size to the assets to be acquired.

(b) A graduated tax on mergers and acquisitions should be imposed on such transactions on companies with more than \$10 million of assets. The proceeds should be applied to a "Small Business Growth Fund" for the support of Federal small business activities.

(c) One use of the proceeds of the Growth Fund should be to support a "National Divestiture Loan Guarantee Fund" to be available to finance judicially or administratively ordered "demergers" and "unacquisitions". Divestiture should not lead, as it does too often now, to a mere shift of corporate units from one enormous conglomerate to another.

(d) Alternatives to sale to large companies to achieve liquidity must be developed for small businessmen.

(e) New antitrust procedures, and if necessary a Special Court, should assure a final determination in antitrust litigation in no more than three years. If justice delayed, is justice denied, we have had little antitrust justice indeed in the last 20 years.

FEDERAL FAIR POLITICS POLICY

The post-Watergate reform of Federal election financing should be continued and expanded to reduce still further the significance of large organizations—their money and their manpower—in the political process. Non-partisan efforts to expand participation or stimulate discussion of issues are one thing. Overwhelming elected officials with one-sided concentrations of money, manpower and improper influence, are quite another.

PANAMA CANAL IS ONE OF THE MOST CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS DISCUSSED TODAY

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the Panama Canal is one of the most controversial foreign

policy topics discussed today. Like most political issues it is much more complex than the ardent debaters on either side seem to suggest. I believe that every Member of this body should read and consider all reasonable arguments both pro and con before reaching a hard and fast position. In this light, I invite my colleagues to read the following letter I received from my predecessor, the Honorable Richard Hanna.

The letter follows:

HANIN,
August 22, 1975.

Congressman JERRY PATTERSON,
Cannon Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR JERRY: I hope you will bear with me and summon the patience to read and consider my views on the pending Panama Canal treaty. To me, this issue very clearly highlights what I deem to be a critical turning point in modern American politics.

Since the late 1800s and the "gun boat" diplomacy of Theodore Roosevelt, there has been a continuing presence and a growing dominance of military influence in our foreign policy. Military dominance and the pre-eminence of the Pentagon's interpretation of our national security reached a zenith during the cold war. It ultimately led us to a disastrous climax in Vietnam. A careful analysis of this history, when studied in parallel with the changed conditions in today's world and the effect such changes have in expressions of world power, suggest the need for substantial change in the U.S. foreign policy posture.

Characteristically, power in the history of nations has been expressed in several forms; moral power, political power, economic power and military power. At no time is any one of these present alone, but at various times they have been aligned in different order of dominance. Usually, military power has been behind and not in front. It was the Germans who, in modern times, bared the naked military power as clearly in the front of political Nazism. It is, to me, ironic that the United States which, from its inception, had used moral power up front, economic power next and military power in third place, made after World War, a dramatic switch. We so militarized our anti-communism, that its morality was debased and our economic power became the servant of the military. The political power was reduced to expressing justification for the military decisions. Eisenhower saw the framework of this alignment and, as a parting contribution, warned an unheeding country against it.

It sticks in the throat to say it, but the "arrogance of power" referred to by Senator Fulbright, was telling us that we, to a degree, had come to militarized anti-Communism just as the Germans militarized Nazism. We remained selective in application, but the brutality in its action was certainly demonstrated in the Mai Lai incident and the general world-wide disenchantment with our course of conduct has been for some time now painfully evident.

We are in a transitional period now, when our power posture can be adjusted to the new imperatives and the operative facts in the world. The necessary change in the dominant leadership role does not presage nor would it dictate any lessening of our national security. Rather, it should recognize that in today's world, our economic power must be linked with our moral power in the dominant leadership of foreign policy. The military should be relegated to its proper stance of supporting that leadership policy, not dictating that policy.

The public argument surrounding the Panama Canal issue and the determination of a new treaty is distorted by the battle for the specific interests of the military, the

conservatives, who are their allies, and certain shipping interests whose stake is less obvious. It would be tragic if the final flare of a dominating force, which too long has held sway, is able to direct a policy which must serve the future and realistically respond to our national interest, morally and economically.

I personally visited several times in Panama on this subject. My discussions were with responsible and reliable persons, both in and out of public life. There is great need to forge a more fair and equitable relationship to be worked out in the words of partnership, rather than in terms of the super sovereignty of the United States in Panama. The accommodation should be the work of our political and diplomatic leaders and not our military leaders.

Please give this matter your serious thinking as you face efforts from the Subcommittee of Appropriations and special efforts of certain members of the Merchant Marines and Fisheries. Thank you for your patience and consideration and I will be glad to provide answers to any questions my presentation generates.

Warmest regards,

RICHARD T. HANNA,
Member of Congress (Retired).

ATLANTA KEEPS ATTRACTING THEM

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta's many attractions for visitors and hometowners, too, have recently received a new addition with the opening of the World of Sid and Marty Kroft, a \$20 million spectacular amusement park inside the \$70 million Omni-International, a 5½-acre multiuse complex that houses the 520-room Omni-International Hotel, six movie theaters, several elegant restaurants, two office towers, a skating rink, and a number of small shops.

This multiuse complex is situated adjacent to the famous Omni sports and event coliseum, adjacent to Georgia's World Congress Center, which is destined to be the site of many meetings and conventions of regional, national, and worldwide importance, attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors and participants.

The new theme park, whose opening I recently attended, is unique in that it is indoors, America's first "high rise fantasy", enabling it to be open day or night, rain or shine, to 6,000 visitors. Sid and Marty Kroft, sixth generation puppeteers whose great-great-grandfather opened a puppet theater in 18th century Athens, offer entertainment in the tradition of European festivals and American vaudeville acts.

The park is composed of several levels of open terraces or "environments," which include a satirical carnival show, a flashy puppet show, a simulated mine shaft, and a giant pinball machine in which visitors ride in a 6-foot silver ball.

Indeed, the World of Sid and Marty Kroft has brought an exciting new dimension to downtown Atlanta and further helps those who travel there to enjoy this new international city.

LATIN AMERICA: ENDING OUR SUPPORT FOR THE DICTATORS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am asked to approve economic and military aid to many nations around the world. As I have looked at the requests, I have continually found the United States aiding harshly repressive regimes. I have spoken out against our seemingly unconditional support for the dictatorships in South Korea and the Philippines, but efforts to reduce aid to these countries have failed because the Congress views that aid as crucial in combating Communist aggression.

The situation in Latin America is quite different, however. There, repressive military dictatorships receive \$200 million in military assistance—grant aid, training, and credit sales—from the United States despite the fact that no country there is threatened by an external power. Rather, the military in Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil and many other countries use their power to repress internal dissent. And by our military assistance programs, we are aiding in that repression.

Obviously, we cannot expect every country we assist to be in our democratic image, as only about 24 countries in the world can truly be labeled as "democratic." But at present we seem to have no standards for doling out arms, other than a desire to maintain cordial relations with the government and the military in those countries.

I can understand our assisting a country, especially a democratic one, which is under external attack or which affords the United States a vital strategic military advantage. But again, such is not the case in many Latin American countries. A few examples will illustrate the error of our policy in Latin America.

Chile is the most publicized case of a policy that extends throughout the hemisphere. It is a matter of record that the United States destabilized the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende. Once the military toppled Allende, the United States increased economic and military aid to the new dictatorship until the Congress put a stop to that support.

More commonly, instead of "destabilizing" a regime, the United States by its aid supports a "strong man" in the interests of stability. In Nicaragua, we have supplied aid to dictator Anastasio Somoza, who has run that country as his own private feudal manor. His family has run the country since the Marines left in 1932, and has done so by relying on the National Guard of Nicaragua, which the United States continues to train and equip.

Perhaps the most tragic consequence of our policy is the case of Uruguay. Known as the "Switzerland of Latin America" because of its democratic and progressive traditions, it was subject to

severe economic and political strain in the 1960's. An economic decline was coupled with the growth of the Tupamaros, a leftwing urban guerrilla group, who nearly destroyed all political order. The United States reacted by providing assistance to the police and military of Uruguay. By 1973 the military had won the battle against the terrorists. But a momentum had been established. Legitimate civilian control was lost as the military continued its drive for power. Using "subversion" as a pretext, the military has created a horribly repressive police state, jailing 5,000 Uruguayans, many of whom are peaceful and democratic opponents of the dictatorship. One in every 500 Uruguayans is a political prisoner. Since 1973 the United States has continued its military aid and increased economic support to the Uruguayan regime, despite repeated reports of widespread use of torture, reports which have been documented by Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists. The State Department appears to uncritically accept the Uruguayan Government's assertion that the repression is temporary but necessitated by internal threats.

In May I was successful in having my subcommittee end military assistance to Uruguay because of the repression there. The State Department has opposed this move vigorously. In July the House accepted the cut-off. Congressional hearings have been held on Uruguay, in which Wilson Ferreira, an articulate Uruguayan democratic leader now in exile, charged that the U.S. Embassy in Uruguay was giving active support to the regime there.

I believe that this cut-off serve as a signal to all the regimes in Latin America that the United States will not passively accept the use of our assistance in the suppression of peaceful dissent. The Senate version of the military assistance bill has no cut-off to Uruguay, and the matter will be decided in conference. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this cut-off will be accepted. Because we will be sending a message not only to these repressive countries such as Uruguay, but also to our own State Department. In hearings last week, State Department officials indicated that they could not implement the Human Rights Provision already in the Foreign Assistance Act because a working definition of "a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally-recognized human rights" had not been established. To this, my response is to quote Colman McCarthy's editorial in the Washington Post:

Experts aren't needed to understand that death lists, kidnappings, torture, and imprisonments are ways of governing that mock the American philosophy of law.

Finally, there are those who believe this type of criticism of Uruguay comes only from "leftists." No one would call Time magazine "leftist," but in its August 16 issue, Time decried Uruguay's imprisonment and torture of thousands of Uruguayan citizens, and even indicated that a cut-off of aid might influence the Uruguayan regime's treatment of its people. In any event, democratic peoples everywhere must speak out

against totalitarianism whether it comes from the left or the right. As we abhor the police state tactics of the Soviet Union, so should we condemn the right-wing military dictatorships in Latin America.

And we should certainly not assist them in the repression of their own peoples.

METHANOL TALKED UP AS GASOLINE ALTERNATIVE

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, the time for methanol is now. As you and many of my colleagues may know, I sincerely feel that this alternative fuel should be more seriously considered as a substitute for gasoline.

There are many reasons why methanol appears to be an attractive alternative for gasoline, one of those being that this fuel can be produced from any cellulose material, including waste and waste by-products, all of which can be found in abundance in this country. However, as we consider the Clean Air Act amendments and the question of auto emissions, I might point out that methanol-gasoline blends substantially reduce emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides.

Methanol is indeed a fuel whose time has come: We have the technology, we have the resources, we have the demand, but most importantly we have the need to develop our own energy supplies, and especially those that can offer an immediate relief from the energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention an article from Tuesday's Christian Science Monitor, which describes the practical application of methanol in automobiles. The article follows:

METHANOL TALKED UP AS GASOLINE ALTERNATIVE

(By Charles E. Dole)

I step on the "gas" pedal, shift into high, and I'm rolling along State Route 2 heading west from Boston. The car, a 1974 Ford Pinto, has just over 40,000 miles on the clock.

What's so different about my ride this morning? Just this: the car is running on a 15 percent blend of methanol, or wood alcohol, in the fuel tank—and I really can't tell any difference from a car fed by gasoline alone.

The car belongs to Dr. Thomas B. Reed of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is part of his ongoing drive to convince a wary world that methanol is an ideal synthetic fuel to stretch the world's finite supplies of petroleum.

The U.S. now is on a massive gasoline-burning binge, buying larger-size cars and using gasoline at alarming rates. This summer could set an all-time record in fuel consumption and perhaps give new immediacy to the need for a backup fuel when the gas pumps run low—maybe by the end of the century.

Of all the backup fuels, methanol now is seen as the most promising alternative to gasoline.

Volkswagen, for example, midway through an 18-month research project, finds that a blend of 15 percent methanol and 85 percent gasoline reduced carbon monoxide exhaust by

50 percent, compared with regular gasoline fuel. Hydrocarbon emissions are reduced about 15 percent, and nitrogen oxide is also substantially cut. The \$1.5 million, government-backed project involving 45 cars aims to prove methanol's short-range potential as an automotive fuel-extender and, says Herbert Heitland of VW, to provide a "smooth transition from gasoline-powered cars to methanol-gasoline-powered cars from 1980 onwards."

In Sweden, a 300-car fleet is testing a similar methanol-gasoline blend—and tests are under way or planned in other parts of the world as well.

The U.S. auto industry readily agrees on the future potential for the fuel and says it can supply the cars if the petroleum companies provide the fuel. "Methanol is a long-range solution to the fuel crisis," declares Serge Gratch of Ford Motor Company. "But," he adds, "it could take 10 years before it would start making an impact."

Joseph Colucci of the General Motors Technical Center in Milford, Michigan, says: "We can build cars which run just fine on a blend," but adds: "We prefer a pure-methanol approach, however."

"If you design a car to run on pure methanol, you can take advantage of methanol's physical and chemical properties. You can get better engine thermal efficiency than with gasoline. You can run at higher compression ratios for better performance. And you can control oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) much more readily because methanol burns cooler and generates less NO_x."

Further, "We know that with fuel injection we can get very good drivability with methanol while a carbureted system would present more difficulties."

The big stumbling block is cost—an estimated \$100 billion for new plants in order to make the "big switch." Also, "if you get any water in the tank, the methanol separates from the gasoline and goes to the bottom of the tank or fuel bowl," says Mr. Colucci. "We don't have that problem with pure methanol."

The Swedes, however, are using 4 percent isobutanol in the gasoline-methanol mix to halt the cold-weather separation of the fluids.

Meanwhile, to soften the cost and massive distribution problem which an all-out switch would cause, many people, including experts of the Energy Research and Development Administration, are studying the viability of using methanol in the nation's huge utility turbines to produce electricity.

The gasoline thus saved could then go into mobile transportation, such as automobiles. "Methanol is a great fuel for gas turbines," agrees Mr. Colucci.

As a fuel, methanol is storable, transportable, and usable right now. "We don't see any promise for hydrogen and gasoline mixed," says GM's Mr. Colucci.

As for electricity to run cars, "It will come," say engineers, "but only for short-haul, commuter-type travel, at least before the turn of the century."

Seattle has looked at the feasibility of converting all municipal vehicles to operate on 100 percent methanol produced from garbage.

Maine is considering a methanol plant to convert 5.5 million acres of forests, affected by spruce budworm which is killing the trees, into liquid fuel.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on August 8, 1776, the Continental

Congress, concerned about the buildup of British forces in New York, ordered the immediate departure for Amboy, N.J., of the Delaware battalion and the several militia battalions in Philadelphia. That part of the militia lacking arms was to remain behind until armed, at which time it was to leave immediately for the same city.

Congress also directed the Board of War to immediately inquire into the state of the Army in the northern department and the naval forces in the Great Lakes.

HON. WILLIAM E. SIMON ADDRESSES THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF NEW YORK

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently Secretary of the Treasury William E. Simon, in an address before the Union League Club of New York, discussed the terrible impact that inflation makes on our free enterprise system. He pointed out that when inflation distorts the economic system and it destroys the incentives for real improvement, the people will no longer support the system and society disintegrates. The unique and productive society we Americans have developed over the 200 years of our national life will collapse if we permit inflation to dominate our economic affairs. Federal Government policies which have the result of stimulating inflation, no matter how well intentioned, are a cruel hoax. When inflation takes over an economy, it is the poorest people who suffer most and turn to the Government. It is an insidious process because they become willing clients of the state and the very policies which created their misery.

In my view, inflation is a hidden tax which destroys the savings of those on pensions and fixed incomes, destroys the incentive to save and participate in capital formation, and stimulates speculative fever as prices chase costs in a vicious circle and everybody tries to keep ahead of the game.

We are about to commence the quadrennial national debate of a Presidential campaign. The great balance wheel of representative government is the two-party system, where citizens and taxpayers have an opportunity to vote for or against candidates whose policies will regulate their lives and property for the next 4 years. My good friend, Carl L. Shipley, one of Washington's most distinguished lawyers and political leaders, has called my attention to Secretary Simon's Union League speech. It is a remarkably strong statement and thorough explanation of what happens to a nation when the government spending absorbs so much of the nation's resources that there is not enough left to expand the plant and machinery to employ more people tomorrow.

As Secretary Simon says, "Government doesn't create wealth—people do." I recommend to my colleagues who are

presently debating various bills which would cause the Federal Government to spend and spend and create larger deficits leading to more inflation, that they read the following remarks by Secretary of the Treasury William E. Simon, one of America's most distinguished public servants, and a man whose leadership as Secretary of the Treasury has brought down inflation and brought our budget into closer balance, without hurting our national security or lessening the important programs to help those who because of age, physical infirmity, or other reasons are unable to help themselves.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SIMON

It is both an honor and a real personal pleasure to address this distinguished audience and to be among so many old friends again.

The Union League Club of New York stands for fundamental values of loyalty and dedication and good citizenship which are needed today more than ever. Over a hundred years ago, at a time of national crisis, your founders outlined the objectives that have guided you ever since:

"To dignify politics as a pursuit and a study;

"To reawaken a practical interest in public affairs in those who have become discouraged," and

"To enforce a sense of the sacred obligation inherent in citizenship."

And so your organization has fought the good fight against slavery, against denial of the right to vote, against Tammany Hall, and many of you are fighting today against other wrongs in our society and standing foursquare behind the things that are right about America.

I know that each of us here shares a common concern about the future and the continued growth of the remarkable and dynamic economic system that has given our people the highest living standards and the greatest prosperity known to man. And it is clear that unless the American people rally behind the principles that underlie this system, our steps will falter. Because far more is involved than the survival of a few companies, or a few jobs, or whether the price of beef goes up or down over the next few months. What is at stake is the very survival of our economic freedoms and, along with them, our personal and political freedoms as well.

Abraham Lincoln, in talking about our nation's founders during the Civil War, said, "Surely each man has as strong a motive now to preserve our liberties as each had then to establish them."

The same holds true today. Our system, while not perfect, has given Americans the blessings of both liberty and abundance. That system will continue to be true to us so long as we are true to it. This means that every citizen has the duty to ensure that our elected officials pursue sane and solid and responsible policies that will promote our economic stability and assure durable growth.

That is why I believe the election of 1976 is one of the most important in our history—certainly the most important in my lifetime. Why do I say that? Because, the decision the American people make this year at the polls will determine not only our nation's course for the next four or eight years, but well into the next century. And after all the political speeches have been made, and the editorials written, what that decision will really boil down to is this—a choice between the freedom for each of us to live our lives as we best see fit, or the surrendering of more of that freedom to an increasingly powerful govern-

ment in exchange for a false promise of security and permanent prosperity. This theme was best described by Gibbon in his epitaph for ancient Athens. "In the end," he wrote, "more than they wanted freedom, they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life and they lost it all—security, comfort and freedom. When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to society but for society to give to them, when the freedom they wished for most was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free." That is the issue.

I believe that what this country needs is a political program that is, in Harry Truman's words, a genuine contract with the people, a commitment to more than vague good intentions.

This program does not have to be complicated to be effective. All it requires is an underlying moral commitment to personal freedom and care for those who genuinely need help. This commitment would be linked to four equally explicit goals:

Prosperity and economic growth through encouragement of the private sector that provides jobs and generates the abundance that pays for government as well.

Skillful management of economic affairs by creating an environment of sustained, non-inflationary growth which will benefit every man, woman and child in our country.

Reducing the growth of runaway government spending which more and more Americans recognize as the biggest single domestic problem facing our country today.

Lowering the level of taxation in America. Taxes are too high for almost everyone. We must reduce the overall level of taxation so that our vital economy and society are spared the stultification and decay we have seen in other societies where the state has consumed an ever larger part of the national product.

These moral and practical guidelines would provide the basis for the most sweeping reform of American government in our history. But what have the American people been offered thus far in this political campaign? If, indeed, a platform is a contract with the people, then the platform adopted a few weeks ago here in New York City is a stark statement of the principle of spend-spend, elect-elect, inflation, controls, bigger and bigger government syndrome that has been at the very root of our economic problems during the postwar period—especially the past 10 years—and still remains alive and well in Washington, D.C. today.

This platform should really be called "Promises Promises Promises," for just like Santa Claus, and all the platforms from years past, it has something for everybody. The trouble is, playing Santa with the taxpayer's money dispenses neither good will nor integrity. The only thing it does dispense is pure hypocrisy.

Take a look at the platform and see what it calls for:

Guaranteed jobs for all at government expense;

National economic planning;

National day care systems;

A mandatory national health system;

A phased-in federal takeover of welfare;

Entirely new federally funded programs for transportation;

New public needs employment programs for the cities;

Substantially increased federal payments to education;

Countercyclical aid to state and local governments;

More federal subsidies for public housing;

Higher commodity prices for farmers, yet lower food prices for consumers. And then to top it all off, we're promised a balanced budget.

Now isn't it wonderful? There's more money for literally everything that lives and breathes. The list goes on and on. But what

it all adds up to is bigger and bigger government, higher and higher inflation, and eventually more unemployment and greater economic instability.

And in all of this, mind you, not a word about who would pay for all these programs, or even how much they would cost. Well, they do cost, and they're going to cost a lot, because there is no such thing as a "free" lunch or "free" education, or "free" health care. In fact, there is no free anything.

What is the price of these instant cures? The programs of this platform could easily exceed an additional \$200 billion—that's \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in America or over one-half of what our federal budget is today. The average American taxpayer would have to work for half the year just to support government, and only then could he start to support himself and his family.

But the platform makes the appealing claim that all these programs are possible without substantial new inflation given a federal policy of full employment, because for every one million newly employed people who pay taxes, the federal deficit will supposedly be decreased by \$16 billion. But how are these people to become employed? Why, by spending more money, of course. This means that the deficit will not disappear by such steps but will only grow.

So where would the additional needed revenue come from to balance the budget? It could be raised by borrowing or taxing from the private sector, but that would only lead to a loss of jobs in the private sector. The other alternative would be to inflate the money supply which would merely set us off on another boom-bust cycle. The supposed cure, then, turns out to be illusory, and what results is new and higher inflation which in turn would only lead to a new and higher level of unemployment.

The issues involved here are by no means narrowly economic. They concern fundamental principals of equity and of social stability. The trouble with growing government spending is that however good the intentions which underlie the growth, those intentions are not achieved; that instead, the growth in government spending makes low-income people worse off, undermines social cohesion and threatens the very foundation of a free society.

Here, the outstanding fact is, that in every country in which the percentage of government domination has increased there has been a tendency to move toward instability, toward minority government and toward a threat to a free society. Have we forgotten the inextricable relationship between our economic freedom and our social and political freedoms?

Our desire for progress, in the form of improved living standards and employment opportunities, will surely be frustrated unless we better control the insidious inflation which has destroyed economic stability by triggering a costly series of booms and recessions. The tragic policy errors of the past and our hopes for the future must force us to recognize a basic reality: inflation is the greatest threat to the sustained progress of our economy and the ultimate survival of all of our basic institutions.

There is a clear record from the past: when inflation distorts the economic system and destroys the incentives for real improvement the people will no longer support the system and society disintegrates. I am convinced that our uniquely creative and productive society will also collapse if we permit inflation to dominate our economic affairs. There is no tradeoff between the goals of price stability and low unemployment as some critics have erroneously claimed. If we are

to increase the output of goods and services and reduce unemployment, we must first make further progress in reducing inflation.

The intensity of my feelings about inflation has resulted in some critics labeling me as obsessed. However, I am not so much obsessed as I am downright antagonistic toward those who consistently vote for bigger deficits. We must always remember that it is inflation that causes the recessions that so cruelly waste our human and material resources and the tragic unemployment that leaves serious economic and psychological scars long after economic recovery occurs. It is inflation which destroys the purchasing power of our people as they strive—too often in a losing struggle—to provide the necessities of food, housing, clothing, transportation, and medical attention. Inflation is not now, nor has it ever been, the grease that enables the economic machine to progress. Instead, it is the monkey wrench which disrupts the efficient functioning of the system. It is the most vicious hoax ever perpetrated for the expedient purposes of a few at the cost of many. And there should be no uncertainty about its devastating impact, particularly for low-income families, the elderly dependent upon accumulated financial resources and the majority of working people who do not have the political or economic clout to beat the system by keeping their incomes rising even more rapidly than inflation. When inflation takes over an economy it is the poorest people who suffer most and turn to the government. It's an insidious process, because they become willing clients of the state and the very policies which created their misery.

The Democratic party platform then, far from being a guide to a new prosperity built upon sustained non-inflationary growth, is in reality a blueprint for economic disaster. By advocating such a massive and undesirable federal takeover of our national economy without even stipulating the means, the cost, or the method of payment, this platform not only insults the good faith and intelligence of the American taxpayer, but ignores the fundamental lesson of the past decade: it was these same excessive fiscal and monetary policies that caused the worst inflation in our peacetime history which in turn led to the worst recession in more than a generation. Our people have paid a terrible price for that ignorance.

In President Ford, we have a man who knows that real leadership is not always saying yes, because he has had the courage to say no. Thanks to his prudent, tough policies, we now have the best chance in a long time to enter an era of durable economic stability.

Our critics term the President's policies "Government by veto." But it is precisely because the President has vetoed more than 50 bills passed by the reckless free-spending Congress that the taxpayers have saved more than \$14 billion.

Restraint on spending brought about by the President is the reason inflation has been cut in half, inflationary expectations have been lessened, and 87½ million people are now working, more than at any other time in the nation's history. In essence, we've come a long way from the depths of the recession in 1975 and we're now well advanced into a period of economic expansion.

The essential point to remember, however, is that the President acted as he did because he had to. We must never forget that the other party has controlled both houses of Congress in all but four years since 1930. During this campaign the American people are being told we need to try new ideas, to spend a lot more money to create public employment which will allow us to balance the budget. This is a total contradiction; more of the same old quack nostrums which

have in reality produced budget deficits in 38 out of the past 46 years. Every time you see the sun rise here in New York City, be reminded that your Federal Government, spurred by an undisciplined Congress, has spent more than a billion dollars of your hard-earned money. And if you think that's incredible, let me give you some more unbelievable facts about government spending.

Since 1962, our budget has exploded from \$100 billion to a figure that will certainly top \$400 billion in 1977. That's an increase of 300% in 15 years. The government is now growing much faster than our ability or willingness to pay for it.

The U.S. Treasury in just the past 10 years has borrowed half a trillion dollars in the private capital markets. That's money that was swallowed up by the Washington bureaucracy that could and should have been invested in the dynamic private sector.

Added to that is the suffocating weight of excess government regulations that are threatening to overwhelm many small businesses. Government now controls over 10% of everything we produce in the economy and indirectly controls almost all of the rest. That translates into a cost to consumers of \$125 billion a year. One-hundred and thirty million man-hours are spent just filling out the forms.

It doesn't take a Ph.D. in economics to realize that the federal government has become the nation's biggest single employer, its biggest consumer, and its biggest borrower, and also the biggest source of inflation in the United States economy.

I am frankly astonished that whenever our critics are confronted with such irrefutable evidence proving we have too much government, they nevertheless plow on trying to make the case that there is not enough. The casualties of this misguided logic are jobs.

Free lives, individual lives, productive lives are built on capital investment, not on the red ink and the printing press of the government. If we are going to create the kind of jobs that will keep people permanently employed, that will meet the needs of a growing labor force and that will reduce our inflation by expanding our output of goods and services, then we must equip our workers with new and efficient plant, machinery, and tools. These capital needs of the future are staggering, about \$4½ trillion in the next decade—or about three times as much as we spent in the last decade.

Savings are the source of this needed capital. But savings are currently being drained by excessive government deficits. Resources absorbed by government for its spending today cannot simultaneously be invested in expanded plant and machinery to employ more people tomorrow. We cannot have both bigger government and a healthy expanding private sector. Government doesn't create wealth—people do. We cannot continue to transfer each year an increasing percentage of our national wealth from the most productive to the least productive sector of our economy without endangering the economic future of our children.

If we're really sincere about providing more productive and lasting jobs for our economy we will only succeed by strengthening our free enterprise system, and that, I might add, constitutes the centerpiece of President Ford's program. This means controlling government spending, getting rid of excessive and counterproductive regulations, reducing personal and corporate taxes, and striking a new balance that favors less consumption and government spending and more savings and investment. The only way to wage a real war on poverty is to create jobs in the private sector, not jobs for bureaucrats.

In the past, we have looked upon our dy-

namic free enterprise system as the Golden Goose that produced all our blessings and encouraged the self-initiative that has made our country the envy of the world. But today Congress is spending faster than the goose can lay its eggs. And should these policies continue, they will not only steal all the eggs, but kill the goose itself.

What a tragedy that would be. Just look at what we would be sacrificing:

The private sector produces the food we eat, the goods we use, the clothes we wear, the homes we live in.

It is the source of five out of every six jobs in America, and it provides, directly and indirectly, almost all the resources for the rest of the jobs in our all-to-rapidly expanding public sector.

It is the foundation for defense security for ourselves and most of the Free World.

It is the productive base that pays for government spending to aid the elderly, the jobless, the poor, the dependent and the disabled. Indeed, far from being the inhuman monster caricature painted by political demagogues, the American private sector is in reality the mightiest engine for social progress and individual improvement ever created.

This, is the crucial theme that must be communicated broadly and deeply into the national consciousness: The American production and distribution system is the very mainspring of our nation's strength—the source of present abundance and the foundation of our hopes for a better future.

Yet we could lose it unless we act. Let's face it. Under the politics of spend-spend, elect-elect we will get a massive increase in federal expenditures which will inevitably be followed by a new round of double-digit inflation and a wrenching recession. And that means more cries for government help and more calls for government intervention. So what we're talking about is the survival of our free enterprise system and, more importantly, whether the protection of our personal liberties can survive in its absence.

Ladies and gentlemen, the question is, are we going to promote the individual or the government? We cannot do both. That is the issue, and our freedom and our children's is at stake. Do we want more freedom of choice and more freedom of individual action? Or do we want to see these freedoms and all the other individual freedoms we hold so dear gradually erode under more and more government encroachments on our lives. That is the true, crucial decision behind the rhetoric and personalities of this election year. And the choice we make will affect not only our own futures, and our children's, but the future of our country itself as America embarks on its third century as the hope and inspiration of free people everywhere.

Gerry Ford has taken his stand. He's taken a stand to protect the dignity and freedom of millions of individuals like yourselves by leading the battle to slow the growth in government. Control over government spending will allow you to keep more of your own money. President Ford has made and continues to make these tough decisions despite persistent criticisms, because he knows that it's the hard-working taxpayers who keep this country going. And those people need to be protected, not punished. That's the honest way to run an Administration—nothing flashy, no gimmicks, just facing up to the job at hand each day and doing it. And by succeeding, he's also demonstrated that he understands what the real meaning of compassion is all about.

Two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson said, "To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude." That was the choice 200 years ago and

it remains the same today. But time is now running out—1976 may be the last opportunity we will have to stem the tide of big government and thinly disguised state socialism as practiced—if not preached—by many in Congress and elsewhere today.

If we love our freedom, then we must be prepared to defend it. Between now and election day I urge each one of you to decide how you can most effectively contribute to the preservation of a society that in 200 years has come to symbolize man's capacity to attain freedom, prosperity and dignity. This is an election in which the individual efforts of individual citizens will make the difference.

Thank you.

THE U.S.S. "MISSISSIPPI"

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on July 31 the U.S.S. *Mississippi* slid down the ways at Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. into the James River. She will soon join the fleet of the greatest naval power on Earth. It was an inspiring moment that brought pride in accomplishment to those who built her, and pride in being an American to those who watched the christening ceremonies.

To mark the occasion, the Honorable JOHN C. STENNIS, U.S. Senator from Mississippi and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, delivered a stirring and provocative address on the Navy's unchanging mission: decisive naval power.

I would like to take this opportunity to share Senator STENNIS's remarks with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. I am sure Members of the House will find the Senator's thoughts as timely and impressive as I did:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS
THE NAVY'S UNCHANGING MISSION: DECISIVE
NAVAL POWER

Secretary Middendorf, President Diesel, Americans all:

First, I bring you warm greetings from the people of Mississippi, and for them, I thank the Navy for naming this ship for our State. Mississippians are proud of our heritage, our culture, our traditions and, if I may say so, of our loyalty. Our people have fought with valor in the defense of our nation in past wars and take great pride that we have been in the forefront when duty called.

Also, on behalf of Mississippi's splendid Governor, the Honorable Cliff Finch, and at his special request, I bring greetings to the Navy, to those who have built this ship, to the Mississippians who are present, and to the other guests and visitors. Governor Finch regrets that he could not be here in person, but he is proud that members of his family will play significant roles in this ceremony.

Seventeen months ago many of us were here when a slab of steel was laid as the keel for the New USS *Mississippi*. Today this new, nuclear-powered guided missile cruiser will be launched and later join the fleet to assume its anti-aircraft and anti-submarine role as a part of an aircraft carrier task group.

The construction of this ship is a tribute

to the Navy, the 23,000 shipyard workers here, and to this shipyard management and organization, where about 500 ships have been constructed in the last 85 years.

This shipyard, along with the other privately operated shipyards throughout the country, are great national assets, indispensable to our national defense. Our free enterprise system is the basic economic strength of the American way of life. Its productivity and achievements range from the success of the American farmer in producing food for the world to this fine ship which we launch today.

Use of the name U.S.S. *Mississippi*

The three ships carrying the name of the U.S.S. *Mississippi* over the past 135 years—from side-wheel steamer to nuclear power—are concrete illustrations of the progress of naval advancements and power over this long period of time.

The first U.S.S. *Mississippi*, the 1841 side-wheel steamer, which among other things served as Commodore Perry's flagship, was destroyed in an assault against the Confederate forces in New Orleans in 1862. The 1908 and 1917 battleships bearing this same name also played crucial roles in naval power. The U.S.S. *Mississippi* being launched today, therefore, symbolizes progress in the Navy. She is a dramatic part of a dramatic modernization program which is essential for our continued supremacy of the seas.

Our Navy has an unchanging mission. Many of our resources, our allies, and our enemies as well, lie overseas. In most of our wars in the last 175 years, including the Revolutionary War, this country would not have been victorious without superior naval power being on our side.

This mission to maintain decisive naval power for our global interests will remain as imperative for the future as the past. Our global interests and overseas dependence grows, not lessens, with each passing year.

As we all know, over 35 percent of our oil must be imported, as well as 90 percent of all types of strategic materials and metals consumed in this country. These percentages will increase. Our ability to move unhampered through the world's oceans is crucial to our economy and strength, both in peace and in wartime.

A strong and powerful Navy—a Navy second to none—is the greatest deterrent to war and influence for peace that our country can possess. I believe, beyond all question, that we have the most balanced and effective Navy in the world today. The very special advantages possessed by our Navy make it clear that it is now more than a match for any aggressor or combination of aggressors.

Soviet naval threat

In the last twenty years, however, the Soviet Navy has grown from a coastal defense force to a full-fledged ocean-going navy and poses an ever-growing challenge.

Our Navy can carry out our mission. But we must get on with modernizing our fleet if the United States Navy is going to be in a position to carry out its mission in the decades ahead.

I also believe, beyond all question, that we must provide a new family of modern ships as quickly as we can, or ten years from now, we will find that our Navy has fallen behind. This would be a calamity, not only for us but for the entire free world. The money that the Congress is providing now is intended for this purpose. The stream of ship production which is now contemplated must become a reality without delay or interruption!

Time has already been lost due to the deferral of shipbuilding during the Vietnam war. To modernize a fleet is a slow, expensive process. For larger ships it takes about ten years from the drawing board until a ship enters the fleet ready for combat.

All of these facts, the Soviet naval buildup,

the Vietnam funding deferral and the time-consuming ship construction process, are facts we can do little about.

There are, however, two issues which are subject to our control which I will briefly discuss.

Need for a consensus on new ships for the Navy

One of the great strengths of our democracy is the intense debate and criticism to which we subject all of our defense programs, and I thoroughly believe in a vigorous debate on what type of ships we should build.

I am of the view, however, that as we debate the composition of the Navy, there is an urgent need to develop a greater consensus as to what we need. In both the Congress and the Executive Branch, there are divisions of opinion, growing sharper, on the types of ships we should build. Some want more nuclear ships, some desire a conventional nuclear mix, others want greater emphasis on submarines and still others desire additional surface ships. Unless a greater consensus is developed, I am concerned that our attempt to modernize the fleet will be slowed and possibly jeopardized. Both the Executive Branch and the Congress must continue to strive to achieve a greater degree of agreement in order for these programs to move forward. The needs of the Nation demand no less.

Shipbuilding claims issue

The other issue that should not be allowed to delay fleet modernization is the resolution of prior-year shipbuilding claims.

In no way do I attempt to assess the validity or place the blame with respect to any of these claims. The Government should not pay out one dime that is not owed or reward any mistakes of private contractors. At the same time, the Government should recognize its responsibilities and obligations under these old contractual arrangements.

Long delays have characterized settlement of shipbuilding claims. For example, last year a claim was settled for late and defective Government-furnished equipment and other justifications—three years after filing. Some resolutions have taken even longer. Too many of these claims tend to drag on, month in and year out. Thus, results become more remote.

I would observe that there is no doubt in my mind that some of these claims must have validity based on our previous experience and settlements. Some have been paid. My remarks are not aimed at one shipbuilder. Instead, my remarks relate to the Navy, the Department of Defense, and major shipbuilding contractors.

All year long I have pushed hard, against sharp opposition, for funds to pay these old bills. Congress has now authorized and is in the process of appropriating \$1.6 billion this year, to pay these old bills including claims. The Congress has done its part in providing the money.

That shows how the great majority of the Congress feels. There are some dissenters, and I have to say I am glad these dissenters are not running the Navy. As I have said, the money is in the last stages of being appropriated. The House bill and the Senate bill now have that sum in them, and I don't believe this amount will be attacked again on the floor of either House this year.

It is now imperative for all parties, Navy and Department of Defense officials and shipbuilders alike, to immediately sit down and negotiate a fair settlement—fair to all sides. This must be done in a reasonable period of time.

The Congress has met this issue head-on. I am not asking you to commend the Congress. That is up to you. I am part of it. But we have faced up to the problem. And I say for emphasis to all the American people that this has the overwhelming support of their Representatives and their Senators, and I am

delighted that so many of them are represented here today. They didn't come to hear me speak; they came because of their interest in these programs.

Prospects without a resolution to claims issue

Now, why do I emphasize the claims problem? Because I am convinced, my friends, that it is going to materially retard our ship construction program if a settlement is not reached on those claims involving the major shipbuilders.

With all proper respect for lawyers—I am a lawyer—and with due respect for the courts—and I used to be part of the courts—they have their place, but they cannot build ships. They cannot build ships. We have to get these claims settled or there will be a serious setback to our shipbuilding program.

Using Federal government-owned shipyards for new ship construction provides no answer to the overall demands for construction. According to Navy estimates, new construction costs are about one-third greater, even if necessary management talent and labor were available.

We all know that there is sharp competition for the defense dollar. The Army today is short of ammunition, artillery and other weaponry needed for Western Europe. The Air Force needs a greater number of new, modern aircraft. Funds for building Navy ships now take up about 25 percent of the entire Defense procurement budget. If this shipbuilding claims problem continues to drag out and delays the construction of new ships, it will be difficult to resist demands to shift ship dollars to other programs.

I am encouraged to learn that steps are being taken by the Navy and all the building contractors to more clearly define the obligations of all the parties involved. I strongly urge that all possible action be taken in this regard.

With men of good will on all sides actively seeking a fair settlement of this problem, and with logic and national necessity dictating such a result, and Congress already having appropriated the needed funds, I have no doubt as to the ultimate outcome. I am now encouraged, not discouraged.

I want to close now with one further word. I think our Bicentennial programs, my friends, have helped tremendously and we are thankful for all of them. But we cannot save our Nation by resolutions, marches, and patriotic programs and slogans alone. We can't save our Nation either merely by building ships.

We must realize that the honor and character of our Nation sometimes seems to be shifting and changing and that somehow and in some way all is not done in the true spirit of helping our Nation in these changing times. Doubt is in the minds of some of our people, and even our allies—or some of them—are asking themselves the question: Is America on the way up or is America on the way down?

I want to answer quickly: We are not going down. That is not the American way. But I can see how some of our actions, slipshod ways and laxness can be misinterpreted. Those are signs that don't look good. But America is on the way up, and every real American must believe and act the part of believing that America continues on the way up to even more strength and a broader, fuller life. Every intelligent American must believe and act as if he or she believes that moral values and things of honor and integrity still count, and that they are necessary.

We want our country and our people to have strength and honor and integrity, and we must personally stand for those things that create these values—for instance, pride in an honest day's work and pride in achievements of a personal nature, be they large or small. We have to remember always that our

great Nation, with its freedom, was founded on spiritual values, and that we have got to keep that goal. There is no way around it. Otherwise, it could mean self-destruction. No one can defeat us but we can destroy ourselves.

There are enough people that carry these things in their hearts and minds and cling to those values that we know that our Nation was founded on and keep those spiritual values a part of America. If we continue to do that, and remain willing to do our part and keep doing it, then I believe a thousand years from now people will still be gathering here or somewhere else and saying God Bless America. So I say God bless the shipbuilders, the Navy and all America.

Thank you very much.

TO PASS OPEN-FLAME TEST

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, last month I brought to the House's attention the serious flammability hazard of polyurethane mattresses. In an effort to solve this problem, my colleague from Connecticut, U.S. Representative STEWART B. MCKINNEY, and I met last week with seven leaders of the plastics industry.

These industry spokesmen agreed with us that polyurethane mattresses do present a serious threat to persons in high-risk areas of many institutions throughout the country. They further agreed that mattresses used in these high-risk areas should be able to pass an "open-flame" test, a more rigorous test not currently part of the Federal mattress flammability standard.

To determine the extent of the polyurethane mattress threat, Representative MCKINNEY and I sent detailed questionnaires to more than 200 State corrections, consumer, health and mental health officials across the Nation. To date, we have received many substantive replies from these officials. 35 officials in 29 States have declared their strong support for upgrading the Federal flammability standard to include an "open-flame" test for mattresses used in high-risk areas. Only five replies have recommended against such a test.

We continue to receive 5 to 10 responses daily, and many contain impressive evidence to support more stringent Federal mattress safety requirements. Some of these responses are quite eloquent in their support for stronger standards, and periodically we will be sharing them with you. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to share with my colleagues the response from the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation:

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL
HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDA-
TION,

Austin, Tex., July 27, 1976.

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Congress,
429 Cannon House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DODD: Dr. Kenneth D. Gaver has asked me to respond to your letter to him of July 1, 1976, regarding flam-

mability characteristics of polyurethane and other types of mattresses currently in use in public health and penal institutions. A copy of this letter is being sent to each of the Senators and Congressmen from Texas.

I will respond to your questions in the same order in which they appear in your letter:

"To what extent are polyurethane or other types of mattresses used by public institutions under your jurisdiction? By private institutions and the general public in your state? (Specific types and numbers of mattresses and types of institutions, i.e. prisons, hospitals, nursing homes, mental facilities, orphanages, etc., would be most helpful.)"

Polyurethane mattresses make up about 91% of the mattresses owned by the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. At the present time, we have approximately 16,700 mattresses in use, and the total number of polyurethane mattresses owned by this Department is approximately 24,000.

We do not have detailed information for private institutions and the general public, but it is felt that there are large numbers of polyurethane mattresses in use throughout Texas by the private sector. For example, in this State there are approximately 980 licensed nursing homes with some 93,000 beds. We do not have any information regarding the types of mattresses in use in these facilities, but there is a good possibility that many are polyurethane.

The Texas Department of Corrections manufactures mattresses for use in state and local governmental facilities throughout Texas. They report that they have furnished approximately 8,300 polyurethane mattresses to Texas colleges and universities, the Texas Youth Council, and to city and county jails. They reported that there are no polyurethane mattresses in use in Texas Department of Correction facilities.

"Have there been any mattress fires in your jurisdiction? Can you attribute any deaths or injuries to this source? If so, how many, when, and, specifically, what types of mattresses were involved?"

Mattress fires do occur in facilities of this Department in spite of diligent efforts to prevent them. We recently experienced one death resulting from a mattress fire on May 18, 1976. The fire occurred in a six-bed bedroom in a ward building at the Austin State Hospital. All six mattresses in the bedroom were polyurethane. The fire originated under one mattress in the bedroom and in approximately five minutes the fire spread to the remaining mattresses in the room. The mattresses were consumed very rapidly with great volumes of smoke, flame, and heat intense enough to deform the steel roof joists. A resident in an adjacent bedroom was overcome by smoke and heat and was rescued through a window. The resident was hospitalized from smoke inhalation and first and second degree burns to the upper portion of the body. He recovered from his burns, but died on June 9, 1976 of bilateral pneumonia, secondary to smoke inhalation.

The fire started about 4:00 p.m. when nearly all of the residents were out of the dormitory. If the fire had occurred at night or in a building housing non-ambulatory residents, the results would have been more tragic.

On June 26, 1976, in the same Hospital in another building, a fire was experienced where one polyurethane mattress was ignited in a four-bed bedroom and the fire spread to two other polyurethane mattresses within a few minutes.

On July 19, 1976, in a fire at another of our facilities, one of the few cotton inner-spring mattresses still in use became ignited. Only about 5% of the mattress was burned and the fire remained small. Under the same

circumstances, it is felt that had this been a polyurethane mattress, it would have been a large and destructive fire.

"What action has been taken to correct the problem, or what have been reasons such action has not been initiated? What were the costs involved, or what would be the potential costs?"

Since the fire of May 18, 1976, we have conducted numerous tests to determine the flammability characteristics of polyurethane mattresses in use at TDMHMR facilities. Our tests indicate that polyurethane mattresses will successfully pass the cigarette test as outlined in Federal Register Vol. 37, No. 110, Wednesday, June 7, 1972. None of the mattresses tested in this manner ignited. However, all of the polyurethane mattresses tested under conditions simulating a deliberately set fire burned very rapidly with intense heat and large volumes of smoke. The mattresses were completely consumed within as little as two minutes after ignition. Some of these mattresses were identified as being "self-extinguishing" or "flame retardant", and most were covered with tick classified as "flame retardant". We are now working with the Texas Department of Corrections to develop a safer mattress to replace the polyurethane type. Preliminary test results on experimental mattresses are encouraging. To date, it is estimated that approximately \$5,000 to \$6,000 have been spent in staff time in the testing and development work which has been performed. It is presently estimated that it will cost \$1,680,000 to replace our existing 24,000 mattresses at about \$70.00 each from commercial mattress manufacturers:

"Do you think that the current Federal standards for mattress flammability should be changed? If so, in what way? Would you support a change in the Federal regulations that would mandate an open flame test for all mattresses? Only for mattresses used in institutions? If your state has revised its standards, would you please send us a copy of the new regulations?"

We strongly support revised Federal standards for mattress flammability which will protect all users from hazardous materials. We believe that mattress flammability tests should be developed which will more realistically establish the flammability characteristics of mattresses when they are exposed to actual conditions such as bed linens which have become ignited or mattress fires which have been deliberately set. Our tests indicate that the so-called cigarette test is not an effective test. Also, our tests indicate that "open flame" tests are not necessarily effective in determining the behavior of mattress materials under actual conditions of use.

For instance, some of the polyurethane material from mattress cores which we tested passed the open flame test of a Bunsen burner when tested according to ASTM Specification No. D-1692. Briefly, this test requires that the flame of a Bunsen burner be applied to a corner of a 12"×6"×1" specimen until the specimen is burning freely. Upon removal of the flame, the specimen must self-extinguish within ten seconds in order to be classified as a self-extinguishing material under this test. We found that a mattress core of polyurethane material which successfully passed this test burned fiercely and was totally consumed in a short period of time when ignited by burning bed linen.

We feel that present Federal standards for mattress flammability are not effective and that mattress flammability should be determined by tests which are more effective than the cigarette test and ASTM Test D-1692. We believe that the rate of combustion and the volume and toxicity of smoke produced are factors which are of vital importance in determining the safety of mattress materials,

and flammability tests should take these factors into consideration. We believe that there should be realistic safety standards governing the flammability of mattresses, particularly those used in institutions and public lodging places.

The State of Texas has no State standards on mattress flammability. This Department has, since 1971, required that all polyurethane foam mattresses purchased for use in our facilities be of self-extinguishing foam tested in accordance with ASTM Test D-1692, but as mentioned earlier, these mattresses will burn fiercely when ignited by burning bed linens.

We appreciate your interest and concern in this matter of consumer safety and we appreciate your giving us this opportunity to comment on our experience with polyurethane mattresses. We will be pleased to furnish any additional information which we have on this subject, and we will assist in every way possible in finding a solution to this problem.

Sincerely,

W. G. KIRKLIN,
Assistant Commissioner.

LETTER FROM ISRAELI STUDENT

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mrs. KEYS, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the warm, sensitive letter which I have received from one of two visiting Israeli students whom I had the pleasure of meeting with during one of my trips to Kansas:

JULY 20, 1976.

DEAR MARTHA KEYS: I was grateful to get your letter sent on the 2nd of April and sorry for the long time it took to catch me finally here in Israel.

I am also very grateful to you for giving Chagit and me this unique opportunity, of having this open and very honest talk.

I want to express my deep admiration to your knowledge and understanding of the Israeli problems and general situation, and to your will to hear two Israeli youngsters' opinions and hopes for the future too.

Two events have occurred lately and have strengthened my hope that peace and justice will govern upon this planet one day.

One is the releasing of captive Jews at Entebbe airport in Uganda by Israeli forces, showing that if we gather our will and power together, forgetting for awhile our narrow superficial interests, we can diminish the international terrorism out of this world.

The other deals with the medical aid and food sent by my government to Lebanon in its crisis. It shows once more that even when we are intensive conditions with our neighbouring countries, we can still cooperate and help one another for the sake of all inhabitants of this world, being led by humanitarian causes.

Furthermore, I hope this will serve as a positive example of behaviour for our neighbours, the Arabs.

I dare to be inspired by these events and strengthen my desire for true peace and understanding between people and nations, which I believe you share with me.

With my deep respect,

Shalom,

REUBEN TZAJOR,
Israel.

U.S. NEWS COMMENTS ON ARMS-SALES LUNACY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been alarmed in recent weeks by disclosure of the character and extent of U.S. arms sales to the Middle East.

In Iran, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has learned, tens of thousands of American personnel are deeply entwined in military operations. Despite the study's conclusion that our arms sales threaten to create a de facto American commitment to the Shah, Secretary of State Kissinger has now announced the administration's intention to sell another \$10 billion worth to the Iranians over the next 6 years.

In Saudi Arabia, which this year surpassed Iran as our largest weapons customer, the administration has been negotiating the sale of 2,000 Sidewinder air-to-air missiles. Although this transaction has run into strong public and congressional opposition, the State Department is contemplating the additional sale of Maverick TV-guided missiles, TOW wire-guided missiles and laser-guided "smart" bombs to the Saudis. Total American arms sales to Saudi Arabia in the last year are already near the \$6½ billion mark.

In Jordan, which acknowledges that it abstained from the 1973 war because it lacked air defenses, the United States has eagerly sought to sell an elaborate \$540 million Hawk anti-aircraft missile system.

And in Egypt, the most powerful of the Arab States confronting Israel, the United States has inaugurated an arms-supply relationship with the sale of C-130 Hercules military transports.

U.S. News & World Report of August 16, 1976, contains an insightful analysis of American arms sales policy in the Middle East. I recommend the article, written by Deputy Editor Joseph Fromm, to my colleagues.

The text follows:

NEW PERILS IN ARMS SALES TO MIDEAST

A year after the disengagement from Southeast Asia, the U.S. is being drawn into an ever-deepening involvement in the explosive Mideast.

That entanglement turns out to be an unexpected by-product of a policy designed to promote the massive sale of this country's most sophisticated nonnuclear weapons.

Until quite recently, Washington decision makers maintained that the U.S. stood to gain a great deal at little risk from arms deliveries to such countries as Iran, Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

Their argument: America is winning influence at the expense of the Soviet Union, obtaining leverage to promote an Arab-Israeli settlement and earning billions of dollars to bolster the U.S. balance of payments.

Now a report issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tells a different story. It drives home this point, based on a study by experts: "The U.S. assumes the obligation of long-term support for the equipment it has sold. The purchaser becomes dependent

on the U.S. in much the same manner as a local automobile dealer becomes dependent on Detroit."

That means the continuing sale of sophisticated weapons to nonindustrial states involves a military commitment on the part of the U.S.—one that conceivably could drag this country into a future Mideast war.

KEY DEVELOPMENTS

Three events in early August brought to light the implications of the expanding scale of these commitments:

1. The Senate report revealed that 50,000 to 60,000 American military technicians—maybe even more—will be needed by 1980 to help maintain and operate the 10.4 billion dollars' worth of arms that Iran has purchased from this country since 1972. Iran, according to the study, cannot go to war without U.S. support "on a day-to-day basis."

2. Washington agreed to sell thousands of laser-guided "smart bombs," Maverick air-to-surface missiles and "TOW" antitank missiles to Saudi Arabia. These sales come on top of 6 billion dollars in American arms contracts already signed with that oil-rich kingdom over the past year or so.

3. Jordan decided to buy a 540-million-dollar American air-defense system after threatening to turn to Moscow for weapons because of a financial quibble. Saudi Arabia agreed to foot the bill. Result: The U.S. will remain Jordan's prime supplier of military equipment.

Besides commitments to these three countries, the U.S. is deeply involved in Israel as the major foreign supplier of advanced weapons. Arms deliveries to the Jewish state this fiscal year will total 1.5 billion dollars, with at least another billion set for the 1977 fiscal year.

Now Washington is establishing military links with Egypt, Israel's most powerful adversary, for the first time in 20 years. The sale of six C-130 Hercules transport aircraft to Cairo, after Egypt's break with Russia, is seen as the first installment in a continuing program of American arms deliveries.

The Senate report makes clear that a shooting war anywhere in the Mideast would confront the U.S. with difficult and potentially dangerous dilemmas.

DILEMMA NO. 1

Should Washington in a conflict involving its arms customers let its technicians remain and participate in the hostilities? Or should the U.S. renege on commitments to keep sophisticated weapons in full operation?

That dilemma would arise, in particular, in the case of Iran and probably Saudi Arabia. Both have long-standing, if dormant, feuds with neighbors, and both lack the know-how to operate some of the weapons they are buying from this country. The Senate study makes this point about Iran's purchases: "The F-14 system is so complicated that the United States Navy is having major difficulty keeping it operational. Iran's Spruance-class destroyers will be even more sophisticated than those being procured by the U.S. Navy."

DILEMMA NO. 2

In another Arab-Israeli war, should the U.S. mount a large-scale resupply operation for American clients on either or both sides? Or should it allow them to run out of essential supplies?

In the 1973 conflict, the rate of attrition was so great that it took an American airlift to save Israel from defeat because of a lack of ammunition and replacement weapons.

Now under close study in Washington is this question: How can the U.S. avert the danger of being dragged willy-nilly into a Mideast war?

Independent experts say there is no way to escape the risk entirely—not as long as the Arab-Israeli conflict remains unresolved and Russia seeks to buy influence among the

Arabs by supplying advanced weapons on a large scale.

In their view, the U.S. cannot hope to dislodge the Russians and expand American influence in the Arab world unless it can guarantee delivery of essential military supplies.

Furthermore, the experts point out, the U.S. is pledged to maintain a military balance between Israel and its Arab adversaries to protect the security of the Jewish state.

In this situation, Mideast specialists assert that an Arab-Israeli peace settlement offers America the best hope of avoiding involvement in a new war.

Iran and Saudi Arabia pose different problems. Arms-control specialists contend that much tougher constraints are required to limit the scale and type of weapons going to these countries. Congress has moved in this direction with a law permitting a legislative veto of arms deals exceeding 25 million dollars.

In the final analysis, this is the lesson that emerges clearly from the new Senate committee study:

The delivery of quantities of modern weapons to Mideast countries may have succeeded in buying the U.S. influence at Russia's expense and in putting this country's balance of payments into the black, but it also has locked America into potentially high-risk, commitments that seemed inconceivable a year ago.

PRODUCERISM—KEEP TAXES DOWN

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we should take a good look in Congress at the constant trend toward the heaping of excessive taxation on Americans' sore backs. Taxation reminds me of planting an acorn and watching it grow into a big oak tree. The acorn seems small when Congress initially passes each tax bill.

In the early days of our Republic, Chief Justice Marshall stated that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Apparently in Congress we overlook the discouraging impact of taxation on our citizens. In order to produce more, we need to provide a direct incentive relationship in which a person who produces goods and services will be paid back dollars, instead of seeing these dollars drained off to the IRS in taxes.

Let us look at income tax. On my office wall I have a copy of the income tax form 1040 for the year 1913, the first year the income tax went into effect. When we adopted this 16th amendment to our Constitution, on October 3, 1913, it was thought that the income tax would have very little effect on anyone except the very rich. Everyone thought it was a good idea because the average citizen was not going to be taxed at all.

In 1913 the income tax on income between \$20,000 and \$50,000 was only 1 percent. This was on net income after all the deductions had been allowed. You were allowed not only general deductions, but a specific exemption of \$4,000. If you were earning \$50,000 in 1913, you would be earning \$289,300 in terms of dollars

today. Where you would be paying \$260 on the \$50,000 earned in 1913, today you would pay a tax of \$202,510 on the equivalent income of \$289,300. This acorn has come a long way.

How this hurts is that it discourages investment and the creative thinking that would develop new and expanding business.

Now, let us look at social security and the way it affects most people today. When the Social Security Act was first enacted in 1935, people were told that Congress had provided a separate reserve account for each individual and that these funds would be earmarked for them. When a person reached 65, his reserve would be there. Let us look at what has happened.

Today we are no longer talking about individual reserves. Instead we talk about the overall picture and the cash flow. We all know that the reserves that have been accumulated over the past 40 years have already been depleted. During the first 12 years of the social security system, from 1937 to 1949, the total amount paid into social security benefits each year was \$60. The individual paid \$30 and his employer paid \$30. The taxable wage base during these 12 years was \$3,000. By 1975, the tax rate had jumped from 2 percent to 11.7 percent, the wage base had risen to \$14,100, and the tax payment for social security had grown to \$1,649. Although the individual is now seeing a total tax which is 27 times as large as when it first got started, he realizes that this tax money is no longer "earmarked for him," but is going instead into a general Government slush fund.

It seems clear that an alternative should be provided for those individuals who want to provide their own social security—those who wish to be independent and earmark funds for themselves from their own investments which can be used as a pension plan providing security for themselves and their families. The tremendous increase in social security tax from \$60 to \$1,649 and in income tax from \$260 to \$202,510 on the same amount of income illustrates just how far we have traveled down the primrose path to national bankruptcy. This should serve as a lesson to Congress in its future planning. When a program is started we have to think in terms, not of its initial cost, but of its eventual cost.

It is alarming to think that today 40 percent of our gross national product is going for taxes. When will the well run dry? If taxes keep increasing at the rate they have been, the incentive to produce will be gone—and it is producerism which has made this country great. For people to produce, they must receive the encouragement, stimulus, and satisfaction of realizing a return for their work and services.

A few years ago a Government official said that the best policy for our country is to spend and spend, and tax and tax. This is the policy we have been following for several decades now. Let us change this philosophy while we still can. Let us talk instead about business building and expanding and creating

more jobs. Let us talk instead of leaving more money in the pockets of our hard-working citizens. Let us talk more about producerism.

FORD TO GET A SCIENCE AIDE AND FOUR NEW ADVISORY UNITS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate confirmed the nomination of Dr. H. Guyford Stever as Director of the new Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The statute which created this Office, which enunciated a science policy and which provided for a comprehensive 2-year survey of the Federal mechanisms for carrying out such policy, emanated from the Committee on Science and Technology which it is my privilege to chair. We are most pleased that the President has now inaugurated proceedings under this new authority.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of August 6 carried a factual explanatory statement of the new Office and the statute creating it. I should like to ask that the article, written by Walter Sullivan, be incorporated into the Record at this point:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1976]

FORD TO GET A SCIENCE AIDE AND 4 NEW ADVISORY UNITS

(By Walter Sullivan)

A major overhaul of the apparatus for determining national policy in science and technology at the highest level is to take place after the expected Senate confirmation today of Dr. H. Guyford Stever as director of the new Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The reorganization creates four new agencies within the executive branch of the Government and abolishes one. It brings a representative of the scientific community back to the White House staff for the first time since President Nixon abolished the science advisory apparatus there at the start of 1973.

It also provides for a special blue-ribbon committee to spend the next two years taking a long, hard look at where the United States is headed in terms of its priorities in scientific and technological research—and at where it should be headed.

Dr. Stever is leaving his post as head of the National Science Foundation, to be replaced by Dr. Richard T. Atkinson, deputy director of the foundation, who will probably serve as acting director until the next president takes office.

Dr. Atkinson, formerly a psychologist on the Stanford University faculty, will be the first social scientist in that role.

While changes in leadership of the new White House science section may occur if Jimmy Carter becomes President, its structure is expected to remain intact. In any case, it could be changed only by new legislation.

The empowering legislation, of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976, was enacted on May 11. Its provisions, however, cannot become effective until President Ford nominates someone for the central role as director of the Office of Science Technol-

ogy Policy, and he is confirmed by the Senate.

On July 21, after two months of off-again, on-again uncertainty, Dr. Stever was nominated for the job. The delay was related to objections by a few conservative senators to social science textbooks prepared under auspices of the National Science Foundation in the four years that Dr. Stever has headed the agency.

President Ford seems to have decided finally that the Stever nomination would not prove politically embarrassing, although it was announced so quietly that it largely passed public notice.

At the time of Dr. Stever's appointment as head of the N.S.F. by President Nixon he was president of Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh. When the post of Presidential science adviser and its related apparatus, the Office of Science and Technology, were abolished by President Nixon, Dr. Stever, as head of the N.S.F., assumed a limited, ex officio role, as Presidential adviser.

LONG DEBATE ON AIMS

In the three years that followed there has been a continuing debate as to how best to provide the executive branch of the Government with scientific advice and policy assessments, for both the long and short terms.

Congressional hearings were held; studies and proposals were prepared by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and others.

The result was the act adopted in May, whose statement of purposes, in the view of the first Presidential science adviser, Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., is "the most significant such statement since Vannevar Bush's 'Science: the Endless Frontier.'"

That document, prepared in 1945, formulated what became the goals of American science and engineering in the postwar years. Dr. Bush had directed the Office of Scientific Research and Development—in Dr. Killian's view, "the most successful and decisive weapons development program in history."

Dr. Killian, now honorary board chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was appointed by President Eisenhower as Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology in 1957. Commenting on the current reorganization a few days ago in a telephone interview, he said it conformed closely to what had been recommended by the committee of the National Academy that he headed.

In particular it enables the Presidential incumbent to choose whether he prefers a single science adviser, in the role for which Dr. Stever had been nominated, or a council of several advisers representing diverse specialties and viewpoints.

In that case the President may appoint up to four associate directors as well as the director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The new agencies are as follows:

THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Within the Executive Office of the President this office will provide advice in such fields as, to quote the empowering legislation.

"Economy, national security, health, foreign relations, the environment, and the technological recovery and use of resources." The role of its director is in effect that of Presidential science adviser.

The office will assist the Office of Management and Budget in its decisions on funding federally supported research and development. It will prepare for the President an annual Science and Technology Report, to be presented to Congress as a counterpart of the State of the Union Message.

During its first year it will also "identify

and describe situations and conditions that warrant special attention within the next five years." These would include "current and emerging problems of national significance" as well as "opportunities for, and constraints on, the use of new and existing scientific and technological capabilities."

These "five-year outlooks" are to be brought up to date each year.

The director of this office will provide advice to the National Security Council "at the request" of that council. Like previous science advisers, he will not be a member of the council.

He will, however, serve on the Domestic Council, which includes the President, Vice President and a number of department heads. It deals with domestic policy problems, primarily through ad hoc committees.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This committee, to be formed of eight to 14 distinguished specialists in a wide range of fields, will spend up to two years preparing a report on the nation's science, engineering and technology policies. The President's science adviser will be an ex officio member but not necessarily be chairman.

It will focus on such problems as organizational reform, improved handling of scientific and technical information, better technology assessment in the Federal executive branch, a better environment for technology innovation and a broader base for basic research.

It will also explore "reduction and simplification of Federal regulations and administrative practices and procedures which may have the effect of retarding technological innovation or opportunities for its utilization."

After the committee submits its report, two years hence, and an interim report on its operation within one year, it will be dissolved unless the President chooses to continue it.

THE FEDERAL COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

The role of this council is to deal with problems and programs of research and development that involve more than one agency. It replaces the old Federal Council for Science and Technology, which was designed to perform much the same role but, in the view of many, was not very effective.

The science adviser, that is, the director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, will be chairman. The agencies included are the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Health, Education and Welfare; Housing and Urban Development; Interior, State and Transportation.

Also the Veterans Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Environmental Protection Agency and Energy Research and Development Administration.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY PANEL

The purpose of this agency is to "identify and define civilian problems at state, regional, and local levels which science, engineering, and technology may assist in resolving or ameliorating." It will recommend priorities in this regard and ways to apply new knowledge to such problems.

The panel will consist of the science adviser as chairman, and the director of the National Science Foundation, or their representatives, plus "at least 10 members representing the interests of the states."

In contrast to earlier wariness of central, long-range planning as inimical to American traditions of freedom, the empowering act emphasizes "long-range, inclusive planning as well as more immediate program development, to incorporate scientific and technological knowledge in the national decisionmaking process."

HAMILTON SUPPORTS LABOR
LEGISLATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the 94th Congress has demonstrated great concern over the well-being of working men and women and has taken several steps, with my support, to promote their interests.

Among the bills to help labor that have become law are these:

First, the Public Works Employment Act has been recently enacted, by overriding President Ford's veto. The act will provide about 350,000 much-needed jobs and authorizes funds to finance the construction of various local facilities. The act also authorizes money for grants to States and local governments initiating public works projects within 90 days, for maintenance of essential State and local services, and for construction of waste water treatment plants.

Second, the Rail Services Act of 1975 was enacted to revitalize the Nation's railroads and to create thousands of jobs for Americans in need of work.

Third, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was amended to provide an increase in maximum daily benefits of almost 100 percent and to liberalize sick pay benefits.

Fourth, the Tax Reduction Act passed in 1975 served to stimulate the economy and helped many workers through a difficult period, as taxes were cut some \$22.8 billion.

Several other bills await final action in this session:

First, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments have recently passed the House, providing for an increase in the taxable wage base to \$6,000, and extending the benefits of unemployment insurance to over 9 million previously uninsured State and local government employees and agricultural workers.

Second, a bill proposes to nearly double the present public service jobs program. Another bill would expand the Youth Conservation Corps to 1.2 million jobs and made it a year-round program.

Fourth, the House has passed a bill providing for liberalization of eligibility for black lung compensation, stipulating that anyone who has worked in an underground coal mine for 30 years is eligible for compensation.

Fifth, both the House and Senate have passed bills to make permanent the 1975 tax cuts. Differences between the two bills must now be reconciled.

In the area of labor relations, Congress was thwarted in its effort to allow construction workers to picket an entire jobsite to publicize their dispute with one or more of the contractors or subcontractors. After extensive legislative work and special care to draft the bill in accordance with the President's requests, the President still vetoed the bill.

In spite of this setback, the 94th Congress has succeeded in promoting the interests of the worker. Hopefully, there will

be still more action in this session but it is clear that some headway has already been made, as reflected in these legislative achievements.

LET US NOT JUDGE HUMPHREY-
HAWKINS BY 18TH CENTURY ECO-
NOMICS

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 50, the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, of which I am a cosponsor, has, as we all know, become the subject of growing controversy. The bill is receiving a continuing barrage of both support and criticism from various quarters. Our colleague from Michigan (Mr. Esch) apparently sees the goal of full employment embodied in the bill as so threatening that he has treated us to an almost-daily stream of letters denigrating one aspect of the bill or another. It is clearly going to be a major issue in this fall's campaign.

One of the latest critics to join the assault on H.R. 50 is the celebrated conservative economist from the University of Chicago, Prof. Milton Friedman. In a recent column in Newsweek, he decried the bill as being "as close to fraud as has ever served as a campaign document" the "political soothing syrup" of the Democrats for the election year.

This disparaging judgment should be exposed for what it is: Nothing more than the old shibboleths of classical economics dressed in the rhetoric of its ancestral prophet, Adam Smith. The "classicists" have been fighting this battle against Keynesian economics for 40 years, and they are not about to stop now.

Let us look at some of the premises underlying the Friedman view that additional public employment cannot reduce overall unemployment. He appears to be saying that Government employment is not economically real; that public activity is not productive in the same sense as activity in the private sector. By equating public jobs with welfare, he is implying that Government activity produces no economic goods and services. His conclusion is that public jobs cannot be created without spending private money and destroying jobs in the private sector.

The corollary at the aggregate level is that Government spending can have none of the stimulative effects of private consumption and investment. He says that if the Government borrows or expands the money supply to create public employment, the result cannot be an increase in national product and employment, but will result only in inflation. What he is saying, in essence, is that we cannot use an expansionary monetary and fiscal policy, in the public as well as the private sector, to stimulate aggregate demand and create employment.

In my view, Friedman's latter-day reincarnation of laissez faire economics, with its modern version of the classical Says law at the aggregate level, is no more relevant to the modern economy than Adam Smith's celebrated "widgets" are to the sophisticated products of today's technology-based industries.

The Smithian view of an atomistic industry of small producers, none of whose actions could decisively affect the others, may have been meaningful for 18th century cottage industry. But prices and wages are not now determined, if they ever were, by the invisible hand of pure competition among small producers and individual laborers.

The fact of the matter is that they are determined by the very visible and strong hand of big labor unions and powerful corporations, as you have heard me say frequently. They, and big Government, control the modern, "managed" economy. And I would submit that the Friedman view is no less obsolete at the aggregate level when we look at the potential for additional national product and employment through expanded public sector activity.

A matter closely related to one's view of the role of Government in generating economic activity and employment is the judgment we make about the role our Government should play in coordinating and planning the various sectors of the American economy. Humphrey-Hawkins is based on the premise that the Government can do a much more effective and comprehensive job of coordinating its many policies and programs and relating them to activity in the private sector, and that the needed reforms in our economic management are a key element in our efforts to fulfill the full employment and production goals set by the bill.

Conservative critics of this approach appear to take the curious, dualistic view that on the one hand the bill wouldn't really have us do anything much different from what we are already doing, but on the other, what the sponsors are really talking about is full-scale Soviet-style regimentation of the economy. That is the case, at least, if a recent American Enterprise Institute round table discussion on national economic planning, attended by our colleague from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and Prof. Herbert Stein, critics of the bill, as well as Senator HUMPHREY and Prof. Wassily Leontief, is any guide.

Let me insist that the type of planning envisioned by the bill is something we do not do very well now. We set tax policy one way, budget policy another and monetary policy in a distant third. And we do not, for example, coordinate our policy on the amount of pollutants we permit with public health programs which are certainly affected by pollution-caused problems. Or, we set housing policy, which represents one of our major energy users, without much thought in the direction of energy policy.

Yet on the other hand, Professor Stein seems to believe that one of our rationales for better planning is the success of the Soviet system. He insists that the only thing the Soviet Union does right is build up its military might.

I suspect that Soviet input-output analysis and economic planning is probably more effective than he implies, despite the abysmally low productivity of the Soviet economy. But in any event, this argument is totally beside the point.

I want to make it very clear that we are not writing a brief for a Soviet-style system based on centralized planning under absolute Government control. As Senator HUMPHREY emphasizes, that has no relationship at all to what we are talking about.

I think our aim is well described by what he terms "indicative planning," the effort to set comprehensive goals and priorities, but not mandatorily.

Professor Leontief phrases it as follows:

The drive for more planning is essentially a drive for a systematic analysis to provide a basis for rational choice.

Put still another way, we need to get the Federal Government to do a much better job of coordinating its far flung and disparate parts, and relating them to the private economy. Perhaps much of this represents things which the current system ought to be capable of doing. The problem however, is that it just does not do them. My conclusion is that we must structure and institutionalize our planning effort if it is to become really effective.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying we must necessarily adopt H.R. 50 without change. I understand our committee is even now considering strengthening amendments to the bill reported last May, and is expected to report out another version of the bill after the August recess. In any event, we in the House will be scrutinizing that bill with great care if it comes to the floor, as expected, later this year. But let us not evaluate this legislation on the assumptions that public employment is, by definition, non-productive and inflationary, or that comprehensive and effective Government planning will necessarily take us down the barren Soviet path. In my estimation, they represent the conservative economists' own "political soothing sirup," designed to appeal to Americans' fundamental distrust of Government and the public sector.

The man who repairs the highway is not less productive than the man who repairs the car which runs on it, simply by virtue of the fact that one is performed for the public and the other for a profit. Public employment and more effective planning are not without problems, but we can make them work to move toward our goals of full employment and production. I believe we should do so.

At this point, I would like to include Professor Friedman's column in the RECORD so my colleagues can examine his economic shibboleths for themselves:

HUMPHREY-HAWKINS

(By Milton Friedman)

A centerpiece of the Democratic fall campaign is the "Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1976." Support of that bill has become the litmus

test of the true-blue Democratic faith of every candidate from Jimmy Carter to the aspirant for dogcatcher.

The present expanded version of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill embraces the earlier Humphrey-Javits bill. It proposes to establish a process of long-range economic planning to achieve "a full-employment goal . . . consistent with a rate of unemployment not in excess of 3 per centum of the adult Americans in the civilian labor force, to be attained . . . within not more than four years after the enactment" of the act, as well as a long list of other goodies.

ADAM SMITH'S CRITIQUE

The best critique of this bill that I have come across was published 200 years ago in that great book, "The Wealth of Nations" by Adam Smith—the original Adam Smith, not the current impostor who has had the effrontery to adopt that pseudonym.

Wrote Smith: "The statesman, who should attempt to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their capitals, would not only load himself with a most unnecessary attention, but assume an authority which could safely be trusted, not only to no single person, but to no council or senate whatever, and which would nowhere be so dangerous as in the hands of a man who had folly and presumption enough to fancy himself fit to exercise it."

Has any contemporary political writer described Hubert Humphrey more concisely?

Not to put too fine a point on it, the Humphrey-Hawkins bill is as close to a fraud as has ever served as a campaign document. It is full of pious promises but contains no measures capable of fulfilling those promises. It would not reduce unemployment but simply add to government employment and reduce private employment, in the process making us all poorer and very likely igniting a new inflationary binge.

How can such a bill do otherwise? Easy enough to say that the government will be the employer of last resort. But where does the government get the money? Ultimately, from you and me, by hook or by crook. If it spends, we don't. If it employs people, we don't.

Of course, people on welfare could be relabeled "civil servants assigned to home duty," thereby reducing recorded unemployment without additional spending. But to do more—and Humphrey-Hawkins promises to do far more—requires more government spending. The extra spending could be financed by higher explicit taxes. In that case, taxpayers would have less to spend and would hire fewer people. The extra spending could be financed by higher borrowing. In that case, the lenders, or the borrowers outbid by government, would have less to spend. Government employment would replace employment in building homes or factories. Finally, the government could print the money, which would tax us indirectly via inflation. We would have more pieces of paper to spend but could buy less. For a time, that could mean more government spending without less private spending, but surely by now we have learned that that is a fool's paradise that would not last.

Is anyone so naïve as to suppose that the government jobs created will be more productive than the private jobs destroyed?

VISIBLE GOOD, INVISIBLE HARM

Why do Democrats believe that Humphrey-Hawkins is such potent political soothing syrup? Do they have such a low opinion of the intelligence of the American people? I do not think so. It is for a very different reason—one that is the source of so many harmful government policies: the visible vs. the invisible effects of government measures. People hired by government know who is

their benefactor. People who lose their jobs or fall to get them because of the government program do not know that that is the source of their problem. The good effects are visible. The bad effects are invisible. The good effects generate votes. The bad effects generate discontent, which is as likely to be directed at private business as at the government.

The great political challenge is to overcome this bias, which has been taking us down the slippery slope to ever bigger government and to the destruction of a free society.

ARMS SELLING

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Ms. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues several articles on the arms selling arrangements between Iran and the United States. These articles appeared in several national newspapers between August 6, 1976, and August 9, 1976, and are a source for real alarm.

As the accounts point out, ex-President Nixon, with a later approval of Secretary Kissinger, entered into a secret agreement with Iran that promised to provide for Iran all the weapons, short of nuclear armaments, it desired. This open-ended agreement to furnish conventional arms was made without review within the executive branch of the Government. Strange as it may seem, we have been put in the position of supplying a country with over \$10 billion worth of arms since 1972, without ever judging the agreement on its merits. The security importance to the United States has not been judged and the costs to the United States have not been evaluated.

We have added to the Middle East and world arms race without thoughtful consideration. We have placed ourselves in the position of furnishing U.S. technicians able to run the sophisticated arms and equipment. Reports now tell us that 30 retired American Air Force officers now serve in the headquarters staff of the Iranian Air Force and 24,000 American civilian technicians now serve in Iran. One can only be alarmed with the possible implications of our presence and ask if we can permit a large number of our trained civilian personnel to serve Iranian needs.

As if this is not cause enough for concern, we find out as well that a consortium of American oil and defense industry interests have been bartering access to American arms for Iranian oil. With prospects quite alive for a 10-year \$13 billion oil agreement in the making, one must wonder who sets defense policy and how it is established.

Beyond these serious accounts, one cannot say much. However, I do implore my colleagues and the public to watch quite closely the developing situation for without careful review we cannot expect to have cogent analysis of American interests in this matter.

THE SUCCESSFUL WORK OF OIC

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that government has a continuing obligation to fulfill the promise of equal economic opportunity for all, I have taken a deep interest over the years in the work of Opportunities Industrialization Centers. Since its origin in Philadelphia 11 years ago, OIC has been uniquely successful in its efforts to train individuals to take their place in our economy as productive members of the labor force.

I recently received a new confirmation of the success with which this program operates. As a part of its comprehensive employment training program, Montgomery County in Pennsylvania has chosen to make use of the capabilities which the local Opportunities Industrialization Center possesses. I asked County Commissioner Frank Jenkins to send me an assessment of the efforts that OIC has made on Montgomery County's behalf, and I had read his subsequent report with a good deal of satisfaction.

The Opportunities Industrialization Center has exceeded its contractual obligations to the county in terms of total enrollment, enrollment of veterans, enrollment of unemployment individuals, as well as enrollment of heads of households, women, and older workers. More importantly, it has met 92 percent of its obligations in stimulating employment opportunities among its trainees. This is an extraordinary record in view of the high unemployment rates that persist in southeastern Pennsylvania and across our Nation.

The proven success of Opportunities Industrialization Centers is worthy of this body's appreciation, and in light of that success I believe that OIC deserves government's support. For the past two Congresses I have introduced legislation to give this excellent program the help it has shown it deserves. Many of my colleagues have also expressed interest in aiding OIC, and in the interest of pressing forward with our legislative efforts in this direction, I would like to share with my fellow Members of the House the report on OIC that I recently received from Montgomery County's Manpower Planning Department:

MANPOWER PLANNING,
Norristown, Pa., August 5, 1976.

HON. JOHN HEINZ, III,
324 Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEINZ: This office provides financial aid to Montgomery County O.I.C. as a result of a sub grantee contractual agreement. Our contract with them requires that they serve a certain number of people during the year, that these people be broken down as coming from particular significant segments and that a certain number receiving their training be placed into unsubsidized employment. We require O.I.C. to furnish us with a monthly comprehensive report

showing their accomplishments for that month and the year to date.

The following information is extracted from O.I.C.'s report to us on June 30, 1976 for the year July 1, 1975 to June 30, 1976.

1. Total enrollments, 851.
- Total enrollments planned in our contract, 703.
- Percent of plan attained, 121.1%.
2. Number entering employment for year, 204.
- Number planned to enter employment, 222.
- Percent of plan attained, 92%.
3. Number of Veterans served this year, 55.
- Number of Veterans planned to be served, 33.
- Percent of plan attained, 166.7%.
4. Number of unemployed served, 657.
- Unemployed planned to be served, 409.
- Percent of plan attained, 160.6%.
5. Heads of Household served, 372.
- Heads of Household planned, 259.
- Percent of plan attained, 143.6%.
6. Women served, 609.
- Women planned, 373.
- Percent of plan attained, 163.3%.
7. Older Workers served, 13.
- Older Workers planned, 7.
- Percent of plan attained, 185.7%.

The following financial information is extracted from our June 30, 1976 "Detailed Statement of Cost" report showing moneys we subsidized to O.I.C. for the period July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976.

1. Administrative salaries, \$119,768.87.
- Contract budget for same, \$157,699.00.
2. Counseling salaries, \$32,184.13.
- Contract budget for same, \$43,819.00.
3. Instructional Salaries, \$147,947.83.
- Contract budget for same, \$195,884.00.
4. Training Equipment rental, \$19,222.58.
- Contract budget for same, \$23,959.00.
5. Training Supplies, \$18,884.96.
- Contract budget for same, \$23,480.00.
6. Total Contract Costs, \$417,874.11.
- Training allowances paid enrollees, \$19,000.00.

Total subsidized by this office, \$436,874.11.
Total contract budget, \$444,655.00.

I hope this information can be of use to you and should you need any further assistance or information, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

CETA, Title I Manager
DONALD R. STATES,

UNITED HELLENIC AMERICAN
CONGRESS RESOLUTION**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the United Hellenic American Congress, which met last month in Philadelphia.

The United Hellenic American Congress is a nationwide organization of Americans of Hellenic origin interested in developments in this country as well as developments affecting Greece and Cyprus. This group is a complete cross-section and has a truly representative membership of the American-Greek community.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United Hellenic American Congress has conducted its National Meeting in the City of Philadelphia this 6th day of July, 1976, in conjunction with the observance of our country's Bicentennial celebration; and

Whereas, we are mindful in our deliberations of the historic moment and place we have chosen for our meeting; and

Whereas, America has, from its inception, stood not only for freedom, justice, and liberty for its people, but as a beacon of freedom, justice, and liberty for all of the peoples of the world;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Officers and Members of the Executive Committee of the United Hellenic American Congress assembled this 6th day of July, 1976, in the City of Philadelphia, do hereby proclaim liberty and reaffirm our dedication to the principles of the founding fathers of our Nation, and we hereby urge the Government of the United States to exert its full efforts and moral support for freedom and liberty and justice throughout the world; and,

Be it further resolved, that the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to continue to support democracy, self-determination, and majority rule throughout the world, and to condemn and oppose aggression throughout the world; and

Be it further resolved, that the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to continue support to the democracy in Greece and to support the Rule of Law in prohibiting all arms transfers to Turkey until Turkey withdraws all her troops and civilians from Cyprus and allows all refugees to return to their homes.

SUGAR RAY CHARLES LEONARD

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the Fifth District of Maryland join me in honoring a young man from Palmer Park, Md., who has achieved what so many only dream about—the winning of an Olympic gold medal. I am, of course, speaking of Sugar Ray Charles Leonard, whose splendid performance in the 1976 summer Olympics in Montreal brought fame to him, brought honor to his family, brought pride to his friends and community, but even more importantly, it brought to our understanding the worth and depth of the character of this champion.

Following his stunning victory in Montreal, Sugar Ray returned to his community. It would have been easy for him to pursue a lucrative and glamorous career in the ring, for the tempting offers were there. But this young man, believing that his achievements could serve as a guideline for others to follow, shunned further glory and chose the course of helping others. It is his plan to help disadvantaged children get a start in the world, by going to college to sharpen his intellectual skills. With his academic training coupled with his skillful athletic abilities, he hopes to return to his old

neighborhood and involve young people of the community in athletic programs designed to build healthy bodies and minds.

For someone so young, Sugar Ray Leonard has achieved a great deal. He started his boxing career just 5 years ago, winning the Golden Gloves Championship in 1974 in the 139-pound division. He will be the first to tell you that a most important ingredient in his path to success in his coach, Mr. David Jacobs. The disciplined and rigorous training, directed by Mr. Jacobs, was not easy, but the results most rewarding. The mutual affection which developed between the champion and his trainer is evidenced by Sugar Ray's own admission that his success was attributed to "first God, and second, Mr. David Jacobs, my coach."

His goal of helping others will be pursued with the same vigor and determination as his race for the gold medal award. We offer our prayer that his attainment of that goal will be graced with the same admiration, affection and esteem he has earned along the way.

HILLEL BUTMAN—SOVIET PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of thousands of Americans, there are those living in the Soviet Union who are still being denied not only the right to emigrate but the right to exist as human beings.

I recently received a letter drawing my attention to the plight of Hillel Butman, a Soviet engineer who has been imprisoned since 1970. The letter from his wife, Eva, who managed to reach Israel with her two children but has been allowed to see her husband only twice since his imprisonment. Following is my letter to Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin in Mr. Butman's behalf:

AUGUST 4, 1976.

HIS EXCELLENCY ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN, Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: The enclosed letter from Eva Butman describes a situation that is of great concern to me. Hillel Butman is incarcerated in the Soviet Union, allegedly for striving to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel. It is said that he has been denied a number of privileges normally accorded prisoners under Soviet law and, that his health is precarious.

Such a situation would violate not only Soviet law, but also the common principles of human decency agreed upon in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The conditions outlined in Eva Butman's letter cannot be tolerated.

In light of Mr. Butman's emigration aspirations and in the spirit of the Helsinki Accords, I urge you to bring this concern to the attention of your government and to communicate a hope for the necessary corrective action.

Sincerely,

EDWARD MEZVINSKY.

U.S. GRAIN

HON. JACK HIGHTOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, last month, Mr. Bruce W. Smith, editorial director, Grain Age magazine, wrote an article which I believe accurately and perceptively presents both the achievements and problems stemming from the Grain Standards Act. I must say that from the perspective of foreign purchasers the existing law and system seems to be accomplishing a large part of its objective.

The Grain Age article provides an excellent overview of the present grain inspection process and I insert this article to be printed:

NOT ONE COMPLAINT FROM EUROPEAN CUSTOMERS ON GRAIN FROM THE UNITED STATES

(By Bruce W. Smith)

Irregularities and alleged irregularities and/or improprieties in the quality and weight of export grain have been on the front pages of daily newspapers and prominently displayed in newsmagazines since last October. In an election year, senators and congressmen have expressed outrage at such happenings and alleged happenings and have rapped the grain industry far and wide.

Bills have been introduced in Congress which their proponents claim would clear up the "unholy mess" once and for all. The Department of Agriculture has reacted by stiffening its export regulations and by hiring hundreds of new grain inspectors.

Major grain companies have taken positive action, mainly on a voluntary basis, to make sure their own exporting procedures are honest and forthright.

TIGHTER CONTROL

A month ago, USDA altered its inspection regulations to "bring about tighter federal control" over sampling of export grain for official inspection.

Basically, the amended rules concern installation, location, and operation of diverter-type samplers at the 77 export elevators in the United States and which also will affect the port facilities now under construction.

Unless the Agricultural Marketing Service approves otherwise, the mechanical sampler now must be placed "as near as practicable to the end of the loading belt or other conveyance" which moves grain from an elevator to the holds of a ship.

Last fall, the department decreed that all export elevators had to install samplers prior to May 1 of this year. Variances in the compliance date now can be requested on an individual installation basis. Until an elevator is employing mechanical sampling as specified, it is required to describe in a qualifying statement on the official inspection certificate how the cargo was sampled.

In making mandatory the use of mechanical samplers, the AMS said they obtain the most-representative samples of grain if operated properly.

What the department says it is seeking is insurance that official samples taken at an export elevator are "truly representative of the grain being loaded out," that the mechanical samplers are not being tampered with, and that the elevators are so constructed "that no grain or other material can be introduced into the loading stream after the official samples have been taken."

Specific rules permit certain materials to be introduced into the grain stream following sampling; an example is the use of mala-

tion to protect against insect infestation, according to David R. Gallart, director of AMS's Grain division.

WE GO ABROAD

With much of the information above in mind and with the extravagant charges of some politicians and some members of the media fresh, Grain Age set off for Europe to seek to determine if any important customers for U.S. grain felt they had been short-changed by activities in the New Orleans port area.

As the accompanying list indicates, we spoke with merchandisers and processors in Germany, France, Holland, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Iceland. We also visited with United Kingdom buyers on the continent.

While virtually all of those with whom we talked were familiar with the subject from what they had read in European and U.S. publications and heard about on radio and television, we did not hear a single complaint from anyone concerning either the quality of the grain received or the weight of the cargoes.

Nor did any tell us about any known or rumored complaints by buyers.

We probed; we asked leading questions; we sought rumors, if there were any, as well, as fact. We did not hear a single negative comment.

ANOTHER VIEWPOINT

Great Plains Wheat, Inc., reports a similar response from a group of grain importers in Belgium and Holland. The trade promotion organization said that members of the group polled "appear to be more satisfied with the quality of the merchandise which they receive from the U.S. than are the U.S. critics of the system."

The European customers spent two weeks in the United States recently. They further commented: "The unbelievable amount of publicity the United States gives to irregularities in its system is damaging U.S. interests abroad."

SOME OF THE PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE SPOKE

In its efforts to learn first-hand the sentiments of European customers for U.S. grains and oilseeds concerning the quality and dependability of American commodities, GRAIN AGE visited with 27 persons who represent a total of 143 continental and United Kingdom customers.

Included were full-time executives of European food and feed trade associations. We also talked in person with representatives of U.S. trade promotion organizations active in Europe and with attaches of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Listing of the names which follow does not necessarily mean that any or all of the persons commented on the grain & oilseed quality and dependability subject. Rather, they are listed to indicate the extent of our investigation.

Ferry J. E. Verkuylen, The Hague, Holland; Hans G. Haack, Wuppertal, Germany; Reinhard H. Jachmann, Langen, Germany; Ed. Richardson, Veenendaal, Holland; Jan Jansen, Nijmegen, Holland; Wolfgang Schneider, Hamburg, Germany; Dick Richardson, Lunteren, Holland; Bjorgvin Olafsson, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Peter A. Hawkyard, Elland, England; Hans Sorensen, Oslo, Norway; David G. Stern, Stafford, England; Evert Lindgaard, Reykjavik, Iceland; Elisabeth Ruppe, Frankfurt, Germany; Andre Simon, Paris, France; and representatives of Graan Elevator Mattschappij, Rotterdam, Holland.

We also spoke with these Americans: Dr. Turner Cloyce, agricultural attache, Bonn, Germany, and his sides, Jon E. Falck and Carol Harvey; Dr. Halvor J. Kolshus and Arthur Camp, European director and deputy director, respectively, for the U.S. Feed Grains Council, Rotterdam, Holland; and Raymond Rodgers, Great Plains Wheat, also of Rotterdam.

DANTLEY LEADS ROMP FOR GOLD

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, international athletic competition often arouses spirited and Herculean performances from the participants and provides the spectator with opportunities to give partisan or nonpartisan cheers. Such was the case at the recent Olympic games which were held in our neighboring country, Canada.

I would like to commend those world-wide sportsmen for their accomplishments and, of course, I am very proud of the American team which was composed of outstanding individuals.

One of the events which generated wild enthusiasm among American spectators was the basketball finals. After suffering a questionable defeat in the Munich games, the Americans wanted to bring the gold home to the country which invented the sport. The young American team, made up of college all-stars who had played together for only a few weeks, and who are individual headliners on their own teams, distinguished themselves by synchronized play throughout the games.

By the time the undefeated team reached the final game, it was time for an individual standout performance and one was given by Washington, D.C.'s Adrian Dantley. Dantley is a DeMatha graduate who has distinguished himself at home and at his community at Notre Dame, where he has carried on the tradition of great athletics amidst a demanding academic atmosphere. His professional career will be followed intently by his many avid fans. A fine credit to any of his organizations, Dantley exhibited his talents in an outstanding manner during the final game of the Olympic basketball competition. Scoring 30 stunning points against the Yugoslavian team, Dantley sparked the Americans to the cherished gold medal. The following excerpt from the Washington Post shows how much that game meant to those Americans who participated and watched:

DANTLEY LEADS UNITED STATES TO BASKETBALL GOLD: YUGOSLAVIANS FALL, 95-74

(By Robert Facht)

MONTREAL, JULY 27.—Adrian Dantley, who cut his basketball teeth on the playgrounds of Washington, saved his finest Olympic basketball game for last.

Dantley, a graduate of De Matha High and an All-America from Notre Dame, scored 30 points to power the United States to a gold medal with a 95-74 rout of Yugoslavia.

The victory in the final tonight was particularly satisfying to the U.S. team, which was thought by many to be too shy on guards and quality centers to survive this rugged international competition.

But survive the U.S. team did, winning all seven games, including two over the Yugoslavian team. The Soviets, upset by the Yugoslavs on Monday, clinched the bronze medal with a 100-72 victory over Canada today.

Tonight's victory, applauded loudly by a flag-waving crowd of 18,000 at the Forum,

returned the gold medal in basketball to the U.S. four years after the Soviet Union won the gold in a controversial finale at Munich.

The 6-foot-5 Dantley played like a man possessed as he put on a 13-for-19 shooting performance. Dantley got a bump over his eye from a Yugoslav elbow, too, and that made a good symbol of the work that went into the gold medal performance.

"We told Adrian to go one-on-one with (Kresimir) Cosic guarding him, to use his speed," said coach Dean Smith. "But otherwise it was a team game. They played as a team. Maybe I cry too easily, but I had tears in my eyes when we were standing there and everybody was yelling."

It marked the end of a crusade, one that began in Munich in 1972, and tonight the U.S. players finally got to meet the Soviet Union team that was the object of all that disaffection. The Soviets, beaten by Yugoslavia in a semifinal, received the bronze medal and the boos of many in the emotional gathering.

It was much like an Atlantic Coast Conference tournament final, except that there was no mobbing of the players by happy fans. One spectator who tried offering a handshake was quickly hauled away.

After the players leaned over to receive their medals from Lord Michael Killanin, president of the International Olympic Committee, the crowd began chanting "U-S-A," forcing a delay in the other awards.

The players were emotional, too, after a lengthy pep talk this afternoon from assistant John Thompson, the coach at Georgetown.

"Coach Thompson spoke for four or five minutes and said more than some people say in a lifetime," Smith said.

"I don't listen to my speeches," Thompson laughed. "I was just pointing out the sacrifices they had made, the criticisms people had made of them. Some said this was the weakest team we ever had. I told them to have pride. And I told them I wished I had the opportunity to play with them. One of the Russians is 33 and I'm only 34."

The Americans were obviously fired high from the opening tap. They raced to an 8-0 lead in 2½ minutes and by the 15-minute mark had doubled the score, 44-22.

Dantley was brilliant inside, out maneuvering the 6-11 Cosic, a graduate of Brigham Young. Meanwhile, North Carolinas Phil Ford was using his quick hands to pick the Yugoslavs' pockets and upset their poise.

With the U.S. ahead, 20-12, largely because of Dantley's 12 points and Ford's steals and set-ups, Smith threw in four fresh players. They ran the Yugoslavs into the woodwork, with Steve Sheppard of Maryland contributing five quick points.

Yugoslavia hung in after the intermission, however, with 6-5 Drazen Dalpagic scoring 27 points, and it was still a losable game at 66-56. Phil Hubbard of Michigan rescued his faltering mates with 10 of the next 15 U.S. points and the foul-prone Yugoslavs gradually were overpowered. The Americans hit 57 per cent of their field-goal attempts on the night.

Dantley was a trifle embarrassed to miss a dunk attempt early in the second half. Moments later, he was outraged when he was called for fouling Dalpagic. Dantley blocked a shot and, when Dalpagic came down, still with the ball, his elbow cut Dantley above the right eye. After quick repairs, Dantley was back in.

In the closing minutes, Dantley reached the 30-point level on a magnificent follow through as his arm was cracked by Damir Solman.

THE ENVIRONMENTALIST
CRUSADE

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, in going through my files recently, I came across an old article from the Wall Street Journal that had caught my eye when it appeared on December 16, 1974. The article is entitled "The Environmentalist Crusade" and is authored by Irving Kristol, professor of urban values at New York University.

Professor Kristol's words of wisdom 2 years ago make even more sense in light of what is happening with environmental legislation in this current Congress. At that time he warned that there was "considerable evidence that the environmentalist movement has lost its self-control—or, to put it bluntly, is becoming an exercise in ideological fanaticism. It is mindlessly trying to impose its will—sometimes in utterly absurd and self-contradictory ways, and very often in unreasonable ways—on a reality that is always recalcitrant to any such imposition, by anyone."

Kristol points out several examples of where environmental extremism is taking us, including the EPA's activities in dealing with our clean air problems. He states that—

EPA proceeds as if its mission were, not to protect Americans from dirty air, but to protect clean air from Americans. Most of us not being clean air-worshippers, are bound to regard this order of priorities as more than a little odd. We would all like the air to be cleaner rather than dirtier, but very few of us really want to define our individual lives or our national purpose in terms of achieving the greatest possible air purity, regardless of cost or consequence. Such an idea does seem to verge on the fanatical.

He goes on to add that—

If EPA's conception of its mission is permitted to stand, it will be the single most powerful branch of government, having far greater direct control over our individual lives than Congress, or the Executive, or state and local government. No one ever contemplated such a situation nor are the American people likely to permit it in the future. Clean air is a good thing—but so is liberty, and so is democracy, and so are many other things.

The dangers that Professor Kristol was warning us about in December of 1974, are even more apparent today. The costs that we are being asked to pay for environmental legislation must begin to receive more attention. We must begin to call for a workable balance between our environmental and economic goals. Another article from the Wall Street Journal—Tuesday, August 10, 1976—entitled "Ecology's Missing Price Tag," vividly points out how much we need to take a closer look at the cost-benefits of our environmental programs. In this article, Dr. Lewis J. Perl, vice president of National Economic Research Associates, shares with us his cost estimates for our environmental programs. For example: a total capital investment in pollution control cost from 1974 to 1983 of \$175

billion to \$263 billion and annual costs in 1983 of \$55 billion to \$66 billion. This is \$679 to \$815 per household per year—in 1975 dollars.

Dr. Perl has also costed out the cost-benefits ratio of the significant deterioration standards in the amendments to the Clean Air Act that the House will soon be debating on the floor. His estimate on this cost-benefit ratio is 33.5 to 1.

Clearly, it is time that the Congress begins to live up to its responsibility and take a long, hard look at the imbalance that now exists between the economic and environmental costs of legislation such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to consider the attached remarks by Professor Kristol.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 16, 1974]

THE ENVIRONMENTALIST CRUSADE

(By Irving Kristol)

There is in the United States a tradition of evangelical reform that has no exact counterpart in any other nation. It emerges, one assumes from our Protestant origins, with its conception of this new nation as being "a city upon a hill," "a light unto the nations"—in short, as properly striving for and being able to achieve a degree of perfection that is beyond the reach of less blessed peoples elsewhere. All of us, for the most part without even realizing it, subscribe to this American dogma—which is why we constantly find ourselves being enlisted into movements of enthusiastic reformation.

In some respects, this reform impulse is one of our glories. It gives American politics a permanent moral dimension and moral thrust that is entirely proper to a democratic republic, one of whose major functions must be to ennoble the common men and women we all most certainly are. But it has its dangers, too. It is so easy to move from the moral to the moralistic, from a concern for what is right to a passionate self-righteousness, from a desire to improve our social reality to a blind and mindless assault against the real world which so stubbornly fails to conform to our ideological preconceptions. In short, the great temptation which all American reform movements experience is to become a crusade. It is a temptation, alas, that the reform impulse will frequently succumb to, with all the disagreeable results that have always attended upon crusades.

The antislavery movement before the Civil War and the temperance movement before World War I are two examples of reform movements which degenerated into crusades. Both addressed themselves, with commendable fervor, to very real evils: slavery (about which nothing need be said) and working-class alcoholism (whose ravages, we forget, were far more devastating than those of drugs today). Both, in time, permitted their moralistic enthusiasm to overwhelm all prudential judgment, so that both the abolitionist crusade and the prohibitionist crusade ended up by alienating public opinion, despite all sorts of legalistic victories they could proudly point to. And it can be said that their "final solution"—the Civil War perhaps, the 18th Amendment most certainly—created at least as many problems as they solved. Barry Goldwater to the contrary notwithstanding, extremism in defense of liberty, or virtue, or whatever is *always* a vice—because extremism is but another name for fanaticism which is a vice by definition.

A SERIOUS DANGER

Is the environmentalist movement now in danger of being transformed into such an immoderate and ultimately self-defeating crusade? It certainly is beginning to look that way. It is a reform movement which began with a massive reservoir of public sympathy, since there is no doubt that a com-

petitive economic system does create noxious "externalities"—general effects on our lives that are beyond the purview or control of any single enterprise, since an effort by any single enterprise to take them into account would put it at an immense competitive disadvantage. The only way to cope with such "externalities" is by legislation and regulation, and there can be little question that the public has been, and to a goodly extent still is, supportive of such efforts. But there is now considerable evidence that the environmentalist movement has lost its self-control—or, to put it bluntly, is becoming an exercise in ideological fanaticism. It is mindlessly trying to impose its will—sometimes in utterly absurd and self-contradictory ways, and very often in unreasonable ways—on a reality that is always recalcitrant to any such imposition, by anyone. And it is not too late to predict that, as this becomes more widely perceived, public opinion will become rapidly less amiable.

Nothing, I think, illustrates so nicely the kind of historic blind alley that environmental extremism seems headed for than the way in which the Environmental Protection Agency has involved itself in urban planning. Because urban sprawl involves extensive use of the automobile, and because air pollution can then become a serious problem (as in Southern California), the EPA is trying to discourage extensive, low-density suburban and exurban development. Well, that's reasonable enough—though even here there are difficulties.

The difficulties arise because EPA does not concern itself merely with those areas of the nation where the air is polluted, or on the verge of being polluted, or in striking distance of being polluted, but also with those areas where air pollution is, in the judgment of the average citizen, or even of EPA's own scientists, still far below acceptable levels. In these other areas, the EPA proceeds as if its mission were, not to protect Americans from dirty air, but to protect clean air from Americans. Most of us, not being air-worshippers, are bound to regard this order of priorities as more than a little odd. We all like the air to be cleaner rather than dirtier, but very few of us really want to define our individual lives or our national purpose in terms of achieving the greatest possible air purity, regardless of cost or consequence. Such an idea does seem to verge on the fanatical.

Still, in view of the air-pollution problems that do exist, and of our hitherto neglectful attitude toward them, one might put a benign interpretation on EPA's single-minded enthusiasm. After all, sometimes one does initially need such enthusiasm to get things moving at all. But any such benign interpretation is soon put to the test by the fact that EPA seems not only to be opposed to urban sprawl—it appears also to be opposed to urban concentration as well! For urban concentration, though it may minimize the individual's use of his particular automobile, does produce a large concentration of automobiles and trucks, which in sum do create some degree of air pollution. So EPA is now insisting that it have the right of approval and disapproval over the construction of inner-city convention centers, cultural centers, shopping centers, department stores, parking lots, amusement parks, housing projects, industrial parks, etc. And it is being very grudging in its approvals, highly peremptory in its disapprovals.

Now, this is really bizarre. It is bizarre, to begin with, in that Congress, when it established the EPA, and public opinion when it supported this reform, certainly never intended to give a handful of bureaucrats such immense powers. If the EPA's conception of its mission is permitted to stand, it will be the single most powerful branch of government, having far greater direct control over our individual lives than Congress, or the Executive, or state and local government. No one ever contemplated such a situation, nor

are the American people likely to permit it to endure. Clean air is a good thing—but so is liberty, and so is democracy, and so are many other things.

What makes the situation even more bizarre is that the bureaucratic usurpation of power is wedded to an utterly irresponsible use of such power. Here, in New York City, a low-income housing project was delayed for months—and finally had to be expensively redesigned—because the EPA perceived a threat of "noise pollution." Noise pollution in a New York slum! People are being mugged right and left, children are being bitten by rats, junkies are ripping out the plumbing of decaying tenements—the EPA is worried about noise pollution! These same EPA officials, of course, go home at night and tranquilly observe their children doing their homework to the accompaniment of thumping, blaring rock-and-roll music. And if the neighbors should complain, they get very testy.

A MAJOR OBSTACLE

The EPA has now become a major obstacle to the redevelopment of the inner city. It has also become a major obstacle to the development of new suburban communities. Indeed, it seems to be spending much of its time and energy figuring out how to be an obstacle to practically anything that Americans want to do. What was in its origins a movement for environmental temperance has become a crusade for environmental prohibition. It could take some time before Congress and the American people decide to call an end to this crusade—just as it took some time to repeal the 18th Amendment. Nevertheless, it is only a matter of time.

But the area of urban and suburban planning is only one instance of environmentalist crusaders rushing in where more reasonable men would tread more warily. In just about every aspect of American life, the environmentalists are imposing their regulations with all the indiscriminate enthusiasm of Carrie Nation swinging a baseball bat in a saloon. Common sense seems to have gone by the board, as has any notion that it is the responsibility of regulators and reformers to estimate the costs and benefits of their actions.

Thus, we all agree that the United States needs desperately to increase its domestic oil production. Geologists tell us that offshore drilling along the Atlantic seaboard offers us the best—perhaps the only—opportunity to achieve this aim. The environmentalists promptly declare themselves as adamantly opposed to any such enterprise. Why? Well, there is always the possibility that one of these offshore wells will malfunction, the oil will mix with the waters of the Atlantic Ocean, and many fish will then come to an untimely end. With all due respect to the natural rights of our fellow creatures of the deep, this verges on madness. After all, the high cost of oil is resulting in millions of Americans losing their jobs. Is such "unemployment pollution"—already a fact, not a mere prospect—really more tolerable than the risk of increasing the mortality rate among the fish of the Atlantic Ocean? It is interesting to note that such nations as Britain and Norway, which do not have our tradition of evangelical reform, have no compunctions about offshore drilling. Precautions against environmental dangers are taken; but the drilling gets done. Do we really think that Britain and Norway are more barbarous than we are? Or are they being more sensible?

Or take the case of the strip-mining of coal. We have enormous reserves of coal which can substitute for oil, and which can be strip-mined easily, cheaply, and safely. That last feature of strip-mining—the fact that far fewer miners get injured or killed in the process—might seem to be a mighty argument in its favor. We are so concerned about miners' safety that we have just enacted complicated (and expensive) rules and regu-

lations governing deep-pit mining. Good—so strip-mining should be the preferred alternative. But no: our environmentalists want to prohibit strip-mining altogether. Why? Because it defaces the landscape, at least temporarily. The question then naturally arises: what price do we wish to pay to avoid a temporary disfigurement of the landscape? But it is forbidden to raise this question and the environmentalists will not even discuss it. Indeed, anyone who does raise it will quickly find himself being excoriated and slandered as an unprincipled enemy of the true, the good, the beautiful.

RECALLING AUDEN

In one of his last poems, the late W. H. Auden wrote:

"Nothing can be loved too much,
but all things can be loved
in the wrong way."

One wishes our more rabid environmentalists would take these lines to heart. They might then reconsider their crusade, which has by now gone beyond the limits of even the purest reason. Making the world safe for the environment is not the same thing as making the environment safe for our world.

INDIA WILL HAVE A DYNASTY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach our own elections, we would do well to remember that India, under the emergency government headed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, is fast losing her own claim to democracy. Following is an article on political repression in India written by Ved Nanda, professor of international law at the University of Denver, that I would like to share with my colleagues:

[From the Rocky Mountain News,
Apr. 18, 1976]

IF MRS. GANDHI HAS HER WAY, INDIA WILL
HAVE A DYNASTY
(By Ved Nanda)

What significant political, economic and social changes in India have resulted from Indira Gandhi's imposition of the emergency rule in June 1975?

The question is pertinent, for Indira Gandhi's oppressive actions in the wake of the suspension of democracy have been repeatedly defended and justified by her and by apologists for her dictatorial regime as necessary, indeed imperative, to bring about the "sorely needed," "long-overdue" reforms in India.

The argument obviously has served its purpose, for the media in the West seems to have given Indira Gandhi the benefit of the doubt, and, as a result, have downplayed events such as mass arrests and imprisonment of her political opponents, whose number has reportedly reached as high as between 100,000 and 200,000; harsh press censorship, and gross and persistent violations of civil and political rights, including the inhumane treatment of detainees and political prisoners in police stations and jails.

Notable political changes, purportedly introduced to bring stability and order, include:

The outlawing of several opposition parties for their allegedly communalistic activities. These parties were accused of inciting violence to achieve their parochial ends.

The postponement by a year of national elections scheduled for last March, with a hint that the elections might be indefinitely postponed.

Suspension of fundamental civil and political rights guaranteed under the constitution of India, followed by a steady erosion and whittling away of these rights by executive regulations, which are in turn endorsed by actions of parliament. (Indira Gandhi's ruling Congress party has an overwhelming majority in parliament. Political prisoners and detainees include not only several opposition members of parliament but also some Congress party members opposed to Indira Gandhi's policies.)

Harsh press censorship, which has muzzled the once independent and lively press in India. The government owns and operates the All India Radio (popularly called "All India Radio") and television stations across the country. But the daily papers and periodicals have a rich tradition of fierce independence and responsive journalism, holding the government and the opposition parties accountable for their utterances and actions.

The press is now silenced, for not only can it no longer report on the activities of the opposition parties, it can no longer criticize government actions or even government officials, and is even prohibited from reporting certain parliamentary proceedings—it has been transformed from the liveliest to the dullest press in only a few months.

Indira Gandhi's attitude toward the press was graphically described in a recent interview she gave to a Denver religious group visiting India and reported in local papers. She said that she wouldn't allow the press in India to treat her the way the U.S. press treated Nixon, which to her was the hallmark of an "irresponsible" press.

Cartoons, music sheets, scholarly books, and even quotations from speeches by Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi (made before the imposition of the "emergency") are censored because some of these could be cited to criticize Indira Gandhi's actions.

The takeover by the federal government in New Delhi of the state governments of Tamil Nadu (in Madras) and of Gujarat, the only two states controlled by the opposition parties.

Severe curtailment of judicial review of executive and legislative actions, and a general downgrading of the role of the judiciary, an unfortunate development since the courts in the past have provided the necessary checks and balances in the Indian political system.

A general breakdown in the decision-making apparatus of the government which is creating uncertainty and unpredictability.

During my visit to India last December, the most often heard criticism of the government was that its decisions were arbitrary and seemingly capricious. Since nobody knew who comprised the "it," the most popular guessing game on the cocktail circuit in New Delhi was to name bureaucrats and Congress party leaders close to Indira Gandhi and her son, Sanjay Gandhi, who were "in" on making decisions ranging from who should be arrested to who should be included in federal and state cabinets.

I learned the meaning of arbitrariness in decision making the hard way. I was interrogated and detained at the Delhi Airport for having taken a public stand in the United States against Indira Gandhi's emergency. (My first article opposing Indira Gandhi appeared in the Rocky Mountain News Trend section of July 6, 1975, and was entitled, "India Suffers an Aberration.")

I was constantly harassed and kept under surveillance while in India and had no way of knowing who was deciding what actions were to be taken against me. The closest I came to finding out who the decision makers were was a statement by a senior police official who said the orders to keep surveillance on me came from "high up, very high up, but not from the top."

India's much heralded economic reforms were announced as a 20-point New Deal program, and their purported objective was to

combat poverty and unemployment, increase productivity, and halt inflation.

The program, which promises a 6 per cent annual rate of economic growth, proposes to expedite land reform, liquidate rural indebtedness, abolish bonded labor, and effectively combat black market operations. It differs little in content from the earlier promises made by the Congress party since the 1950s.

The impression created by the Indian government is that, as a result of the emergency, the country's economy has turned the corner, that vastly improved productivity in both agricultural and industrial sectors has replaced stagnation, that prices have fallen sharply and that the poor are better off.

The government's assertions were recently refuted by Dr. S. Swamy, who is a member of parliament and an economist by profession. Swamy was visiting the United States at the invitation of his alma mater, Harvard University (where he had earlier taught economics), and was briefly in Denver.

"The economy has considerably worsened since the emergency if one considers the basic indicators such as retail prices of essential commodities, unemployment and new investment. Retail prices had fallen a little during the first two months of the emergency, but since then have risen far above the earlier levels," said Swamy. He added: "All India Radio announces fictitious lower prices of goods, but consumers know that they cannot shop at All India Radio."

On unemployment and industrial production, Swamy said:

"Unemployment has soared by 28 per cent judging by employment exchange data. This is partly because of the credit squeeze clamped on earlier and partly due to the powers given by the emergency to the big industrialists to lay off workers at will. . . . The small and medium units however have been badly hit by the emergency.

"The credit squeeze, the lack of protection from unfair competition, and the political power of the conglomerates have starved these units. More small industrial units have shut down since June 1975 than in the previous 10 years."

On agricultural production: "In agriculture, the situation is not critical due to a good monsoon. Even so, output of food crops is 114 million metric tons, only six tons higher than five years ago, and 15 tons lower than the target set for two years ago. The next monsoon is due (soon). What happens if it falls?"

On the lot of the poor, Swamy observed: "The poor are miserable. About 300,000 people living in New Delhi slums have been carried in truck loads and dumped 25 miles outside the city. Entire slums have been bulldozed. Similar uprooting has taken place in every city of India. Workers in factories have had their bonus effectively abolished by law leading to a 20 per cent drop in their incomes. Strikes have been outlawed.

"Police corruption has gone up four-fold judging by the bribery rate required to avoid false or vindictive arrest. Clerks come to office on time out of fear. Senior officers now lord over junior officers because the latter can be dismissed by the former without assigning specific reasons. Of course, the rich are happy—they can kick their servants around now."

Swamy's statements coincided with my impressions during my India visit. He also confirmed my suspicion that the much-used term "discipline," of which Indira Gandhi has suddenly become so fond, has been skillfully used by her to silence dissent.

The trend in India is toward further consolidation of executive power. According to a draft of proposed changes in the Indian Constitution (not yet made public but privately circulated among high Congress party officials), India will change to a presidential system in which there is a vast concentration of power in the executive, the role of the judiciary is further diminished (subordinating it to the executive), and civil and polit-

ical rights are curtailed, making them non-justiciable.

Huge posters I saw on walls in Delhi, Bombay and other cities in India, and murals and billboards all over the country equated India with Indra and exhorted people to follow her shining example and that of her son, Sanjay Gandhi.

They left me with the distinct impression that if Indra Gandhi has her way, a dynasty will be in the making. India and the people of India deserve a better future—a return to democracy, free press, and basic human rights.

OSHA—A NATIONAL DISASTER

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a long-standing advocate of repeal or major reform and reduction of certain regulatory agencies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, I have been named chairman of a House Republican Task Force for Government Executive Agency Review—GEAR—and chairman of a national Stop OSHA Committee sponsored by the American Conservative Union—ACU. In this capacity I was invited to testify regarding OSHA before the Republican Platform Committee's Subcommittee on Government Concerns and the Consent of the Governed.

The impact of OSHA on this Nation in terms of higher taxes, higher costs, higher unemployment, greater shortages, and significant lack of improvement in workers certainly makes it rank high as an issue, not just for Republicans but for all Americans. Mr. Speaker, I submit my remarks as presented to the subcommittee for review by my colleagues here in Congress where responsibility lies and where corrective action is far overdue:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, SECOND DISTRICT, IDAHO BEFORE THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORM COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE GOVERNMENTAL CONCERNS AND THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED, MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 1976

One of the oldest and most enduring issues in government is the constant fight against Federal growth, waste, and the power of the bureaucracy. It is this largeness which leaves people with a feeling of helplessness and gives the impression of government being a master over, instead of a servant to, the people.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is a prime example of the need for regulatory reform.

It seems ironic, in the year that we are celebrating the 200th Anniversary of our forefathers' fight for liberty from oppression, entry without notice fines without consultation and many other "Tory" tactics, that the same thing is again happening to many small businessmen at this very moment. I refer to the practices and tactics being used by the United States Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

OSHA is presently being challenged on all sides. Several cases are pending before the Supreme Court and many more are pending in the District Courts as well as the circuit Courts of Appeal. The constitutional challenges are sound, i.e., freedom from warrantless searches, freedom from self-incrimination, right to due process, and right to trial by jury. Thus far no major decision has been made favoring OSHA. When faced with a

hopeless situation, OSHA lawyers request a stay of decision on the part of the judges, pending action by the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, this tactic did not work recently in the case of Rupp Forge Company of Cleveland. The judge found that "upon review of the Act and the relevant case authority, the Court is constrained to conclude that Congress did not intend to enact, nor did it in fact enact, proceedings encouraging or authorizing broad, arbitrary administrative searches such as that herein suggested by petitioner. Clearly such unbridled authority is not cognizable under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution."

I can't help but believe that the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health Administration realizes as I do that OSHA is on constitutionally unsound ground at this time. OSHA's current plight is pointedly apparent in light of the fact that the Congress is still waiting for the report from OSHA due in April of 1974 as per Section 4(b)(3) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. The report is now over two years overdue with no indication as to when it will be prepared.

The stated object of this agency is to improve safety conditions for American workers. There is precious little proof that it has done so—but plenty of proof that it has caused immeasurable grief for their employers.

Consider, first of all, OSHA's record of metastatic growth. The law that gave it birth runs to a modest 31 pages, which could, of course, be troublesome but not impossible for average citizens to master. As usually occurs, however, Congress permitted executive agents in the Department of Labor to run amok—pumping out an endless batch of OSHA regulations in the *Federal Register*.

At last count, there were some 800 pages of such regulations, setting forth the safety standards that strike the bureaucrats as proper. These standards number no less than 4,400—2,100 devoted to business generally, 2,300 focused on the maritime and construction trades. They are enforced by an army of a thousand-plus inspectors.

These standards are not only voluminous, they are often of eye-glazing complexity. One of the most notable, isolated by Professor Murray Weidenbaum of Washington University in St. Louis, consists of gobbledygook on ladders, including this delectable specimen: "The angle (a) between the loaded and unloaded rails and the horizontal is to be calculated from the trigonometric equation: Sine a-difference in deflection 9/ladder width."

Small wonder that the Federation of American Scientists says: "Regulations are voluminous and complex, the language convoluted beyond recognition except by a scientist or lawyer . . . Businessmen who have no legal or scientific training are unable to understand OSHA regulations. Unfortunately, few efforts are being made to translate the information into readable language . . . Equally unnerving to the businesses is the sheer volume of the regulations—thousands of them apply to one small operation."

That the average citizen doesn't understand the mumbo jumbo is of small concern to OSHA. The important thing is that you be in compliance. OSHA agents make unannounced pop inspections and issue citations on the spot that can lead to fines of hundreds or thousands of dollars. There is no provision for advisory opinions on whether a given ladder, an exit, or trash can, is out of sync with OSHA's mysteries. In fact, it is a criminal offense for anyone without authority to do so to give you notice of an OSHA inspection.

Even assuming the standards can be understood and met, the costs can be prohibitive. Robert Stewart Smith, formerly in charge of safety and health evaluation for the Department of Labor, has examined the costs and benefits of OSHA in an excellent analysis for

the American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C. On his showing, the costs are heavy, the benefits negligible. Smith quotes findings by the National Association of Manufacturers that OSHA compliance costs range from \$35,000 (for businesses with 100 employees or fewer) to \$350,000 (for businesses with up to 1,000 employees). This estimate is confirmed by the fact that the first 33 businesses obtaining small business loans for the purpose of OSHA compliance averaged loans of \$200,000 apiece.

Such costs are reflected in prices charged to consumers, and they are growing rapidly. Total costs of compliance came to \$2.5 billion in 1972, \$3.2 billion in 1973. And this is just for openers. Full compliance with existing OSHA noise standards would cost \$13.5 billion, and under one proposed noise standard it would cost \$31.6 billion (This doesn't count the additional millions in levied fines.)

Over against these heavy costs are Smith's findings that OSHA had apparently done little or nothing to improve the industrial accident record. Sifting OSHA's own adequate data with other figures, Smith discovered (a) that injury rates were higher, not lower, in industries with good compliance ratings, and (b) that between 1970 and 1973, industrial accidents in OSHA's so-called "target industries" fell by less than 1 percent more than they would have in the absence of the program.

"At the very least," Smith concludes, "the results cast serious doubt on the effectiveness of the target program. . . . A more ominous, but still speculative, implication . . . is that OSHA, whether because of its standards or because of its failure to discover violations, may not be affecting the conditions which cause injury."

"Given the limited potential of a perfectly enforced set of standards and the likelihood that inspectors discover only the most obvious violations, it is perhaps not surprising that the estimated effects on injuries are so small that they cannot be distinguished from zero."

The net of it is that we are administering a vast bureaucracy, armed with constitutionally questionable powers, costing consumers untold millions—to achieve a statistically insignificant impact on the safety record of American industry.

I find sad parallel between the 1976 problem of "regulation without reason" and the 1776 problem of "taxation without representation."

As America begins its third century of freedom, it is clearly time for the Republican Party to relieve American businesses, farms, and individuals from random searches, arbitrary enforcement and fines, and unnecessary and repetitive regulations and reports.

Congress should reappraise each Federal agency, with a view to outright abolition of those which have obviously outlived their usefulness. It should withdraw from the others the vast grants of arbitrary power that it has bestowed. And Congress should define the powers left to bureaucracies in language so clear and explicit that no officials can expand their power beyond Congressional intent. Broad national policies required to protect consumers, workers, minorities, and the environment should be implemented very sparingly and only through specific legislation, rather than bureaucratic whim.

I strongly believe that there are viable alternatives to OSHA. It is imperative that the Federal Government get back to an "incentive" system, towards American business rather than the "punitive" system which is presently being pursued. A broadening of liability insurance, workmen's compensation and other programs could likely accomplish the same goals of OSHA and in even better fashion. It's a fact that private insurance inspectors, health authorities, state and local inspection programs and employee benefit agreements already carry the major burden of assuring health and safety on the job. Insurance inspectors outnumber OSHA com-

pliance officers by approximately three to one.

I am repulsed by the fact that as OSHA grows, so grows its distorted opinion that most American workers are terribly exploited by employers and need the all-encompassing protection of the federal bureaucracy. This is indeed a sad commentary on the attitudes of bureaucrats and their understanding of the American enterprise system.

I have neglected to dwell in great depth upon OSHA compliance techniques due to the fact that a large number of the inspectors are not familiar with the types of businesses that they inspect and therefore cannot understand the individual needs of each company. The very concept of sending inspectors armed with rule books to examine work places for potential hazards is, in a way, as odd as an insurance company personally inspecting every home for which it writes a policy. A more modern approach might be to utilize statistical science and adjust an employer's workmen's compensation and liability rates according to his actual safety record.

OSHA, however, relies on its rules and in the process has compiled a litany of offenses against good sense. A few examples:

Companies have been ordered to remove guardrails 41 or 43 inches high and replace them with rails exactly 42 inches high.

One firm provided more fire extinguishers than required and hung them carefully at the required height. It was slapped with a fine for setting an extra unit on the floor.

Regulations required a shorter turning radius for some fork lifts. Their wheel bases were shortened to comply, and the vehicles were rendered dangerously unstable.

The burden of these OSHA regulations falls most heavily on small businesses, who are least able to pay the compliance costs and fines imposed.

In conclusion, I ask inclusion of platform provisions for a new concept in occupational health and safety basically handled through private enterprise with compliance induced by incentive rather than punitive measures.

OSHA is a product of the tired old "New Deal" idea that government can solve everything and it has typically become just another non-productive, expensive bully that has closed thousands of small businesses and created high costs and shortages and increased unemployment without producing any significant improvement in the health and safety of workers.

Safety and health is everybody's business and with some imagination and proper application it can be accomplished in ways which would assure lower costs, abundant supplies, increased employment and more prosperous business operations. The time to do something is now.

SEVENTY-SIX MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ASK PRESIDENT FORD TO LOOK AT MEXICO'S SLIDE TOWARD COMMUNISM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in 1776, 56 men gathered in Philadelphia to sign our Declaration of Independence. With that, the American Republic was founded. The fundamental concepts have been termed Americanism; in short, Americanism means an adherence to the belief that free men secure their "unalienable rights" from a Supreme Being and not government. Our Government is to protect those basic rights. Our

Founding Fathers listed four of those rights as the right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the right to own private property.

Central in the concept of Americanism is the firm belief in our God, and since our founding that belief has been the underpinning of this great Republic. It has always been the hope of the United States that others would follow up in our new experiment in the history of man.

Today in 1976, unfortunately, the world appears to be going in the other direction and more nations are bowing before the altar of communism. Communism—Marxian materialism—is better understood if it is viewed as militant atheism.

It is therefore with more than casual interest that some of us are concerned with the dangerous leftward slide of our neighbor to the south, Mexico. It is alarming to see trends first noted in Cuba now appearing in Mexico.

This letter to the President, which was signed by 76 Representatives, does not in any way "attack" Mexico; on the contrary, it derives in part from the outpourings of concern by Mexicans for their own country since the Mexican newspapers mentioned congressional interest in the leftward movement imposed upon them from above.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1976.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On May fifth, thirty Members of Congress expressed to you their concern over the trend of political developments in Mexico, asking whether the Secretary of State was, in fact, keeping you adequately informed. A response to this letter has been received, but there still appears to be substantial points of disagreement.

Since the fourteenth of April, at least thirty-five excerpts from the Mexican press have been inserted in the Congressional Record in a sincere effort to illustrate points of concern, and to provide the documentation which critics invariably demand—and invariably ignore.

It would be interesting to learn what favorable interpretation can be placed upon the following:

(1) The amnesty recently provided for hundreds of Soviet agents who provided leadership for the bloody events of 1968, when hundreds of Mexicans were killed in summer-long disturbances.

(2) The placement of at least a thousand non-Mexican Communists and radicals in key government and journalistic positions in Mexico.

(3) The Mexican government's drive to increase political, economic, and "cultural" ties with every Communist nation on earth.

(4) The dismissal, by President Echeverria, of waves of terrorist attacks as mere "diversion" and "provocations" which are not the fault of self-proclaimed leftist revolutionaries.

(5) The recent changes in the Mexican Constitution to cut away the legal basis of private property.

(6) The recent introduction of Castroite textbooks, for compulsory use in all Mexican schools.

(7) The persistent employment of Communist, rhetoric, anti-American demagoguery, and calls for domestic class warfare from the highest Mexican officials.

(8) Government inaction in the face of thousands of land seizures taking place all

across Mexico, often by armed gangs under non-Mexican leadership.

(9) Open declarations that collectivization of the countryside is the government's goal, combined with heavy government pressure on the rural population to join collectives.

Surely we are not expected to overlook the lesson of Cuba, when all our official "experts" and media pundits assured us that Fidel Castro had no intention of imposing Communism upon the Cuban people. As a result, the Cubans were enslaved, except for one Cuban in ten who escaped to the United States, and a Soviet base has been implanted ninety miles from Florida.

The present one-party government of Mexico is following a similar path. For moral and humanitarian reason alone, we should prefer not to see 65 million Mexicans forced to choose between slavery and exile. And for overwhelmingly important strategic reasons, we should prefer not to see what some Mexican writers can already visualize—a Cactus Curtain alone the Rio Grande.

For all these reasons and more, we ask your assurance that the developing situation in Mexico is receiving the deep attention which it merits.

Sincerely,

John M. Ashbrook, Wm. L. Dickinson, Charles E. Grassley, Richard H. Ichord, George M. O'Brien, Carlos Moorhead, Dawson Mathis, G. V. Montgomery, Jack Brinkley, Floyd Spence, Robin Beard, John Myers, Richard Kelly (Fla.), Ted Risenhoover, James M. Collins, Ron Paul, Gary A. Myers, Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., Trent Lott, Bill Hefner, Tim Lee Carter, G. William Whitehurst, Albert W. Johnson, Richard T. Schulze, Larry P. McDonald, Dan Daniel, Philip M. Crane, Gene Taylor, Bill Nichols, Bob Bauman, Steve Symms, Gene Snyder, Bo Ginn, Bud Hillis, Marilyn Lloyd, Jim Martin, Don Mitchell, Thomas N. Kindness, John H. Rousselot, W. Henson Moore, Tom Bevell, Dave Treen, Don Young, Bill Ketchum, Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Bill Wampler, Joe Skubitz, John W. Jenrette, Jr., Ken Holland, Butler Derrick, Mendel J. Davis, Phil M. Landrum, James Abdnor, Thomas N. Downing, George Hansen, J. K. Robinson, J. Herbert Burke, Bob Kasten, David R. Bowen, Alphonzo Bell, John Paul Hammerschmidt, Ed Jones, Bill Chappell, Bill Alexander, David N. Henderson, Sam Devine, Charles Thone, Omar Burleson, L. A. Bafalis, James A. Haley, Henry J. Hyde, Tom Hagedorn, Burt Talcott, L. H. Fountain, Edward Hutchinson, John Breaux.

Material bearing upon the situation in Mexico has been placed in the Record, as follows:

April 14, page 10895, 11059
April 29, page 11926, 11971.
May 4, page 12516.
May 6, page 12921.
May 17, page 14179.
May 21, page 15101.
May 25, page 15429.
June 7, page 16846.
June 15, page 18456.
June 18, page 19328.
June 29, page 21370.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, certain apparently erroneous statements were made on Monday, August 2, during the discussion on the Antitrust Civil Process

Act (H.R. 13489) and the Antitrust Pre-merger Notification Act (H.R. 14580). I think it is important to correct the record for the benefit of the conferees.

The statements were made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), about the July 30 letter from the National Small Business Association which I inserted in the RECORD.

First, on page 25055 the gentleman from Ohio stated that—

The letter is in error in implying that all businesses with sales or assets over \$10 million would be brought into the scope of the bill. The example they give is of a wholesaler doing \$22 million worth of sales, which would not come within the bill because he would be a nonmanufacturing corporation. . . .

The NSBA letter, however, does not state that all businesses with "sales or assets" over \$10 million would be within the scope of the bill. It expressly refers to 18,000 privately-held family-owned businesses with assets over \$10 million. All of these businesses clearly would come within the purview of the bill, whether they be manufacturing corporations (section 7A(a)(2)(A)) or nonmanufacturing corporations (section 7A(a)(2)(B)). A wholesaler who is doing less than \$22 million in sales and is eligible for SBA assistance would nevertheless be covered under the bill if he had \$10 million in assets. This fact was recognized by the gentleman from Ohio when he subsequently corrected himself, in effect, by noting that—

The bill expressly exempts nonmanufacturing corporations with assets of less than \$10 million.

Thus the NSBA letter was not in error as charged.

Second, on page 25049 the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING) commented on a concern expressed in the NSBA letter, that information obtained through CID's may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. The gentleman stated that—

The association apparently did not bother to read the bill because the bill expressly exempts all information disclosed under this bill from the Freedom of Information Act. So the quoted statement is just plain incorrect.

Actually, it is the gentleman from Ohio who is incorrect if he is assuming that the reference to the Freedom of Information Act in the bill (H.R. 13489) prohibits the Justice Department from disclosing CID information. The FOIA reference provides only limited protection, and there appear to be a number of loopholes in the bill as passed by the House.

It is well known, for example, that the courts are divided in their interpretations as to whether the exemptions set forth in the Freedom of Information Act are mandatory or discretionary. Until this question is finally settled it is unclear, at best, whether a Federal agency is prohibited from disclosing documents and materials falling within the FOIA exemptions or whether the agency is merely authorized, in its discretion, not to disclose such information. In fact, the weight of judicial authority to date appears to indicate that the FOIA reference in the House bill does nothing more than authorize the Justice Department to

withhold disclosure of CID information, not prohibit the Department from disclosing it.

In addition, section 4(c)(3)(B) of the new bill provides that the custodian may disclose CID information to others with the consent of the person who produced such material. Unlike the existing CID Act, under the new bill the term person includes an individual. Thus if an executive working for company A receives a CID and produces the response to it, and he thereafter goes to work for a competing company B, company B would be able to obtain such CID material from the Justice Department if the executive who originally produced it—and who is now working for company B—simply gives his consent. Thus there is no protection provided in the bill for company A, the real party is interest.

It may be presumed that the committee did not intend such an anomaly, which could have been cured by the proposed McClory/Wiggins amendment to require return of CID information to the provider thereof when no longer needed. The dilemma we are now faced with is the type of problem which arises when a bill is moved so quickly on the Consent Calendar, without providing an opportunity for further reflection by the House and improving floor amendments. I hope that in the future the House will be more cautious about moving such noncontroversial bills on the Consent Calendar.

THE SMOTHERS BROTHERS END IT

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Members, for those of us who sit at home Saturday night reading the Sunday news, things will never be the same. The Smothers Brothers, one of the great entertainment teams in this generation, have decided to do their own thing. For years Tommy and Dick have done their own thing, but they have now decided to do it separately.

I first became aware of the Smothers Brothers in the late 1950's when they were working at the Purple Onion in San Francisco and I was tending bar at Bimbo's 365 nightclub. On several occasions the brothers went to Bimbo's, as part of a Gray Line tour. They were smalltime boys taking in the sights in the big city.

Their talent, ability, and warmth have thrilled millions on stage and television. They possess that rare ability to entertain people, and, more importantly, to make people laugh. Their Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour television show was a pioneer in entertainment. They were not afraid to break new ground. As a reward, they had their program canceled.

Their careers were linked intermittently with historical figures.

They were at the Purple Onion; I was at Bimbo's 365 Club. Richard Nixon was elected President; they were canceled by CBS. Daniel Ellsberg was on trial for the Pentagon Papers in Los Angeles Federal

Court, they were suing CBS in the same courthouse at the same time. Significantly, both Daniel Ellsberg and the Smothers Brothers won verdicts.

As personal friends and longtime fans, myself, Sharon and Kimi will miss the Smothers Brothers as an entertainment team. I know we will continue to see and enjoy the Smothers Brothers as people. Mr. Speaker, I know that the entire House would like to join me in wishing the Smothers Brothers well, Tom, as he prepares to play Macbeth and Hamlet at Stratford-on-Avon, and Dicky, as he continues to chase bread trucks.

Enclosed is an article written by the distinguished entertainment critic of the San Francisco Chronicle, John Wasserman, entitled "The Smothers Brothers End It."

The article follows:

THE SMOTHERS BROTHERS END IT

(By John L. Wasserman)

"Dickie and I have always tried to be direct about things," Tom Smothers said Saturday afternoon.

"We were direct about our conflict with CBS, we were direct about the Vietnam war, and we want to be direct about our retirement. We went on TV (Johnny Carson's show on Thursday night) to announce the end of the Smothers Brothers because we wanted to forestall the rumors. We thought we'd do it straight, like we've done everything else."

And so, more than 17 years after they burst on the national comedy scene from the launching pad of the Purple Onion, after hundreds of concerts, dozens of night clubs, 11 record albums (three were gold) and television series on all three networks, 39-year-old Tom Smothers and baby brother, Dick, 37, have retired one of the most successful careers any comedy team has enjoyed.

"There was no straw that broke the camel's back," Tom continued. "Actually, when we started at the Purple Onion, we gave ourselves six months to make it but we always said, even with success, that if things ever got to the point where we're not fully committed, and it starts to interfere with our individual desires to express ourselves, we'd retire the act."

"That's different from splitting up," he emphasized time and again. "We're retiring the act, the performing entity, so that we can explore our potential, but we have no personal problems. If anything, we have more love for each other than we've ever had."

It has been a tumultuous period for the brothers since their return to performing nearly three years ago, after what Tom calls the "limbo" period following their 1969 firing by and subsequent litigation with the CBS television network. Since the fall of 1973, the emotional and professional roller coaster:

Tom got married. The brothers got a new network television series. The series flopped. They parted with their long-time manager. They hired another manager. They parted with the second manager. And, two months ago, Tom's divorce from his second wife became quietly final.

Now, as the sage observed, the future lies ahead, "I have no wife, no manager and no Smothers Brothers," Tom said, not unhappily. "Dickie and I both felt we had fulfilled the possibilities of the act. We were limited to expressing ourselves only in the context of our relationship with each other. Dickie never has liked the road. He wants to spend more time with his family, and other interests in Santa Cruz. But neither of us is retiring from show business."

Tom's own plans are vague, but he insists that the vagueness is sincere.

"You can't choreograph a bullfight. Who

knows what's going to come up—film, stage, clubs, directing, writing? Things happen so damn fast. I want to be ready on all fronts."

For the rest of the year, Tom, who will continue to make his home in Glen Ellen, and Dick will fulfill their current commitments. Lamentably, those do not include a Bay Area engagement. The closest they'll come, geographically, is two weeks at Harrah's Tahoe in October. Tom, perhaps presaging a more flexible future, will make his stage debut in "Play It Again, Sam," Woody Allen's comedy, on August 10 at Pat Paulsen's Cherry County Playhouse in Michigan.

As for 1977, Tom is leaving the choreography to fate. If all else fails, as he noted on Carson's show, there's always the Air Force. "As I explained on the show," he explained, "there's 30 days paid vacation and unlimited educational opportunities. My first choices for school are radar and the space program. If I couldn't get into those, I'd go into germ warfare . . . cause I like to work with people."

Tom chortled. "Yesterday, the Air Force called my office and said it was the best plug they ever had. They want to make me an honorary general. But I don't know. Now I'm thinking about the Navy . . ."

THE PROPOSED EXPORT OF COMPUTERS TO RUSSIA

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned of a planned sale of some of our most advanced computer technology to the Soviet Union. The July 1976 issue of *Conservative Digest* magazine contains an article by Miles Costick entitled "The Dangers of Economic Détente." This article describes the proposed export to the Soviet Union of the world's largest and most advanced scientific computers—the fourth-generation Cyber-76 and Cyber-172 series. There are only eight installations in the world using these systems including the National Security Agency, NASA, the U.S. Air Force, and ERDA. Control Data Corp. provided the Soviet nuclear research facility in Dubna—near Moscow—with its second and third generation computers.

I would commend Mr. Costick's article to my colleagues in the Congress:

THE DANGERS OF ECONOMIC DÉTENTE

(By Miles Costick)

Not satisfied with the serious damage done by his grand design for political detente, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has also advanced the concept of "economic detente."

Economic detente, according to Kissinger, is based on the principle of "linkage" of the American and Soviet economies, and would add "an element of stability to the political equation."

However, stability is not the result because what the United States means by detente and what the USSR means by detente are two entirely different things.

Leonid Brezhnev and his colleagues see detente as a policy to increase Soviet power over the United States without alarming the Americans or their allies into taking effective countermeasures. Brezhnev made this clear to his Politburo and Warsaw Pact leaders during the summer of 1973.

His key proposition was dubbed the "new Brezhnev doctrine" by U.S. defense analysts, who summarized it as follows: "We communists have got to string along with the capitalists for a while. We need their credits, their agriculture and their technology.

"But we are going to continue a massive military buildup, and by the middle 1980s we will be in a position a position to return to a much more aggressive foreign policy designed to gain the upper hand in our relationship with the West."

Therefore, every U.S.-Soviet deal—particularly the transfer of advanced technology and sophisticated capital equipment—is an act of international politics.

THE NATURE OF TRADE

By now, the two general techniques in the Soviet pattern of trade have clearly emerged. One is to tap the Western technology and long-term credits in order to develop resources rapidly, including oil, natural gas, timber and rare metals in Siberia.

The other is to import complete industrial installations wholesale, especially in the chemical and petrochemical industries, computer production, the automotive field, the energy sector and modern metallurgy.

In 1972 alone, orders from Western technology ran to \$2 billion—a figure that rose in 1973 to almost \$3 billion and is still climbing—with the result that Moscow now spends over 22 percent of its foreign exchange earnings annually in repaying loans.

The surge in shipments of advanced technology was particularly evident in the case of the United States. According to figures released by the Department of Commerce, the U.S. shipped \$547 million worth of machinery and equipment to the Soviet Union last year.

This sharp increase in the export of technology, combined with grain shipments worth \$1.1 billion, produced a record trade gap in Soviet-American relations in 1975. United States' exports totaled \$1.8 billion, compared with imports from the Soviet Union of \$227 million, a ratio of almost seven to one.

More, however, lies behind the Soviet trade strategy than erecting large new industrial facilities. The major contract with Fiat to build a complete auto factory at Togliatti illustrates another Soviet objective. Fiat not only planned, programmed and supervised construction of the complex, but trained Soviet engineers and technicians and provided technical help in running the installation.

Thus, what Moscow wanted to and did acquire was not just a modern plant, but the very art of modern mass production of cars, plus the management and organization for such mass production. The same applies to the Kama River truck plant, which predominantly utilizes American technology.

Historically, the Kremlin has used trade for political and strategic reasons, to exploit economic crises and to try to disrupt Western economies. In the view of this observer, the Soviet Union had explicit political objectives in exhorting the Arab oil nations to bargain hard with the West.

By half privately, half publicly promoting the upward spiral of oil prices, Moscow hoped to push the West toward bankruptcy and depression. It was obvious that Moscow took great comfort in seeing inflation pressures increasing in the West.

The Soviet press made no secret that Moscow also saw advantages in the rising competitive frictions between Western Europe and the United States as the oil crisis mounted.

THE MILITARY DIMENSION

In his testimony on April 12, 1974, before an executive session of the Subcommittee on Priorities and Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, William Colby, then director of the CIA, stated that the Soviets "have been getting military technology" from the West.

When Chairman William Proxmire inquired about the nature of that technology, Mr. Colby replied: "Computers, some scientific instruments and advanced equipment."

In 1972, the U.S. Departments of State and Commerce granted an export license for 164 of the latest generation Centalign-B machine. These are of critical importance in

the manufacture of precision miniature ball bearings, which, in turn, are imperative for any guidance mechanism used in intercontinental ballistic missiles—ICBMs, MIRVs and the latest in guided missiles, MARVs—Maneuverable Reentry Vehicles. The sole manufacturer of these unique machines is the Bryant Chucking Grinder Company of Springfield, Vermont.

The Soviet war industry gained 164 of these machines; the United States has never owned more than 77 of them. The export of Centalign-B machines to the Soviet Union gave Moscow direct access to the mass manufacture of guidance mechanisms needed for MIRVing and MARVing.

According to testimony presented to the Senate Finance Committee, United States and British computer technology and large scientific computers enabled the Soviets to make a breakthrough in the development and advancement of MIRVs by saving them valuable time ranging from two to four years.

In 1982, the Soviets will have at least 5,000 operational MIRVs aimed at the United States. Without American technology and precision miniature ball bearings, this would not have been possible.

In my presence, the former chief legal counsel of the contracting division in the Soviet Ministry of Armaments gave a sworn statement that, without the use of American computers, precision instruments and digital tools in Soviet research and development laboratories, the Soviet military-industrial complex could not have made any advances in the development of high-energy lasers or nuclear devices. His statement was made in the spring of 1974.

This statement was confirmed on July 21, 1975, when Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, then director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, testified before a subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee in executive session that he was worried about a Soviet breakthrough in "the application of lasers."

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is seriously exploring "revolutionary" and "highly speculative" weapons technologies, which could give it the worldwide lead in military weaponry in the near future.

So stated Deputy Defense Secretary William Clements on April 20 of this year. Clements told an MIT university conference in Washington, D.C., that the Soviet's arms experiments "include high-energy lasers, surface-effect vehicles and antipersonnel-pressure weapons."

It should be stressed that the Soviets have made a breakthrough in the deployment of high-energy lasers in the form of antisatellite devices. It was recently reported that several U.S. spy satellites placed in orbit to observe Soviet compliance with the SALT 1 agreement were rendered nonoperable (blinded) by Soviet laser-beam devices.

Computers are at the core of today's and tomorrow's strategies. Without them there are no weapons systems. All the new technologies—giros, lasers, nucleonics, metallurgy, propulsion, including computer technologies themselves—are dependent upon computers. Furthermore, computers, lasers and nucleonics are interrelated.

ROPE SELLERS RUN WILD

And yet there is a concerted drive by several leading American electronic firms to sell to the Soviets fourth-generation large computers and related technologies, or to provide the Soviets with complete manufacturing facilities for the mass production of the latest generation computers.

For example, Control Data Corporation has provided the Soviet nuclear-research facility in Dubna near Moscow with its second- and third-generation computers. Today Control Data's management is pressing the Department of Commerce and other U.S. government agencies to permit the export to the

Soviet Union of the world's largest and most advanced scientific computers—the fourth-generation Cyber-76 and Cyber-172 series.

Only eight such installations exist in the world, including those at the Atomic Energy Commission, U.S. Air Force, NASA and the National Security Agency.

One of the most flagrant examples of the outflow of American advanced technology and automated machinery is to be found in the case of the KAMAZ—Kama River truck plant, still under construction in accordance with specifications provided by leading American engineering concerns.

Donald E. Stingel, president of Swindell-Dresser Co., told the congressional Subcommittee on International Trade of his firm's role as the plant's principal engineering and construction contractor. His testimony included the revelation that the firm is providing the USSR with a technology yet to be realized even in the United States.

Specifically, the KAMAZ will have an annual production capacity of 150,000 to 200,000 10-ton multiple-axle trucks, more than the capacity of all U.S. heavy-duty truck manufacturers. This plant will be capable of producing tanks, military scout cars, rocket launchers and trucks for military transport, but it was approved as "non-strategic."

Hedrick Smith, a Moscow correspondent for The New York Times, has reported a joke that circulated within the official Soviet establishment on the eve of Brezhnev's visit to Washington in June 1973. Brezhnev, it seems, had gathered his advisors for counsel on what he should ask from America.

"Ask them to sell us cars and build us highways," suggested one. "Ask them to build us computer factories and petrochemical plants," said a second. "Ask them to build us oil pipelines and atomic power stations," said a third. "No," replied Brezhnev thoughtfully. "I'll just ask them to build us communism."

From the results to date of both political and economic detente this is exactly what the West has been doing: Building communism and digging its own grave.

If you believe that Control Data Corporation and other U.S. companies should not be allowed to sell strategic equipment and technology to the Soviet Union, write President Ford, the White House, Washington, D.C.

The American Security Council, 1101 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, is actively opposed to the sale of U.S. strategic computers, lasers and other items to the U.S.S.R. Let them know of your support.

In conclusion, I would encourage a congressional investigation of the pending transfer of this technology to Russia. It is really ironic to think that Soviet ICBM's would be guided to their American targets with U.S. supplied computer technology. Commonsense should tell us that we are digging our own grave with each new sale of lasers and computers to Moscow. The American people have a right to know what is going on here.

RESEDEL INDUSTRIES CELEBRATES ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1976, Resdel Industries, of Pasadena, Calif., will celebrate its 25th anniversary. Resdel, manufacturers of highly sophisticated elec-

tronic communications equipment, has headquarters in Pasadena for the past 20 of those 25 years, providing employment for area residents and generating revenues in the community. Pasadena citizens are justly proud of Resdel Industries and I am pleased to share the Resdel story with my colleagues:

RESEDEL INDUSTRIES CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY

On September 11, 1976, Resdel Industries, a Pasadena based electronics communications company, will celebrate its 25th anniversary. This celebration will have special meaning for many Pasadena area residents, the business community and Resdel's employees; but most of all, for Henry K. Abajian, President and Chairman of the Board of Resdel.

The story of Henry K. Abajian, one of Pasadena's outstanding business leaders, could well fit into a volume of Horatio Alger tales. Born to American parents in Turkey, he understood well the meaning of persecution and in 1923 Mr. Abajian and his family moved to the United States, joining his father who had previously emigrated. From that point in time, Mr. Abajian never looked back. He began his formal education, graduated high school in Troy, New York and received his Mechanical Engineering degree from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1933, during the depths of the depression, the same year he became a United States citizen.

Following graduation he held various engineering positions around the country and in 1951 co-founded Resdel Industries in Los Angeles with a total investment of \$5,000 and three employees. In 1955, Resdel moved from Los Angeles to Pasadena, present site of the corporate headquarters. The company now boasts more than 400 employees and continues to expand each year with three operating subsidiaries: Digital Systems, Inc., designer of high-technology machine tools for the computer circuit board industry; Resdel Engineering, which concentrates on the development of advanced communications equipment for governmental utilization and Fanon/Courier Corporation, a leader in the field of manufacturing and marketing personal communications equipment, notably CB radios, walkie-talkies, telephone amplifiers and intercoms. The parent company also has support subsidiaries in Amsterdam and the Far East.

Resdel Engineering was in the forefront of historic developments in the country's space programs throughout the 50s and 60s and manufactured the solid state transmitter which sent back television pictures from the Apollo spacecraft to Earth during the Apollo-Soyuz space mission last year. Resdel and its management is to be commended for designing and developing advanced communications equipment for use by our government and the consumers in the past two and a half decades. It is hoped that the Company, under the leadership of Henry K. Abajian, will continue to make innovative contributions to communications technology in the future.

BARRY FARBER ON NEW YORK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, an article appeared in the editorial section of the New York Times written by Barry Farber, a former congressional candidate, an outstanding radio talk

show host and a dear friend of mine. The subject Mr. Farber chose to speak out on, in his witty and caustic, but deadly earnest manner, is the problem with New York and what New Yorkers can do about it.

Mr. Farber proposes New Yorkers stop blaming their problems on others and start living up to their civic duty by making their city into a safe, clean, and habitable one. Only until New Yorkers identify themselves as their own real worst foe will any constructive changes occur, until they become "a new kind of New Yorker." I am pleased to insert this article into the RECORD for all to read, and perhaps reflect on the insightful comments of Barry Farber:

You, You, You, You

(By Barry Farber)

It's maddening being the only one who knows what's wrong with New York.

You keep telling yourself there must be others but they're bashful, they're scared, they're inarticulate, they're on vacation, or you had to leave just before they stood up and said it. You think it, feel it, know it, but you never hear it.

You hear all about Beame and his lightweight lackluster nonleadership and Lindsay and his opportunistic pandering to minorities and unions and Wagner who always settled it alone over whisky with Mike Quill while party bosses feasted on patronage.

All of it believed, some of it true, none of it relevant. San Francisco had an earthquake, Chicago a fire, Atlantic a war, Johnstown a flood. New York never had a major disaster, so it made one.

We, in fact, are what's wrong with New York and no politician will ever divulge that secret as long as there are municipal unions, landlords, upstate legislators, welfare recipients, cops who live out of town, smokers who buy cigarettes in North Carolina, and a wide choice of racial and religious minorities to blame it on.

The people are ready to hear what no candidate is ready to say. The rescue of New York will begin the night a voter stands up in the school auditorium and challenges a candidate to review his record on something like housing and, instead of reciting a pre-fab platitude packaged for that neighborhood, the candidate glares at the questioner, pauses, and in the manner of Spencer Tracy in "Judgment at Nuremberg" says: "So you want to know my record on housing, do you? Well, let's look at your record on a few things first. You used to have a great city here; a garden, an envy, a major magnet of global attraction. And you turned it into a toilet! And you've got the shamelessness to stand there and ask me about my record. I'm not sure I want to lead a bunch of self-righteous, overflattered, underfunded draft-dodgers from civic duty like you."

Unless that candidate wore a swastika or a hammer-and-sickle he'd get my vote.

A New Yorker hoping to rescue this city merely by voting for earnest candidates with brave labels is like an alcoholic setting out to cure himself by changing his brand of whisky. New kinds of politicians can't help until we become a new kind of New Yorker.

For every elected official who litters, there are 10,000 of us. For every politician who turns his back when a screaming woman is stabbed to death, there are 10,000 of us. For every politician who cheats, steals, lies, and covers up there are 10,000 of us.

We're losing the battle for New York because of our priggish refusal to identify the foe. Any politician who tries to pin the blame on office holders past or present while praising the "great population of New York" is committing more than a deception.

It's a war crime.

VOTING RECORD

HON. MAX S. BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting today my voting record for the period August 1, 1975, to July 2, 1976. Some of my colleagues may recall that day last fall when I presented my voting record for the first 8 months of 1975. With this installment, the record of the 94th Congress is brought up to date through the Bicentennial Independence Day recess.

Before presenting a detailed listing of each vote, I would like to offer a few words of explanation. To begin with, the total number of votes listed is 527, broken down as follows:

Subject:	Number of votes
Agriculture	31
Communications	5
Consumer affairs	17
Economic affairs	40
Education, arts and humanities	13
Energy	56
Environment	25
Foreign relations	57
Government and civil service	99
Health	19
Housing and urban affairs	7
Justice and judiciary	9
Labor	20
National defense	50
Politics	18
Science and technology	7

Subject:	Number of votes
Social conditions and services	20
Sports and recreation	4
Transportation and public works	30
Total	527

On each vote I have noted the following information: First, a brief description of the issue presented; second, a rollcall number for the vote—note, the number presented in parentheses is the vote number used by Congressional Quarterly, preceded by the last digit of the year of the vote—for example, the first vote noted is No. 5430, which means that it is vote No. 430 in the year 1975 according to the records kept by Congressional Quarterly; third, my vote on the measure; fourth, the outcome; and fifth, the final vote tabulation.

This information is more complete than my last record in that I have provided a vote identification number and the final vote tabulation. On the other hand, for the purposes of saving space, I deleted votes which were on purely procedural questions, such as whether the House should rise as a Committee of the Whole, or whether a particular rule should be passed.

It may be appropriate to explain here the order of the votes presented below. Within each of the 20 subject categories, the votes are presented chronologically, with one general exception. When several votes were taken on a particular bill, I present first the final votes on the

bill, followed by the votes on proposed amendments.

My reasons for presenting this record are several. Foremost among them is my firm belief that representative government works best when the represented know what their representatives are doing to represent them.

During recent Congresses, there have been so many recorded votes—often numbering in the thousands—that it is virtually impossible for the average Montanan to get a feel for what his or her representative is doing.

That leads me to the second reason for presenting my voting record—namely, it provides people with the opportunity to examine the scope of activities undertaken by Congress. By dividing the votes in the 20 categories presented above, readers of this record can gauge for themselves where and how Congress is allocating its time and attention.

A third reason I offer this record is that it enables Montanans to judge my attendance record. Out of the 527 votes presented below, I missed only six, each of which is designated by an asterisk. On those six votes, I did note how I would have voted if I had been able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I must once again apologize for the small print, but as my colleagues can attest, the activity of Congress over the past year has been intense, and I do not wish to take up too much space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD confirming that fact.

The material follows:

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Agriculture</i>			<i>Agriculture</i>		
A bill to enable cattle producers to establish, finance and carry out a program of beef research, consumer and market information. (5430)	Yes	Passed (229-189)	A motion to recommit bill to authorize cattle producers, under Agriculture Department supervision, to create and finance a program to improve markets for beef. (5585)	No	Passed (263-112)
A bill to authorize \$47.9 million for the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act through September 30, 1976. (5454)	Yes	Passed (329-80)	A bill to suspend rice marketing quotas for the 1976-1977 crop years and remove restrictions on rice productions by new producers, and establish target prices for rice and a rice research program. (5588)	Yes	Passed (311-104)
An amendment to give the Agriculture Department authority to block EPA decisions to ban or restrict the use of pesticides. (5437)	No	Failed (167-175)	An amendment to continue marketing quotas and acreage allotments for rice production, delete target pricing, and reduce loan levels to 60% parity. (5586)	No	Failed (97-310)
An amendment to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act authorization for one year through September 30, 1976 without change. (5438)	No	Failed (66-272)	A motion to recommit the bill on rice production and thus kill it. (5587)	No	Failed (102-311)
An amendment to require the Agriculture Department approval for major EPA regulations and actions relating to pesticide control. (5452)	No	Failed (164-233)	A Joint Resolution to provide quarterly adjustments in the support price of milk and increase the support price to a minimum of 85% of parity. (5595)	Yes	Passed (307-111)
An amendment to authorize the EPA to approve state certification plans that required farmers to complete training programs before being certified to use restricted pesticide. (5453)	Yes	Passed (250-155)	A bill to strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and enforce humane standards for the transportation of animals in interstate commerce to make violations subject to civil and criminal penalties and prohibit the transportation of animals for animal fights. (632)	Yes	Passed (335-34)
A bill to authorize a program to encourage direct marketing of agriculture commodities from farmers to consumers. (5492)	Yes	Passed (299-95)	An amendment to delete a provision making it a Federal crime to promote animal fighting for entertainment purposes. (630)	No	Failed (56-312)
A bill to extend the authorization to provide rural development and small farm research and extension programs and to authorize sums not to exceed \$5 million for the transition and \$20 million in fiscal 1977. (5503)	Yes	Passed (323-11)	A second vote on the amendment to include live birds in the provision regarding animal fighting. (631)	Yes	Passed (289-76)
A conference report to authorize \$77.5 million to implement the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act through March 31, 1977. (5532)	Yes	Passed (334-76)	A bill to allow grain weighing and grain inspection at export port locations by either Federal employees or employees of State agencies and to strengthen civil and criminal penalties for knowing violations of the act. (6116)	Yes*	Passed (246-33)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Agriculture</i>			<i>Communications</i>		
An amendment to disallow the participation of State agency employees in grain inspection and weighing, and require that these activities be performed only by Federal employees. (6115)	Yes*	Failed (112-183)	A bill to allow radio broadcast stations that receive from FM radio stations or television stations and retransmit them to a new audience to originate limited amounts of programming and operate them unattached in the same fashion as television stations that broadcast in the same manner. (6308)	Yes	Passed (349-2)
A conference report to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and enforce humane standards for the transportation of animals in interstate commerce, to make violators subject to penalties and to prohibit and make a Federal crime transportation of animals in interstate commerce for the purpose of holding animal fights. (6127)	Yes	Passed (332-31)	<i>Consumer affairs</i>		
A resolution to disapprove the President's proposed deferral of \$18 million in funds previously appropriated for the emergency watershed protection program of the Soil Conservation Service. (6138)	Yes	Passed (338-23)	An amendment to prohibit the Consumer Product Safety Commission from including product sampling plans as part of mandatory product safety standards except in cases of bottles or flammable products. (5408)	Yes	Passed (200-193)
A conference report to authorize cattle producers under Agriculture Department supervision, to create and finance through self-assessments a promotion and research program to improve markets for beef. (6164)	Yes	Passed (200-170)	A bill to authorize \$193 million for the Consumer Product Safety Commission in fiscal years 1976-78 and amend the Consumer Product Safety Act. (5473)	Yes	Passed (313-86)
A bill to provide uniform law enforcement authority for the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service and to establish a national training program that would cooperate with the quality of personnel in both services. (6165)	Yes	Passed (360-0)	An amendment to delete provisions of the bill permitting the Commission to choose on a case-by-case basis, which of the four major laws it administered to use in regulating a product. (5467)	No	Failed (204-205)
A bill to eliminate government funding of cotton research programs, to increase the assessments paid by cotton producers to support the program and to reimburse the Secretary of Agriculture for expenses associated with producer referendums. (6239)	Yes	Passed (370-6)	An amendment to allow House or Senate to disapprove within 30 legislative days, standards, rules, and regulations proposed by the Commission on a product. (5468)	Yes	Passed (224-180)
An amendment to cut Interior Department Bureau of Reclamation construction appropriations to \$339.2 from \$351.4, thus deleting \$12.2 million for the Garrison Diversion irrigation project in North Dakota. (6279)	Yes	Failed (156-244)	An amendment to authorize private parties to bring civil suits against the Consumer Product Safety Commission during a 2-year experimental period. (5469)	Yes*	Failed (166-230)
A bill to appropriate \$11.7 billion for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1977. (6285)	Yes	Passed (377-26)	An amendment to delete a provision of the bill authorizing the Commission to conduct its own civil litigation independently of the Justice Department. (5471)	No	Passed (209-195)
An amendment to limit to \$59 million any subsidies paid under the peanut price support program for the 1977 crop. (6282)	No	Failed (175-229)	A motion to recommit the bill to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, instructing it to delete a provision permitting the Commission to choose which of the four laws it administered to use in regulating the products. (5472)	No	Passed (204-198)
An amendment to delete \$794 million from the food stamp program, limiting that program to \$4 billion for fiscal 1977. (6283)	No	Failed (184-222)	A bill requiring companies leasing consumer goods to disclose fully the terms and the cost of the lease. (5477)	Yes	Passed (339-41)
A motion to recommit the Agriculture Appropriations bill with instructions to cut 5% in new obligational authority. (6284)	No	Failed (103-298)	A bill creating an independent agency for consumer protection to coordinate federal consumer protection activities, and represent consumer interests before federal agencies and the courts. (5497)	Yes	Passed (208-199)
A bill to revise and extend the program in the Department of Agriculture to protect horses from inhumane practice artificially altering the gait of a horse used in exhibitions and horse shows. (6309)	Yes	Passed (346-6)	An amendment to require all federal agency consumer functions similar to those in the proposed agency be transferred to the new agency. (5495)	Yes	Passed (379-27)
A conference report to appropriate \$12.6 billion for the Agriculture Department in fiscal 1977. (6354)	Yes	Passed (372-27)	A bill to modify provisions of a 1974 law designed to help consumers hold down the settlement charges connected with buying or selling a home. (5523)	Yes	Passed (379-21)
NOTE: For votes on OSHA issues, please see the section on labor votes.			A bill to prohibit retailers from imposing surcharges on purchases made with credit cards. (5524)	Yes	Passed (398-3)
<i>Communications</i>			A conference report to outlaw credit discrimination based on age, race, color, religion, or national origin. (665)	Yes	Passed (384-3)
A bill to authorize \$634 million in longrange funding for fiscal years 1976-80 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (5508)	Yes	Passed (336-26)	A bill to permit states bringing consumer antitrust suits to employ private attorneys on a contingency fee basis with court approval. (680)	Yes	Failed (167-217)
A bill to extend permanently the 1973 ban on television blackouts of certain professional sports clubs' games in hometown areas. (5579)	Yes	Passed (363-72)	An amendment to limit state consumer antitrust suits based on aggregated damages to willful price-fixing cases. (679)	No	Passed (220-171)
A Conference report to authorize \$634 million in longrange funding for fiscal 1976-80 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. (5596)	Yes	Passed (313-40)	A motion to recommit the State Anti-trust Suits Bill with instructions to study the feasibility of increasing civil fines to deter anti-trust violations. (681)	No	Failed (150-223)
A bill to authorize \$58 million in fiscal 1977 for the broadcasting activities of the Board for International Broadcasting and to require the President to report to Congress on means to utilize overseas broadcast'ng facilities more effectively. (6100)	Yes	Passed (287-70)	A motion to recommit the conference report authorizing fiscal 1976-78 funds for the Consumer Product Safety Commission with instructions to disagree to a provision authorizing the agency to represent itself in civil litigation if the Attorney General refused to accept a case within 45 days. (6143)	Yes	Failed (177-192)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Economic affairs</i>			<i>Economic affairs</i>		
A bill to amend Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code to grant tax exempt status for development bonds used to construct dams if mainly for irrigation purposes at a reasonable public cost. (5440)	Yes	Passed (286-111)	An amendment strengthening minimum tax on preference income by expansion of tax preferences subject to tax and elimination of 50% of regular federal income tax deduction in tax computation. (5547)	Yes	Passed (314-107)
A bill to extend the authority of federal bank regulatory agencies to set ceilings on the amount of interest paid on savings accounts and to require lenders to disclose the amount of mortgage money they lend. (5488)	Yes	Passed (177-147)	An amendment to delete provisions establishing a limitation on artificial losses and tightening the minimum tax. (5548)	No	Failed (85-334)
An amendment to delete provisions of the bill allowing financial institutions to offer "negotiable orders of withdrawal" (NOW) accounts. (5485)	Yes	Passed (218-134)	An amendment to delete provisions repealing the 30% withholding tax on dividends and interest earned by foreign investment. (5549)	Yes	Passed (301-119)
An amendment to delete provisions of the bill requiring lenders in metropolitan areas to disclose mortgage money lent for four-year periods after enactment within each census tract or zip code area. (5486)	No	Failed (152-191)	An amendment to shorten to 3 from 5 years time provided for limiting amount of export income by a domestic international sales corporation for deferral of federal taxes. (5550)	Yes	Failed (199-223)
An amendment to limit disclosure of mortgage lending data for city neighborhoods to lenders in 20 metropolitan areas selected by the Federal Reserve Board for a 3 year study. (5487)	Yes	Failed (165-167)	A motion to recommit bill to committee with instructions to report with amendment prohibiting use of revenues to finance fiscal spending in excess of \$395 billion. (5551)	No	Failed (202-220)
A bill authorizing voluntary withholding of state income taxes for Members of Congress and congressional employees. (5491)	Yes	Passed (394-7)	A bill permitting a municipality to file a petition of bankruptcy without the approval of its creditors and to continue limited borrowing while it develops a debt adjustment plan with a court. (5565)	Yes	Passed (373-29)
A resolution to set ceilings of \$374.9 billion on fiscal year 1976 outlays and \$409 billion on budget authority; set a floor of \$301.8 billion on revenues and \$73.1 billion as the budget deficit. (5515)	Yes	Passed (225-191)	An amendment to revise municipal bankruptcy proceedings for cities of over 1 million in population. (5564)	No	Failed (145-264)
An amendment to exempt businesses having less than \$1 million in net assets of 25 or fewer full-time employees from the requirement to answer interrogatories issued by the agency. (5494)	Yes	Passed (401-6)	A bill requiring payment of interest on certain funds of the U.S. held on deposit in commercial banks and provide for reimbursement to commercial banks for services performed by the federal government. (5578)	Yes	Passed (391-0)
An amendment to lower budget authority in fiscal 1976 by \$71.9 billion and outlays by \$71.9 billion thereby eliminating the deficit and creating a balanced budget and lowering the debt by \$72 billion. (5512)	No	Failed (127-283)	A conference report on bill to cut taxes by \$8.4 billion by extending 1975 tax reductions through June 30, 1976. (5589)	Yes	Failed (256-160) 2/3 required
An amendment to increase new budget authority by \$7.5 billion and increase outlays, the deficit and public debt by \$1 billion. (5513)	No	Passed (213-203)	A bill to pass over the President's veto, the bill to cut federal taxes \$8.4 billion in 1976 by extending 1975 tax reductions through June 30, 1976. (5597)	Yes	Failed (265-157) 2/3 required
An amendment to lower budget authority by \$12.5 billion, and lower budget outlays, the deficit and public debt by \$4.7 billion. (5514)	No	Failed (159-257)	A bill to pass over the President's veto, the bill to authorize \$6.1 billion for job creating public works projects and anti-recession aid to state and local governments. (642)	Yes	Passed (319-98)
A bill to increase temporary federal debt limit to \$595 billion and extend it through March 15, 1976. (5518)	Yes	Passed (213-198)	A bill to allow 5 New York City employees' pension plans to buy \$2.5 billion of city bonds without losing tax advantages under federal law. (649)	Yes	Passed (298-45)
A bill to extend through 1976 the Defense Production Act, which provides the President with authority to stimulate industrial production and to assure priority use of vital supplies and foods during national emergencies. (5522)	Yes	Passed (318-1)	A bill to impose capital gains taxes on the increased value of stocks of securities transferred to certain partnership exchange funds, trusts, or mutual funds in order to diversify the owners' security holdings. (6168)	Yes	Passed (348-14)
A bill to authorize federal loans of up to \$2.3 billion a year to help NYC meet seasonal cash flows. (5541)	No	Passed (213-203)	A bill to make changes in the Federal Reserve System. (6189)	Yes	Passed (279-85)
A conference report on bill extending Defense Production Act through fiscal 1977, to amend its anti-trust immunity provisions and requiring cost benefit assessments of standards proposed by the Cost Accounting Standards Board. (5542)	Yes	Passed (404-4)	A conference report to ease funding for acquisition of pollution control equipment by small business, liberalize provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, make certain farms and ranches eligible, and require studies of the role of small businesses in the economy. (6197)	Yes	Passed (392-0)
A bill to reduce 1976 individual and business taxes by \$15.5 billion by extending temporary tax cuts, strengthen the existing minimum income tax on preference income, restrict existing business expense deductions, limit tax benefits on foreign income, and make other federal tax law revisions. (5552)	Yes	Passed (257-168)	A bill to increase the lending authority of the Small Business Administration and ease eligibility requirements for federal assistance to small businesses. (6243)	Yes	Passed (341-2)
An amendment to delete provisions allowing individuals with capital losses in excess of \$3,000 in a year to carry them back against capital gains in three previous years. (5544)	Yes*	Passed (379-27)	A bill to levy taxes on all popularly priced cigars at the same rate and to base the rate upon the wholesale price of the cigars. (6310)	No	Failed (269-138)
An amendment to apply a limitation on artificial losses to real estate on a property by property basis effective on persons with more than one real estate project. (5546)	Yes	Failed (192-226)	A bill to provide that income distributed by an insurance company inadvertently from the policy holders surplus account and then promptly returned to the company would not be subject to taxes under the Life Insurance Company Taxes Act of 1959. (6311)	No	Failed (339-66)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Economic affairs</i>			<i>Energy</i>		
A bill to suspend the duties on certain bicycle parts and accessories until December 31, 1979. (6312)	Yes	Passed (370-41)	An amendment to delete from the bill oil pricing sections that would extend federal controls on the price of domestic oil with ceilings at \$5.25, \$7.50 and \$10.00 per barrel. (5388)	No	Failed (151-242)
A bill to allow floating rates for international currencies, instead of the fixed rates in the original Breton Woods Agreement of 1944. (6314)	Yes	Failed (264-147) 2/3 required	An amendment to delete from bill the sections to require the President to restrict and allocate domestic gasoline supplies and reduce the consumption by 2% in 3 yrs. (5389)	No	Failed (150-239)
A motion to recommit bill to committee with instructions to reduce appropriations for a revolving appropriations for a revolving loan fund to aid New York City to \$1.3 billion from \$2.3 billion. (5580)	No	Failed (187-219)	An amendment to delete from bill provisions setting up voluntary energy conservation programs for U.S. industry. (5390)	No	Passed (220-187)
An amendment to reduce budget authority and outlays by \$50 million in order to eliminate funds targeted for a bill on balanced economic growth. (6153)	Yes	Failed (177-206)	An amendment to delete from bill Presidential authorization to act as exclusive purchasing agent for oil imported into the U.S. (5391)	No	Failed (146-254)
<i>Education</i>			An amendment to delete from bill the 1985 goal for auto efficiency of a fleetwide average of 28 miles per gallon for American automobile producers. (5392)	No	Failed (117-284)
A motion to agree to bar HEW from using any funds in the Labor-HEW appropriations to require school districts to bus children beyond their neighborhood schools, but to allow HEW to order busing to the school closest or next closest to the student's home. (5555)	Yes	Failed (133-259)	An amendment to require all government-owned vehicles to use fuels that were a blend of gasoline and certain substitutes. (5393)	No	Failed (118-262)
An amendment to prohibit HEW from using, directly or indirectly, any funds in the Labor-HEW appropriations to require school districts to bus students beyond the school closest to their homes for the purpose of school integration. (5556)	No	Passed (260-146)	An amendment to shift from Commerce Department to the Federal Trade Commission responsibility for administering energy efficiency standards and labeling requirements. (5395)	Yes	Passed (214-165)
A bill to make federal grants to states to reimburse local school districts for the actual costs they incurred in providing education services to Indo-Chinese refugee students. (62)	Yes	Passed (311-75)	An amendment to delete from the bill provisions for requiring energy efficiency improvement standards for major household appliances. (5396)	No	Failed (146-243)
An amendment to reimburse local school districts only for the actual costs incurred in providing education services to Indo-Chinese refugee students. (61)	No	Passed (235-143)	An amendment to delete a section of the bill to authorize the Federal Energy Administration to ban use of natural gas as a boiler fuel. (5397)	No	Failed (93-300)
An amendment to rescind \$97.3 million of already appropriated fiscal 1976 funds for aid to school districts, "impacted" by federal installations. (633)	No	Failed (134-267)	An amendment to provide \$750 million a year in loans to begin liquefaction and gasification of coal. (5398)	No	Failed (154-211)
A bill to extend the Library Service and Construction Act for five years (638)	Yes	Passed (378-7)	An amendment to authorize the General Accounting Office to conduct verification, and if necessary, more comprehensive audits of oil & gas producers who are already required to submit energy data to the Federal Government. (5402)	Yes	Passed (233-162)
A bill to authorize \$250 million for fiscal 1977, \$297 million for fiscal 1978, and open-ended funding for fiscal 1979-80 to extend support for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. (6144)	Yes	Passed (279-59)	An amendment to prohibit use of gasoline or diesel fuel-powered vehicles to transport school children, other than one's own, to public schools other than the appropriate grade school closest to the student's home in his school district. (5403)	No	Passed (204-201)
A bill to extend the authorization for federal aid to vocational education programs and the National Institute of Education. (6191)	Yes	Passed (390-3)	A motion to recommit the bill to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee thus killing the bill. (5404)	No	Failed (171-232)
A bill to extend for one year the authorization for federal aid to higher education programs. (6195)	Yes	Passed (388-7)	A Senate passed amendment to a bill to extend oil price controls from August 31, 1975 until November 15, 1975 and limit the President's authority to propose major changes in oil price controls. (5413)	Yes	Passed (342-16)
An amendment to delete a provision requiring that when appropriations for student aid exceed \$2.5 billion, an amount equal to the excess would have to be appropriated for community services, continuing education and facilities. (6192)	No	Failed (146-255)	A bill to extend for 10 years the federal program insuring the public against damages up to \$560 million resulting from a nuclear accident and limiting industry liability. (5559)	Yes	Passed (329-61)
An amendment to prohibit funds authorized under the Foreign Studies and Language Development Section to be used for activities involving any aspect of the religion of "secular humanism." (6193)	Yes	Passed (222-174)	An amendment eliminating \$560 million limit on the liability of the nuclear power industry for damages resulting from a nuclear accident. (5557)	Yes	Failed (178-217)
An amendment to exempt professionally oriented fraternities and sororities from regulations prohibiting sex discrimination. (6194)	No	Failed (121-272)	An amendment to allow citizens within 90 days of the effective date of the bill, to go to court to challenge the constitutionality of the \$560 million liability limit. (5558)	Yes	Failed (161-225)
A bill to provide an extension of the student loan program through September 1976. (6304)	Yes	Passed (350-0)	A motion to delete from bill authorization up to \$6 billion in federal loan guarantees to encourage development of synthetic fuels. (5572)	Yes	Passed (263-140)
<i>Energy</i>			A motion to delete provisions authorizing ERDA to select a tract of public land and to conduct an oil sale demonstration program. (5573)	No	Passed (283-117)
A bill to provide the President with emergency energy standby authority, for creation of a civilian strategic oil reserve, to extend price controls on domestic oil, establish mandatory gasoline allocation programs, and set fuel economy standards. (5405)	Yes	Passed (255-148)			

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Energy</i>			<i>Energy</i>		
A Conference report to provide \$7.5 billion for fiscal 1976 programs of ERDA and Army Corps of Engineers water power development programs and \$2.1 billion for transition. (5575)	Yes	Passed (339-31)	An amendment to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to make a definitive finding that the Clinch River breeder reactor would be safe before licensing construction. The new amendment would require instead a "reasonable assurance" of safe operation before construction. (6211)	No	Passed (238-140)
A bill to deregulate the price of natural gas producers with sales of less than 100 billion cubic feet a year, but continue regulation of major gas producers, and extend regulation of major gas producers to cover gas sales in intrastate markets. (628)	Yes	Passed (205-194)	A bill to extend the authority of the FEA to December 31, 1977 from July 1, 1976 and to authorize \$173 million in fiscal year 1977 for FEA operations. (6235)	Yes	Passed (270-94)
An amendment to delete provisions that would end the Federal Power Commission's authority to reduce price ceilings on natural gas still under federal regulation. (621)	Yes	Passed (232-184)	An amendment to reduce fiscal 1977 authorizations for the FEA Office of Conservation and Environment by \$37.4 million to \$12.6 million. (6230)	No	Passed (220-154)
An amendment to allow the Federal Power Commission to set varying ceilings, instead of a single national ceiling, on prices for offshore natural gas that would remain under federal regulation for 5 yrs. (622)	Yes	Failed (182-236)	An amendment to prohibit the FEA from making oil price and control allocation changes in a single action, thus enabling congress to veto one action while letting the other stand. (6231)	Yes	Passed (200-175)
An amendment to direct the Federal Power Commission to give industrial as well as agricultural users of natural gas feed stocks priority access to natural gas supplies. (624)	No	Failed (131-274)	An amendment to allow congress to reject within 60 days any FEA rule or regulation that was likely to have substantial impact on the U.S. economy or on large numbers of people. (6232)	Yes	Passed (226-147)
An amendment to substitute an amendment to deregulate small producers of natural gas with provisions to extend federal controls over major companies to cover gas sales intrastate markets. (625)	Yes	Passed (205-201)	An amendment to reduce the extension of the FEA to 18 months from 39 months, making the agency's authority expire at the end of 1977 instead of on September 30, 1979. (6233)	Yes	Passed (194-172)
An amendment as amended to deregulate small gas producers but to continue regulation of major gas producers. (626)	Yes	Passed (219-184)	An amendment to require that hearings on proposed FEA rules affecting a particular state or local government or geographic area be held within its boundaries. (6234)	Yes	Passed (267-95)
A motion to recommit the bill to deregulate natural gas sold by small producers and expand regulation of major producers, with instructions to deregulate all new onshore natural gas in 1976 and offshore gas in 1981. (627)	No	Failed (198-204)	A technical amendment to a proposed substitute to revise the method by which lands on the outer continental shelf are to be leased for development. (6275)	No	Failed (156-201)
A bill to authorize \$1.45 billion in new federal financial aid over five years to help coastal states cope with the development of their offshore oil and gas resources. (669)	Yes	Passed (370-14)	An amendment to delete language requiring the Secretary of Interior, before leasing a tract of the outer continental shelf, to give the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission such information as they would require to determine whether leasing was inconsistent with anti-trust laws. (6276)	No	Failed (114-231)
A conference report authorizing production of oil and gas from U.S. Naval petroleum resources. (6106)	Yes	Passed (390-5)	An amendment to revise the method by which lands on the outer continental shelf are to be leased for development by giving the states less power to block OCS leasing and development. (6277)	No	Failed (139-209)
A bill to extend through fiscal 1977 federal programs tightening safety regulations in the construction of natural gas pipelines. (6169)	Yes	Passed (277-88)	A bill to appropriate \$9.7 billion in fiscal 1977 for public water and power projects and for ERDA operating expenses and construction projects, and \$200 million to compensate victims of the Teton River Dam disaster in Idaho. (6281)	Yes	Passed (378-20)
A bill to authorize \$274.3 million in fiscal 1977 for salaries and expenses of Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (6187)	Yes	Passed (356-5)	An amendment to prohibit the spending of 5% of the fund appropriated by the Public Works-ERDA Appropriations Bill for payments not required by other laws. (6280)	No	Failed (194-216)
A bill to authorize \$7.4 billion in fiscal 1977 for ERDA nuclear and non-nuclear programs. (6212)	Yes	Passed (316-26)	A bill to extend the Federal Energy Administration for three months to September, 1976. (6316)	No	Failed (170-157)
An amendment to eliminate provisions authorizing an additional \$58 million for solar heating and cooling programs, thus cutting increased funding to \$58 million from \$116 million for solar electric and other purposes. (6204)	No	Failed (188-207)	An amendment to increase by \$67.5 million the appropriation for energy conservation programs administered by ERDA. (6343)	No	Passed (381-15)
An amendment to redistribute \$116 million for solar electric, ocean thermal, wind energy, biomass and related research and development programs by allocating \$58 million to solar heating and solar programs and to increase the ERDA Solar Division staff. (6205)	Yes	Passed (265-127)	A conference report to appropriate \$9,703,713,000 for fiscal 1977 ERDA nuclear, solar and other energy programs and for public water and power projects, and to appropriate \$200 million in compensation to victims of the Teton Dam disaster in Idaho. (6352)	Yes	Passed (381-15)
An amendment to authorize \$116 million for solar electric, ocean thermal, wind energy, biomass and related research programs. (6206)	Yes	Passed (321-68)	A bill to extend the Federal Energy Administration for 30 days through July 30, 1976. (6364)	No	Failed (194-216)
An amendment to delete provision authorizing \$1.2 billion in fiscal 1977 authorizations for ERDA nuclear weapons development, testing and production. (6209)	Yes	Failed (97-286)	A conference report to provide \$1.2 billion over 10 years in federal financial aid and guarantees to help states cope with the development of their offshore oil and gas resources. (6372)	Yes	Passed (391-14)
An amendment to limit federal contributions for paying cost overruns that increase the total cost of the Clinch River fast breeder reactor project by more than \$2 billion, and require private utilities to bear a portion of further overruns. (6210)	Yes	Failed (173-209)			

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
A motion to discharge the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee from consideration of the resolution expressing disapproval of the House to the Administration's action in removing price and allocation controls from heating oil and diesel fuel. (6374)	Yes	Failed (194-208)	Energy		
<i>Environment</i>			An amendment to expedite a change in the allocation formula for the Land and Water Conservation Fund that would give more advantage to populous states. (6175)	No	Failed (177-221)
A motion that House concur in Senate passed amendment deleting House-passed provisions barring EPA from implementing proposals on pollution control or carrying them out without new legislative authority. (5436)	Yes	Passed (302-77)	A separate vote on previous adopted amendment to prohibit the use of Land and Water Conservation funds to enclose or shelter facilities used for outdoor recreation activities. (6176)	No	Passed (248-147)
A bill to require that all parts of the National Wildlife Refuge System be administered through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (5521)	Yes	Passed (341-10)	A bill to authorize a 5 year program of \$20 million to develop advanced automobile propulsion systems to improve fuel economy and reduce pollution. (6238)	Yes	Passed (296-86)
A bill to add 235, 230 acres in the State of Colorado, to the National Wilderness Preservation System. (5538)	Yes	Passed (369-1)	A bill to authorize funds for the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 for fiscal 1977-79, and to make certain modifications in the law. (6241)	Yes	Passed (339-5)
A conference report to grant \$4.2 billion for 1976 and \$1.2 billion for July 1, to September 30, 1976 for Interior Department and related agencies. (5571)	Yes	Passed (407-5)	An amendment to put more limits on the authority of the Army Corps of Engineers to regulate, dredge, and fill operations in wetlands. (6240)	Yes	Passed (234-121)
A motion to adopt bill without the provisions concerning advanced automotive technology and loan guarantees for expansion of existing low-sulfur coal mines. (5584)	Yes	Passed (236-160)	A motion to recommit the Interior Appropriations bill with instructions to reduce the total appropriations by 5% across the board. (6344)	No	Failed (84-219)
A motion to delete from bill a program in the Department of Transportation to develop, evaluate, and promote the commercial application of advanced automotive technology through grants. (5582)	Yes	Passed (300-103)	A conference report to designate the Eagles Nest Wilderness area within the Arapaho and White River National Forests in Colorado. (6360)	Yes	Passed (388-13)
A bill to authorize \$77.3 million for federal reclamation projects in Wyoming, North Dakota, Oregon, and South Dakota. (63)	Yes	Passed (284-110)	<i>Government and Civil Service</i>		
A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to revise procedures governing the leasing and development of coal deposits on federal lands. (610)	Yes	Passed (344-51)	An amendment to delete provisions requiring the federal government to pay 75% of government personnel systems through October 1, 1978. (5370)	No	Passed (226-168)
An amendment to prohibit any coal mining operations in the National Park system, the National Wildlife Refuge System, the Wilderness Preservation system, the National System of Trails, and Wild and Scenic Rivers. (67)	Yes	Passed (370-32)	An amendment to previous amendment to delete section of bill authorizing grants to employment organizations. (5371)	No	Failed (189-213)
An amendment to delete from the coal leasing bill language to limit the size of a logical coal mining unit to 25,000 acres. (68)	No	Failed (97-301)	A bill to terminate certain authorities of the President regarding national emergencies. Still in effect. (5373)	Yes	Passed (388-5)
A motion to recommit the coal leasing bill (and thus kill it) to committee. (69)	No	Failed (80-319)	A bill to establish a national board to coordinate conversion to the metric system. (5376)	Yes	Passed (300-68)
An amendment to revise the boundaries of the Eagles Nest Wilderness area in Colorado, thus allowing timber cutting in the 6,270 acres East Meadow Creek area near Vail. (6126)	No	Failed (109-273)	A bill to create an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress to encourage the preservation of customs, arts, and crafts of American ethnic and regional groups. (5379)	Yes	Passed (272-168)
A bill to authorize \$10.9 million through fiscal 1977 for programs to protect the nation's waterways and ocean waters from unregulated dumping. (6166)	Yes	Passed (362-0)	A bill to override the President's veto of bill making fiscal 1976 and advance fiscal 1977 appropriations of \$7.5 billion plus \$464.7 million for the 3-month transition period for education programs operated by HEW and related agencies. (5380)	Yes	Passed (379-41)
A bill to extend the National Sea Grant College and Program Act through fiscal 1977. (6167)	Yes	Passed (326-34)	A bill to commemorate Veterans Day on November 11—effective in 1978. (5381)	Yes	Passed (410-6)
A bill to authorize \$256.6 million for EPA research and development activities in fiscal 1977. (6173)	Yes	Passed (381-16)	A bill to increase to \$105 million the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for the construction of new mint facilities in Denver, Colorado. (5401)	No	Passed (236-111)
An amendment to give Congress 60 days to veto any EPA rule or regulation dealing with research and development. (6172)	Yes	Passed (228-167)	A motion to table the motion to discharge from Committee the resolution to disapprove President Ford's proposed 5% pay increase for Congressmen, military personnel, and federal white-collar employees. (5422)	No	Passed (278-123)
A bill to increase the annual authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund to \$450 million in 1978, \$625 million in 1979 and \$800 million in 1980-89, and to establish a federal grant program for preservation of historic properties. (6177)	Yes	Passed (392-3)	A conference report on bill to appropriate \$49.3 billion in fiscal 1976 for HUD, National Aeronautics and space Administration, and several other independent agencies to appropriate \$5.6 billion for 3-month transition period between fiscal 1976-77. (5434)	Yes	Passed (334-41)
An amendment to reduce the authorization level for the Land and Water Conservation Fund to \$500 million in 1979 and to \$600 million in 1978 and thereafter. (6174)	No	Failed (111-282)	A motion to concur in Senate amendment to earmark 50% rather than 75% of fiscal 1976 contracts authority for a rented subsidy program for new construction assistance. (5435)	Yes	Passed (202-174)
			A bill to increase to 50% from 33 1/3% the contributions of the federal government to the costs of government employees life insurance programs. (5464)	No	Failed (172-225)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Government and Civil Service</i>			<i>Government and Civil Service</i>		
A conference report to make fiscal 1976 appropriations of \$36.1 billion and transition period appropriations of \$9 billion for Departments of Labor-HEW. (5554)	Yes	Passed (321-91)	A resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1976 and the transition period through September 30, 1976 for agencies whose appropriations had not yet been enacted. (675)	Yes	Passed (309-76)
A motion to recommit to conference and thus kill the bill to make fiscal 1976 appropriations for the Departments of Labor-HEW. (5553)	No	Failed (156-265)	A resolution to provide for a delegation of Members of Congress to go to the United Kingdom to accept a loan of the original Magna Carta. (678)	No	Passed (294-98)
A conference report on resolution to set ceilings for fiscal 1976 of \$374.9 billion for outlays, \$408 billion for budget authority and \$74.1 billion as the federal deficit with a \$300.8 billion revenue floor and \$622.6 billion as the amount of the public debt. (5574)	Yes	Passed (189-187)	An amendment to limit to five instead of 25, the number of members authorized to go to the United Kingdom to accept a loan of the original copy of the Magna Carta, and to limited travel expenses of \$10,000. (677)	No	Failed (94-306)
A conference report on bill to make supplemental appropriations of \$10.3 billion for fiscal 1976 and \$113.8 million for the three month transition period July 1, 1976-September 30, 1976 for several federal departments and agencies. (5581)	Yes	Passed (275-130)	A resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for voting representation for the District of Columbia in Congress. (690)	Yes	Failed (229-181) 2/3 required
A motion to postpone override attempts of the President's veto of bill appropriating \$45 billion for Departments of HEW and Labor and related agencies for fiscal 1976 and transition period. (5608)	Yes	Passed (319-71)	An amendment to give the District of Columbia one voting representative in the House and such further representation in the House and Senate, up to the maximum to which it would be entitled if it were a state. (688)	Yes	Passed (221-188)
An amendment pledging Congress to attempt to cut fiscal 1977 spending to equal any further extension of 1975 tax cuts beyond the January 1 to June 30 extension provided by H.R. 9968. (5611)	Yes	Passed (372-10)	An amendment to provide for voting representation for the District of Columbia only in the House of Representatives. (689)	No	Failed (67-338)
A bill to authorize the 101st Airborne Division Association to erect a memorial in D.C. or surrounding area. (64)	Yes	Passed (400-0)	A resolution to designate April 13, 1976, as Thomas Jefferson Day. (6119)	Yes	Passed (363-2)
A passage, over the President's veto to make fiscal 1976 appropriations of \$36 billion and transition appropriations of \$8 billion for Departments of Labor, HEW and other agencies. (613)	Yes	Passed (310-113)	A resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of Thanksgiving Day 1976, as National Family Week. (6121)	No	Passed (362-5)
An amendment to extend the Renegotiation Act for 5 years and to allow the board to subpoena materials it needed for its renegotiation determinations, and to strengthen the board chairman's administrative authority. (618)	No	Failed (129-251)	A bill to require that population census records be transferred to the National Archives within 50 years of a census and to make such records available after 75 years to persons conducting research for genealogical, historical or medical purposes. (6128)	Yes	Passed (376-4)
An amendment to authorize the House Select Intelligence Committee to file a report on the CIA and other intelligence agencies by January 30, but barring the release of classified information until the study had been certified by the President for publication. (619)	No	Passed (246-124)	An amendment to remove all penalties and fines for refusal to answer census questions. (6129)	Yes	Passed (248-140)
A bill to provide an additional authorization of \$33 million for the completion of the James Madison Memorial Building of the Library of Congress. (640)	Yes	Passed (342-48)	A bill to make supplemental appropriations to include \$2.4 billion for public assistance grants to the states, \$2.6 billion to pay a 5% federal wage increase, and \$1.6 billion for increased veterans benefits. (6141)	Yes	Passed (352-35)
A resolution to require the House Ethics Committee to investigate the circumstances of the publication of a secret report from the Select Intelligence Committee and to make recommendations. (644)	No	Passed (269-115)	A resolution to set fiscal 1977 budget targets of \$454.1 billion in budget authority, \$415.4 billion in outlays, revenues of \$363 billion and a deficit of \$52.4 billion. (6157)	Yes	Passed (221-155)
A resolution to appropriate \$33 million for the James Madison Memorial Building of the Library of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976. (645)	Yes	Passed (336-52)	An amendment to add \$610 million in budget authority and outlays to the veteran's affairs budget category for a possible extension of eligibility for education benefits, in addition to the \$1.2 billion proposed in an amendment. (6147)	No	Passed (218-188)
A bill to raise the temporary debt limit by \$32 billion, to \$627 billion, through June 30, 1976. (647)	Yes	Passed (212-189)	An amendment to increase budget authority and outlays in the veterans affairs budget category. (6148)	Yes	Passed (397-6)
A resolution to grant the Ethics Committee power to subpoena witnesses who are not House members or employees for purposes of investigating the leak of the House Intelligence Committee report. (654)	Yes	Passed (321-85)	An amendment to reduce budget authority for national defense to \$110 billion from \$112 billion and reduce outlays to \$100.3 billion, from \$100.6 billion. (6149)	Yes	Failed (145-255)
A resolution to provide for a delegation of Members of Congress to go to England to accept a loan of the Magna Carta. (667)	No	Failed (167-219)	An amendment to reduce budget authority in the defense category to \$104.5 billion, from \$112 billion and outlays to \$98.1 billion from \$100.6 billion, and transfer the \$2.5 billion reduction to other budget categories. (6151)	No	Failed (85-317)
A bill to authorize \$38 million for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation to implement a plan for the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia and to authorize \$200 million in borrowing authority. (673)	Yes	Failed (149-201)	An amendment to reduce overall budget authority and outlays by a total of \$100 million in order to eliminate \$50 million targeted for national health insurance and \$50 million for a full employment bill. (6152)	No	Failed (153-230)
			An amendment for overall budget authority of \$420.7 billion, outlays of \$400.8 billion, revenues of \$352.1 billion and a deficit of \$48.7 billion. (6155)	No	Failed (145-230)
			An amendment to provide for a balanced budget containing budget authority of \$394.2 billion, outlays of \$363 billion and revenues of \$363 billion. (6156)	No	Failed (105-272)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Government and Civil Service</i>			<i>Government and Civil Service</i>		
An amendment to the bill to give the Civil Service Commission authority to conduct experiments with flexible work schedules in a limited number of federal agencies. (6180)	No	Passed (240-112)	A bill to require the Postal Service to go to Congress annually for all of its appropriations and to reduce the proposed first class rate increase from 13 cents to 12 cents. (5484)	No	Passed (267-113)
An amendment to prohibit a waiver of overtime regulations in experiments with flexible work schedules unless agreed to in a contract between the federal agency and the union representing its employees. (6181)	No	Passed (76-268)	An amendment to require the U.S. Postal Service to go before Congress for its annual authorization and appropriation, and that U.S. Postal Service revenues be deposited in the general Treasury. (5418)	Yes	Passed (267-123)
A conference report to set fiscal 1977 budget targets of outlays of \$413.3 billion, budget authority of \$454.2 billion, revenues of \$363.5 billion and a deficit of \$50.8 billion. (6196)	Yes	Passed (224-170)	An amendment requiring annual congressional authorization and appropriation of public service funds for Postal Service exceeding the \$920 million 1 year authorized under existing law, to authorize \$1.5 billion in additional funds for 1976, and to limit to 2 cents a proposed raise in the first class postage rate. (5481)	Yes	Failed (196-207)
A conference report to make supplemental appropriations of \$9.4 billion for fiscal 1976 and \$2.6 billion for the transition period, including \$2.6 billion for a 5% federal workers' wage increase, \$1.6 billion for veteran's benefits and \$2.7 billion for public grants to the states. (6203)	Yes	Passed (286-100)	An amendment to repeal federal statutes giving the Postal Service a monopoly on processing first class mail, allowing private companies to compete with it in delivering first class mail. (5482)	No	Failed (68-319)
A bill to direct the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives to publish supplements to the D.C. Code of Laws through 1978. (6218)	Yes	Passed (259-48)	A motion to recommit the bill to committee instructing the committee to hold additional hearings on the legislation. (5483)	Yes	Failed (129-250)
A bill to provide for an independent audit of the financial condition of the District of Columbia government. (6219)	Yes	Passed (308-2)	A bill to implement provisions of the Patent Cooperation Treaty for new international procedures in applying for patent protection. (5490)	Yes	Passed (349-5)
A bill to authorize an additional assistant secretary in the Commerce Department for Congressional affairs. (6221)	No	Failed (143-178)	A bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to provide a tabulation of population statistics, upon request, for use by individual states to facilitate the apportionment of state legislatures. (5502)	Yes	Passed (356-2)
A bill to make appropriations of \$1.2 billion for fiscal 1976 and \$248 million for the three month transition between fiscal 1976-77 for the District of Columbia. The appropriation consisted of Treasury funds and city-raised revenues. (6224)	Yes	Passed (350-13)	A bill to transfer certain federal property in the District of Columbia to the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency. (5506)	Yes	Passed (341-0)
An amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill to increase funds for population research by \$16 million. (6333)	No	Failed (122-278)	An amendment to substitute bill to retain federal control over certain areas of D.C. where federal offices were located and to delegate Presidential authority to appoint the director of the National Capitol Service Area. (5507)	No	Passed (201-150)
An amendment to cut by 5% funding for all programs in the Labor-HEW appropriations, with the provision that no funding level fall below its fiscal 1976 total or the President's fiscal 1977 budget, whichever is greater. (6337)	Yes	Failed (143-218)	A bill to make fiscal 1976 supplemental appropriations of \$7.8 billion and \$127.6 million for the transition period for federal departments and agencies. (5520)	Yes	Passed (334-47)
An amendment to provide for a 5% across-the-board cut, with no single program reduced more than 10% in the Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal 1977. (6338)	No	Failed (87-271)	A resolution to provide for the compliance with subpoenas issued by the Grand Jury of the District Court in D.C. for House records of four House Administrative Committee staff members. (6251)	Yes	Passed (388-0)
An adoption of the conference report to appropriate \$8.3 billion for the Treasury Department, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President and other government activities. (6367)	Yes	Passed (318-82)	A bill to extend the federal revenue sharing program to September 30, 1980, and to authorize the distribution of \$24.95 billion as an entitlement to state & local governments. (6263)	Yes	Passed (361-35)
A motion to agree to prohibit the purchase by the General Services Administration of imported stainless steel flatware. (6368)	No	Passed (206-201)	An amendment to delete provisions 1) providing supplemental assistance to local governments based on need, 2) requiring state governments to report plans to modernize local operations, 3) expanding the Davis-Bacon wage requirements, and 4) modifying additional nondiscrimination requirements. (6258)	No	Passed (233-172)
A conference report to appropriate \$6.7 billion in fiscal 1977 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and other agencies. (6373)	Yes	Passed (360-42)	An amendment to require that local governments use 20% of their revenue sharing funds to reduce local property taxes. (6259)	No	Failed (64-340)
A resolution to create a 15-member commission to study House payroll and administration practices. (6376)	Yes	Passed (380-30)	An amendment to accept amendment definition of townships for the distribution of revenue sharing funds. (6260)	No	Failed (158-229)
A motion to recommit the resolution to create a 15-member commission to study House payroll and administrative procedures to the Rules Committee with instructions to amend it to create a bipartisan audit committee. (6375)	No	Failed (143-269)	An amendment to provide that revenue sharing funds be distributed as an entitlement from 1977 to September 30, 1979 be subject to annual congressional appropriations. (6261)	Yes	Failed (150-244)
A resolution to rescind the unilateral authority of the House Administration Committee to alter members' perquisites. (6379)	Yes	Passed (311-92)	An amendment to apply the Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements to all state and local government construction projects funded by federal revenue sharing grants. (6262)	Yes	Failed (174-218)
A motion to recommit the resolution to strip the House Administration Committee of its unilateral power to alter members' perquisites. (6378)	No	Failed (165-236)			
A bill to extend the temporary federal debt ceiling through March 31, 1976, and raise the limit to \$597 billion from \$577 billion. (5480)	No	Failed (178-217)			

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Government and Civil Service</i>			<i>Foreign relations</i>		
A bill to provide fiscal 1977 appropriations of \$8.3 billion for Treasury, Postal Services, and general government operations, including funds for the White House—a level higher than the President's request. (6272)	No	Passed (261-99)	A bill to amend U.N. Participation Act of 1945 and bring the U.S. into compliance with U.N. sponsored economic boycott of Rhodesia. (5410)	Yes	Failed (187-209)
An amendment to prohibit use of funds appropriated by the Treasury, Postal Service, and general government appropriations to be used to pay informers for information relating to tax law violations. (6269)	Yes	Failed (160-187)	An amendment to include all products containing chromium in a prohibition on importation of any steel mill products containing Rhodesian chrome and remove flexibility to admit such products into the U.S. (5409)	No	Failed (160-237)
An amendment to withhold from obligation and expenditure 5% of the total budget authority provided in the Treasury, Postal Service and general government appropriations for payments not required by law. (6270)	No	Failed (159-191)	A bill to authorize fiscal 1976 funds for the Board of International Broadcasting (includes Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty) and provide partial lifting of the embargo on U.S. arms shipments to Turkey. (5433)	Yes	Passed (237-176)
A separate vote on a previously adopted amendment to bar the IRS from using funds appropriated by the bill to compile and make public any record of contacts made by Members of Congress regarding pending matters before the IRS. (6271)	No	Failed (67-291)	An amendment to permit the delivery of arms contracted for by Turkey before February 5, 1976, provided the President certified significant progress had been made on the refugee problem in Cyprus. (5431)	No	Failed (187-229)
A bill to raise the temporary debt limit to \$700 billion through September 30, 1977. (6274)	Yes	Passed (184-177)	An amendment to give congress 60 days after the President reported to congress on the Cyprus situation, to stop the arms deliveries and sales authorized by the bill. (5432)	Yes	Failed (190-223)
A bill to appropriate \$6.5 billion for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal 1977. (6303)	Yes	Passed (208-9)	A motion to concur in amendment to delete a House provision barring the use of State Department funds for negotiating the transfer of U.S. rights in the Canal Zone to Panama. (5442)	No	Passed (212-201)
A motion to recommit the State, Justice, Commerce and Judiciary Appropriations Bill with instructions to cut 5% in new obligational authority from the bill, with no more than 10% of the overall amount in non-obligated authority. (6302)	No	Failed (66-153)	A joint resolution to implement the U.S. proposal for the early warning systems in the Sinai, including the assignment of 200 American civilians to monitor Egyptian and Israeli forces. (5450)	No	Passed (341-69)
A resolution to codify the rules regarding the display and use of the U.S. flag. (6307)	Yes	Passed (352-0)	An amendment to limit to two years the President's authority to assign American monitors to the Sinai to back up the Israeli-Egyptian peace accord. (5449)	Yes	Failed (122-287)
A resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Postal Service should not close small post offices, except in cases of clear and compelling need, or make any other cuts in service for the period of a year following adoption. (6313)	Yes	Passed (399-14)	A bill to extend the U.S. fishing limit to 200 miles under current law, and establish a federal management program for certain species of fish. (5456)	Yes	Passed (208-101)
A bill to appropriate \$43 billion in fiscal 1977 for the Department of HUD, Veteran's Administration, NASA, the National Science Foundation and other independent agencies. The President sought \$45.3 billion. (6321)	Yes	Passed (369-18)	An amendment to allow the President to suspend the enforcement of the 200 mile fishing limit bill if he deemed it in the national interest. (5455)	No	Failed (128-196)
A motion to recommit the HUD, Space, Science, & Veterans' Appropriations bill with instructions that the Committee withhold from obligation and expenditure 5% of the total budget authority provided for payments. (6320)	No	Failed (98-294)	A resolution to condemn the U.N. approval classifying Zionism as a form of racism. (5511)	Yes	Passed (384-0)
A resolution to elect Representative Frank Thompson Jr., Chairman of the House Administration Committee. (6323)	Yes	Passed (295-4)	A conference report to authorize 1976 funds for State Department operations, foreign buildings and 1976-77 funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. (5530)	Yes	Passed (358-52)
A conference report to authorize \$2 billion for job-creating state and local public works projects through fiscal 1977, \$1.25 billion for countercyclical aid to help state and local government maintain services and \$700 million for waste. (6326)	Yes	Passed (328-83)	A bill to allow the federal government to insure foreign art and human endeavors exhibits while on display in the U.S. (5537)	Yes	Passed (253-116)
A motion to delete from the conference report the title of the bill authorizing \$1.25 billion through fiscal 1977 for a countercyclical aid program to help state and local governments maintain services. (6325)	No	Failed (153-259)	A resolution to reaffirm the sense of Congress that the U.S. continues its policy of non-recognition of the annexations by the Soviet Union of the Baltic nations. (5539)	Yes	Passed (407-0)
<i>Foreign relations</i>			A bill to authorize \$2.25 billion as the U.S. share towards Inter-American Development Bank and authorize participation up to \$25 million in the African Development Fund. (5562)	Yes	Passed (249-166)
A bill to authorize \$2.9 billion for foreign aid and development assistance for fiscal 1976-77. (5384)	Yes	Passed (244-155)	A motion to kill bill authorizing \$2.25 billion as the U.S. share of the replenishment of the Inter-American Development Bank and authorize \$25 million in the African Development Fund. (5561)	No	Failed (140-276)
An amendment to forbid aid to countries who deny internationally recognized human rights to its citizens. (5383)	Yes	Passed (238-164)	A conference report on the bill authorizing \$3.1 billion for foreign economic and development assistance for fiscal 1976-77. (5563)	Yes	Passed (265-150)
A motion to recommit the conference report on the State Department Appropriations bill with instructions that conferees insist on language relating to the Panama Canal Treaty negotiations. (5406)	No	Failed (193-200)	An amendment to ban U.S. aid to the anti-Soviet factions fighting in the civil war in Angola except for intelligence gathering. (614)	Yes	Passed (323-99)
An amendment to state the sense of Congress that any new Panama Canal treaty or agreement protect the vital interests of the U.S. (5407)	Yes	Failed (197-203)	A bill to authorize \$3.5 billion in foreign military assistance for fiscal 1976 and to provide new congressional controls on the sale of weapons to foreign nations by the U.S. and private business. (657)	No	Passed (240-169)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Foreign relations</i>			<i>Foreign relations</i>		
An amendment to prohibit military assistance, including cash sales of weapons, to Chile. (655)	Yes	Failed (139-266)	A bill to authorize \$1.05 billion for State Department activities, salaries, and programs in fiscal 1977. (6298)	Yes	Passed (327-22)
An amendment to delete language in the Foreign Military Aid/Sales Bill that would partially lift the U.S. trade embargo against North and South Vietnam if the Vietnamese provided an accounting of U.S. military MIA's. (656)	No	Failed (185-223)	An amendment to strike out the phrase, "protect the vital interests" of the United States in the Panama Canal Zone and insert, "perpetrate the sovereignty and control" of the United States in the zone. (6295)	Yes	Failed (157-197)
A bill to appropriate \$5 billion for foreign military and economic assistance and related programs in fiscal 1976. (664)	No	Passed (214-152)	An amendment to forbid the use of funds for renegotiation of the 1903 Panama Canal Treaty, to specify that any new treaty must, "protect the vital interest of the United States." (6296)	Yes	Passed (229-130)
An amendment to add \$9 million to Foreign Aid Appropriations bill for private and voluntary organizations engaged in international relief programs. (659)	No	Failed (161-237)	An amendment to specify that any new Panama Canal Treaty must, "protect the vital interest of the United States," in the Canal Zone. (6297)	Yes	Passed (339-12)
An amendment to delete \$85.5 million in Foreign Aid Appropriations for the United Nations Development Program. (660)	No	Failed (179-208)	A bill to authorize \$262 million for United States Information Agency programs in fiscal 1977. (6299)	Yes	Passed (313-25)
An amendment to prohibit the use of any funds in the bill for assassination plots against foreign officials and activities designed to influence foreign elections or political activities during peacetime. (661)	Yes	Passed (250-129)	A conference report to authorize \$6.9 billion for military aid programs in fiscal 1976-77 and to impose new controls on the nation's sale of weapons to foreign countries. (6318)	No	Passed (258-146)
An amendment to reduce the \$1.5 billion in military credits allocated to Israel by \$200 million. (662)	Yes	Failed (32-342)	A motion to recommit the bill on foreign military aid with instructions that the House insist that no funds may be used for aid to Mozambique. (6317)	No	Failed (128-279)
An amendment to prohibit aid to nations that were delinquent for more than one year in repaying principal or interest debts owed to the U.S. (663)	Yes	Passed (229-139)	An adoption of conference report to appropriate \$5.2 billion for foreign assistance programs in fiscal 1976 and \$759.3 million for the transition. The President requested \$5.8 billion and \$534.2 million. (6351)	No	Passed (231-158)
A bill to authorize \$81 million in fiscal 1977 for programs and administrative expenses of the Peace Corps. (682)	Yes	Passed (274-75)	A bill to appropriate \$4.8 billion for foreign aid in fiscal 1977. The President requested \$5.5 billion. (6358)	No	Passed (238-169)
A bill to authorize \$25 million for relief and rehabilitation assistance to 1976 earthquake victims in Guatemala. (683)	Yes	Passed (357-3)	An amendment to reduce the appropriation level for the International Development Association to \$192 million from \$330 million. (6355)	No	Failed (165-229)
A bill to authorize \$287 million for the U.S. Information Agency in fiscal 1976 and \$72 million for the budget transition period. (693)	Yes	Passed (327-81)	An amendment to reduce the overall Foreign Aid Appropriations by 5%, except for payments required by law. (6356)	Yes	Failed (187-214)
A conference report to extend the 12 mile exclusive U.S. fishing zone off U.S. coasts to 200 miles in order to protect American fishermen from foreign competition for scarce fish stocks, and to establish eight regional fish conservation councils. (6102)	Yes	Passed (346-52)	An amendment to prohibit funds for any international financial institution that extends loans for production of palm oil exported to the U.S. (6357)	No	Failed (198-210)
A bill to implement the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea. (6122)	Yes	Passed (366-1)	A conference report to authorize \$1.4 billion for State Department, U.S. Information Agency, and Board of International Broadcasting activities in fiscal 1977. (6359)	Yes	Passed (358-45)
A conference report to authorize \$3.2 billion in foreign military assistance for fiscal 1976 and to provide new congressional controls on U.S. arms sales. (6146)	No	Passed (215-185)	<i>Health</i>		
A motion to recommit, and thus kill, the conference report on the bill to authorize \$3.2 billion in foreign military assistance for fiscal 1976 and to provide new congressional controls on U.S. arms sales. (6145)	Yes	Failed (185-214)	A bill to authorize \$699 million in fiscal 1976-78 for federal drug abuse prevention programs and extend the White House Drug Abuse Office through June 30, 1976. (5387)	Yes	Passed (382-11)
A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe to monitor compliance with and violations of the 1975 Helsinki Agreement, particularly its humanitarian principles. (6199)	No	Passed (240-95)	An amendment to eliminate provisions of the bill which would extend the White House Office of Drug Abuse Prevention through June 30, 1976. (5386)	No	Failed (167-235)
A conference report to authorize \$2.25 billion for the U.S. share of Inter-American Development Bank loan funds through fiscal 1979 and providing for U.S. participation in the African Development Fund. (6208)	Yes	Passed (275-120)	A conference report on bill to amend and extend school lunch and other child nutrition programs. (5394)	Yes	Passed (380-7)
A bill to authorize \$3.2 billion in foreign military assistance, weapons sales credits security aid, and related programs for fiscal 1976 and \$3.1 billion for fiscal 1977, and to impose new controls on the sale of military equipment to other countries. (6237)	No	Passed (255-140)	A bill to pass over Presidential veto, the bill to amend and extend the federal school lunch and other child nutrition programs. (5441)	Yes	Passed (397-18)
An amendment to delete language added by the International Relations Committee placing a ceiling on military assistance to South Korea during fiscal 1976-77 of \$290 million. (6236)	No	Passed (241-159)	A bill to authorize \$1.2 billion over 2 years for federal programs to combat heart, lung, and blood diseases, to prevent and control genetic diseases, and to provide research training support. (5459)	Yes	Passed (375-5)
A bill to exempt from tariff certain aircraft components and materials U.S. manufactured and installed in aircraft previously exported and later reimported without increasing in value abroad. (6245)	Yes	Passed (359-4)	A bill to provide federal assistance to health maintenance organizations, which provide a range of health services to patients who pay to a set monthly fee in advance, rather than separate fees for each service. (5501)	Yes	Passed (309-45)
			An amendment to make changes in medicare program for the aged and change medical peer review procedures in the medicare and medicaid programs for the poor. (5606)	Yes	Passed (371-16)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Health</i>			<i>Housing and Urban Affairs</i>		
A bill to give the HEW Secretary authority to assure the safety and effectiveness of medical devices such as heart pacemakers and intrauterine birth control devices. (668)	Yes	Passed (362-32)	An amendment to provide that Social Security cost-of-living increases should not count toward income in the calculation of rents owed by tenants of federally subsidized housing. (6226)	Yes	Passed (260-99)
A resolution to appropriate \$135 million in fiscal 1976 to finance the production of a vaccine to immunize U.S. citizens against swine influenza. (6124)	Yes	Passed (354-12)	An amendment to establish a Federal Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation to make low-interest mortgage loans to middle income families. (6227)	No	Failed (116-243)
A motion to recommit a bill to authorize \$314.8 million in fiscal 1976-79 for health promotion and disease control programs, with instructions that the committee delete provisions pertaining to health promotion. (6130)	No	Failed (185-207)	<i>Justice</i>		
A bill to extend the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay special subsidies to private medical and dental schools in the District of Columbia through fiscal 1977. (6137)	Yes	Passed (264-90)	A bill to authorize \$10 million for the organization and convening of a National Women's Conference in 1976. (5457)	Yes	Passed (233-157)
A conference report to authorize \$1.3 billion in fiscal 1976-78 for federal programs to combat heart, lung, and blood diseases, to prevent and control genetic diseases and to provide research training support for students in advanced scientific fields. (6139)	Yes	Passed (360-0)	A bill to provide federal employees under investigations for misconduct the right to representation during questioning regarding alleged misconduct. (5476)	Yes	Passed (217-163)
An amendment to second supplemental appropriations to add \$60 million for education for the handicapped and \$315 million for grants under the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program. (6140)	Yes	Passed (318-68)	A bill to establish an annual conference of judges, private practitioners, and law professors from the District of Columbia. (5504)	Yes	Passed (337-0)
A bill to authorize \$481.5 million in fiscal 1977-79 for federal programs to prevent and treat alcoholism and alcohol abuse. (6215)	Yes	Passed (271-3)	A bill authorizing \$150,000 annually for nine additional law clerks for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. (5505)	Yes	Passed (310-21)
A bill to authorize \$318.25 million in fiscal 1977-79 for federal health services, research, health statistics and medical library programs. (6217)	Yes	Passed (268-8)	A bill authorizing \$5 million for the organization and convening of a National Women's Conference. (5568)	Yes	Passed (252-162)
A motion to recommit a bill authorizing funds for federal agencies running health services research, health statistics, and medical library programs, with instructions to drop authorization to hire 30 staff members at highest Civil Service salary level. (6216)	No	Failed (111-172)	A bill to allow the Legal Services Corporation for the Poor to make grants and contracts to outside centers specializing in poverty law. (692)	Yes	Passed (256-143)
An amendment to HEW appropriation bill to increase \$24 million funding for mental health research and community centers. (6334)	Yes	Passed (248-136)	A motion to recommit, with instructions that \$300,000 be earmarked for internal security functions of the Judiciary Committee, the bill authorizing \$1.3 million for Judiciary Committee expenses. (698)	No	Failed (158-193)
A conference report to authorize \$600.5 million in fiscal 1977-79 for federal programs to prevent and treat alcoholism and alcohol abuse. (6353)	Yes	Passed (386-6)	A resolution to authorize the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to spend up to \$150,000 in its investigation of the unauthorized release of the final report of the Select Committee on Intelligence. (699)	Yes	Passed (278-87)
A conference report to expand the federal financial commitment to education of handicapped children. (5531)	Yes	Passed (404-7)	An amendment to add \$138 million to the appropriations in the bill for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. (6301)	Yes	Passed (176-95)
<i>Housing and Urban Affairs</i>			<i>Labor</i>		
A bill to provide a program of federal grants to assist low income persons in winterizing dwellings and to encourage state and local governments to include energy conservation standards in building codes. (5378)	Yes	Passed (258-130)	A bill to establish within the Labor Department a committee of labor and contractor representatives to assist in negotiating new contracts and stabilize collective bargaining practices. (5444)	Yes	Passed (302-95)
A bill to authorize \$850 million in fiscal 1977 contract authority for federally subsidized housing programs, to increase funding available for housing programs for the elderly and to extend a number of other housing related programs. (6228)	Yes	Passed (332-27)	A bill to establish a permanent National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life to expand productivity in the private and public sections of the economy. (5478)	No	Passed (208-188)
A motion to commit (and thus kill) the conference report to authorize contract authority for federally subsidized housing, to increase funding for housing for the elderly and extend other housing programs. (6365)	No	Failed (157-250)	An amendment to delete a provision preventing proposed intervening in labor management disputes or negotiations in which the federal government was involved. (5496)	No	Failed (175-233)
A conference report to authorize \$850 million in fiscal 1977 contract authority for federally subsidized housing, to increase funding available for housing for the elderly, and to extend other housing programs. (6366)	Yes	Passed (341-68)	A conference report on the bill to make it legal for a construction union with a grievance against one contractor to picket all other contractors on the same construction site and establish a Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Committee. (5570)	Yes	Passed (229-189)
An amendment to delete certain provisions earmarking fiscal 1977 contract authority and to authorize these funds generally for subsidized housing programs. (6225)	Yes	Passed (260-110)	A conference report to authorize \$6.1 billion for job creating public works projects and antirecession aid to state and local governments. (617)	Yes	Passed (321-80)
			A bill to authorize the continuation through fiscal 1977 of the public employment program, providing up to 320,000 emergency jobs, and to establish a new project-oriented public service jobs program to create 280,000 jobs. (637)	Yes	Passed (239-154)
			An amendment to extend the existing temporary public service jobs programs through fiscal 1977 and to authorize such funds as Congress might appropriate. (635)	No	Failed (175-226)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Labor</i>			<i>National defense</i>		
A second vote to change the formula for allocating funds under the projects-oriented public service jobs programs. (636)	Yes	Failed (189-206)	A bill to terminate veterans' education benefits for persons entering the military after December 31, 1975. (5439)	No	Passed (298-106)
A bill to grant black lung benefits to any miner who had worked in an underground bituminous coal mine for 30 years or who had worked in an underground anthracite coal mine for 25 years and to establish an industry financed trust fund to pay black lung benefits. (652)	Yes	Passed (210-183)	A bill to appropriate \$3.5 billion for Defense Department construction projects in fiscal 1976 and \$359 million for the budget transition period. (5448)	Yes	Passed (353-51)
An amendment to delete the provision that would grant black lung benefits to the widow of any miner who had worked for at least 17 years in underground mines and had been killed in a mine accident prior to 6/30/71. (651)	No	Failed (141-253)	An amendment to delete \$64.9 million in the bill for construction of an armed services medical school at Bethesda, Maryland. (5447)	Yes	Failed (161-255)
A resolution to designate the week beginning March 13, 1977, as National Employ the Older Worker Week. (6120)	Yes	Passed (365-2)	A motion to recommit to committee, the bill to grant a full credit for National Guard technicians' services from January 1, 1969, for retirement annuity computation. (5460)	Yes	Failed (117-261)
A bill to extend through September 30, 1976, the authorization for appropriations of Public Service Jobs Extensions. (6159)	Yes	Passed (287-42)	A bill providing an 8-percent increase in veterans' and survivors pension rates. (5493)	Yes	Passed (400-0)
A separate vote on amendments to earmark 1% of funds in Public Service Jobs Extension Bill for unemployed artists. (6158)	No	Failed (78-246)	A bill to make certain eligibility retirement determinations by the Secretaries of the military departments with armed services personnel, subject to review by the Defense Secretary. (5525)	Yes	Passed (398-4)
A bill to authorize \$2.5 billion through fiscal 1977 to support state and local public works projects in areas of high unemployment. (6198)	Yes	Passed (339-57)	A bill to extend until June 30, 1976, the authority to pay bonuses to officers exposed to nuclear hazards in their jobs in the Navy and to extend entitlement of special \$100/month pay to optometrists and veterinarians in service. (5526)	Yes	Passed (372-34)
A bill to establish a program to employ young adults in public service conservation projects on public lands. (6222)	Yes	Passed (291-70)	A bill to raise the maximum allowable reimbursement of military travel on official business to \$35/day, and to raise the travel allowance when expenses exceed the allowable per diem to \$50/day. (5527)	Yes	Passed (351-55)
An amendment to add \$66.6 million to the Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill for summer youth employment programs. (6327)	Yes	Passed (205-201)	A bill to limit to 60 days the number of unused leave days an enlisted member of the service may take during his career. (5528)	Yes	Passed (399-3)
An amendment to prohibit fines against farmers who employed five or fewer employees for violations of Occupational Safety & Health Administration regulations, were willful, repeated, or serious. (6330)	Yes	Failed (151-245)	A conference report to appropriate \$3.6 billion for military construction projects in the United States and overseas in fiscal 1976 and \$359.1 million for the transition. The President requested \$4.1 billion and \$359.1 million. (5529)	Yes	Passed (349-59)
An amendment to exempt farming operations in which 10 or fewer persons were employed from OSHA regulations. (6331)	Yes	Passed (273-124)	Adoption of report on bill to appropriate \$90.5 billion for Defense Department programs in fiscal 1976, and \$21.9 billion for the transition period. (5576)	No	Passed (314-57)
An amendment to prohibit first instance citations for OSHA violations against businesses that employed 10 or fewer persons. (6332)	Yes	Passed (231-161)	A bill to extend through June 30, 1976, from December 31, 1975, the Federal Renegotiations Board which reviews defense and space contracts and eliminates excess profits to contractors. (5577)	Yes	Passed (395-5)
A second vote requested on Labor-HEW appropriations amendment to add \$66.6 million for summer youth employment programs. (6339)	Yes	Passed (183-181)	A bill to authorize \$445 million in fiscal 1976 for maritime programs of the Commerce Department including maritime training and education at the Merchant Marine Academy and State-operated schools. (671)	Yes	Passed (315-42)
<i>National defense</i>			An amendment to increase cadet student subsidies at six State maritime academies to \$1,200 a year from \$600 a year. (670)	No	Failed (53-292)
A resolution to establish a committee to investigate U.S. servicemen missing in action in Indochina. (5385)	Yes	Passed (394-3)	A bill to establish a national cemetery in Quantico, Va. (6118)	Yes	Passed (358-8)
A bill appropriating \$90.2 billion for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1976 and \$21.7 billion for the budget transition period July-September 1976, for its programs. (5429)	Yes	Passed (353-61)	A bill to authorize \$304 million in fiscal 1977 for procurement of Coast Guard vessels and aircraft and for the construction of facilities. (6123)	Yes	Passed (358-9)
An amendment to add \$5 million to the bill for army recruiting counseling services. (5420)	No	Failed (112-296)	A bill to authorize \$34 million supplemental funds for fiscal 1976, and \$23 million for the July-September transition for nuclear weapons research development and testing. (6125)	Yes	Passed (311-66)
An amendment restoring \$15.6 million cut by the Appropriations Committee for army recruiting activities. (5421)	No	Failed (177-228)	A bill to authorize appropriations of \$33.3 billion for weapons procurement and military research and development programs of the Defense Department in fiscal 1977. (6136)	Yes	Passed (298-52)
An amendment to require disclosure of the funds appropriated for the CIA contained in an Air Force account in the bill. (5423)	Yes	Failed (147-267)	An amendment to defer expenditure for \$960 million recommended in the bill for purchase of three B-1 bombers until the President certified to Congress, after February 1, 1977, that the purchase was in the national interest and Congress approved the purchase by concurrent resolution. (6131)	Yes	Failed (177-210)
An amendment to delete \$58.2 million recommended for research and development of the F-18 Navy combat fighter aircraft. (5425)	Yes	Failed (173-243)			
An amendment to prohibit use of funds for relocation of the National Oceanographic Office headquarters from Suitland, Maryland to Bay St. Louis. (5426)	No	Passed (219-193)			
An amendment to prohibit use of funds in the bill to close any military installations designated in the amendment. (5427)	No	Failed (130-274)			
A second vote to prohibit use of funds in the bill for relocation of the National Oceanographic Office headquarters from Suitland, Maryland to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi. (5428)	Yes	Failed (190-220)			

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>National defense</i>			<i>National defense</i>		
An amendment to place in escrow \$350 million authorized for long leadtime items for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier until the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House conducted a joint study of the need for the ship. (6132)	Yes	Failed (182-195)	A conference report to appropriate \$3.3 billion for fiscal 1977 for military construction programs and family housing for the armed services. The President requested \$3.5 billion. (6380)	Yes	Passed (357-26)
An amendment to prohibit flight testing of maneuvering re-entry vehicles if the impact point was less than 100 miles from the nearest land. (6133)	No	Failed (95-267)	<i>Politics and political system</i>		
An amendment to reduce the number of U.S. troops overseas by 47,000. (6134)	No	Failed (88-275)	A resolution to disapprove the "point of entry" regulation of the Federal Election Commission requiring the House and Senate candidates to file campaign reports first with the Federal Election Commission. (5458)	No	Failed (220-169) 2/3 required
An amendment to prohibit reductions by more than half in the operations of military bases in the United States unless Congress was notified of such reductions before March 15, 1973. (6135)	Yes	Failed (152-202)	A bill to give federal employees the right to participate in partisan political campaigns or to run for state or federal office. (5463)	Yes	Passed (288-119)
A bill to authorize \$3.3 billion for military construction projects in fiscal 1977. (6184)	Yes	Passed (299-14)	An amendment to prohibit employees from running for any full-time or federal elective office or from participating in campaigns for a federal office. (5461)	No	Failed (147-260)
An amendment to provide that no military base be closed or have its civilian personnel reduced by more than 50 percent or 700 workers, whichever number is smaller, unless Congress received a year in advance notice from the Defense Department. (6182)	Yes	Failed (82-237)	A motion to recommit to committee the bill giving federal employees the right to participate in partisan political campaigns and run for office. (5462)	No	Failed (81-327)
An amendment to permit the Government to pay laborers at military construction projects the locally prevailing wage rates by exempting it from the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. (6183)	No	Failed (35-279)	A resolution to disapprove the regulation of the Federal Election Commission requiring House and Senate candidates to file their campaign finance reports first with the Commission. (5466)	No	Passed (257-148)
A bill to provide a system of special accession and retention bonuses for officers of the U.S. Navy and the nuclear surface fleet who were trained in nuclear engineering. (6186)	Yes	Passed (322-27)	A bill to assure American citizens who lived outside the U.S. the right to vote in federal elections. (5569)	Yes	Passed (374-43)
A bill to make permanent the veterans home loan guarantee and direct home loan programs and to increase to \$30,000 the maximum allowable direct loan. (6202)	Yes	Passed (386-2)	A conference report to give federal employees the right to participate in partisan political campaigns and to run for local, state, and federal office. (6101)	Yes	Passed (241-164)
A conference report to authorize \$3.3 billion for military construction projects in fiscal 1977. (6286)	Yes	Passed (375-20)	A bill to reconstitute the Federal Elections Commission and to make revisions in the 1974 campaign finance law. (6112)	Yes	Passed (241-155)
A bill to appropriate \$3.4 billion for military construction and family housing for the armed services in fiscal 1977. The President had requested \$3.6 billion. (6288)	Yes	Passed (361-22)	An amendment to strike the section providing that Federal Election Commission advisory opinions be issued as regulations to give Congress the opportunity to disapprove them. (6104)	No	Failed (134-269)
An amendment to cut new obligational authority by 5 percent, but providing that no one project be reduced by more than 10 percent. (6287)	Yes	Failed (151-232)	An amendment to delete provisions providing out the requirement that federal candidates file duplicate campaign finance reports with the local Secretaries of State. (6105)	Yes	Passed (293-111)
A bill to appropriate \$105.4 billion for operations and programs of the Defense Department for fiscal 1977. The President had requested \$106.8 billion. (6294)	Yes	Passed (331-53)	An amendment to require unions and corporations to disclose spending on certain internal political communications with their employees or members. (6107)	No	Failed (175-220)
An amendment to add \$10 million to the Army budget and cut \$17 million from the Navy budget for consolidation of helicopter training programs. (6290)	Yes	Passed (288-110)	An amendment to delete provisions providing for termination of the Federal Election Commission after March 31, 1977, by vote of either the House or Senate. (6108)	Yes	Passed (276-120)
An amendment to eliminate \$111.7 million from the bill by abolishing the 1 percent add-on to cost-of-living retiree's pay. (6291)	Yes	Passed (331-64)	An amendment to provide for the public financing of congressional general election campaigns. (6110)	Yes	Failed (121-274)
An amendment to cut \$350 million for long leadtime procurement for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. (6292)	Yes	Failed (179-213)	A motion to recommit the bill for public financing of federal election political campaigns with instructions to report the bill back with an amendment for a simple reconstitution of the FEC with presidentially appointed members. (6111)	No	Failed (153-246)
An amendment to defer until February 1, 1977, obligation of funds appropriated for procurement of the first three regular production B-1 bombers. (6293)	Yes	Failed (186-207)	A bill to prohibit deprivation of employment to persons working for federal, state, or local government who failed to make political contributions. (6117)	Yes	Passed (358-3)
A bill to provide an 8 percent increase in benefits for service connected disabled veterans and eligible dependents. (6305)	Yes	Passed (351-0)	A bill to pas, over the President' veto, the bill to give federal employees the right to participate in partisan political campaigns and to run for local, state, or federal office. (6150)	Yes	Failed (243-160) 2/3 required
A bill to make permanent the 8 percent increase provided for eligible veterans, widows, and other dependents and to provide a 7 percent cost-of-living increase benefits, effective January 1, 1977, and to raise the limitation on outside income that recipients may earn. (6306)	Yes	Passed (354-0)	A conference report to reconstitute the Federal Election Commission and revise the 1974 campaign finance law. (6163)	Yes	Passed (291-81)
A conference report to authorize \$32.5 billion for major weapon systems and military research and development programs of the Defense Department. (6371)	No	Passed (339-66)	A bill to impose limits on the amount of money tax exempt public charities could spend for lobbying to influence legislation. (6246)	Yes	Passed (355-14)
A motion to recommit, and thus kill, the conference report to authorize \$32.5 billion for major weapons systems. (6370)	Yes	Failed (112-298)	<i>Science and technology</i>		
			A bill to authorize \$160 million in fiscal 1976-80 for a project promoting the use of electric vehicles. (5375)	Yes	Passed (308-60)

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Science and technology</i>			<i>Social conditions and services</i>		
A bill establishing an Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President with its director serving as the President's personal adviser on federal science. (5498)	Yes	Passed (362-28)	An amendment to increase by \$10 million funding for multipurpose senior citizen centers. (6335)	Yes	Passed (318-67)
A bill to authorize \$3.7 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1977. (684)	Yes	Passed (330-35)	An amendment to prohibit use of Labor-HEW appropriations to pay for or to promote abortions. (6336)	No	Passed (207-167)
A bill to authorize \$801 million in fiscal 1977 for the National Science Foundation. (697)	Yes	Passed (358-33)	A second vote requested on amendment to prohibit use of funds in the Labor-HEW appropriations to pay for or to promote abortions. (6340)	No	Passed (199-165)
An amendment to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to respond to written requests for information from Members of Congress within 15 days. (695)	No	Failed (136-257)	An amendment to reduce budget authority in the income security function to \$155.7 billion, from \$156.7 billion, and outlays to \$138.2 billion, from \$139.2 billion in order to reflect possible savings in the food stamp program. (6154)	No	Failed (147-229)
An amendment to shift \$1.4 million in authorized funds from pre-college curriculum programs to summer training programs for elementary and secondary school science teachers. (696)	No	Failed (160-232)	<i>Sports and recreation</i>		
A conference report to authorize \$3.7 billion in fiscal 1977 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (6213)	Yes	Passed (255-20)	A bill to establish the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington and thus prevent the construction of two hydroelectric power dams on the Snake River. (5533)	Yes	Passed (342-53)
<i>Social conditions and services</i>			A bill to establish the Valley Forge National Historical Park in Pennsylvania. (6244)	Yes	Passed (364-4)
A conference report to suspend the duty on imported natural graphite until 1978 and to suspend staffing requirements of federally funded day care centers. (5451)	Yes	Passed (383-10)	A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-Six Star Fort National Battlefield in South Carolina. (6247)	Yes	Passed (359-7)
An amendment to restrict eligibility for food stamp funds in the bill to families whose aggregate household income was within the poverty level set by the Office of Management and Budget. (5509)	No	Failed (159-231)	A bill to authorize \$49.3 million for planning, design and construction of winter sports facilities at Lake Placid, New York, for the 1980 Olympic Winter Games. (6267)	Yes	Passed (179-147)
A bill to increase the federal share of funding for community action programs serving the poor to 80% through fiscal 1977. (5534)	Yes	Passed (244-172)	<i>Transportation and public works</i>		
A conference report to authorize \$1.7 billion in fiscal 1976-78 for programs under the Older Americans Act assisting the elderly and for senior volunteer programs run by Action. (5535)	Yes	Passed (404-6)	A bill to authorize \$240 million in federal grants providing unemployed railroad workers with jobs rehabilitating the nation's railroads. (5475)	Yes	Passed (261-129)
A bill to amend Social Security Act to provide uniform hearing procedures for claims under certain titles. (5536)	Yes	Passed (370-0)	A motion to recommend the conference report with instructions that no funds be appropriated for certain railroad terminals. (5509)	No	Failed (158-231)
An amendment to reduce backlog of cases appealing the denial of Social Security and other benefits, to make other minor changes in Social Security. (5607)	Yes	Passed (390-0)	A motion to concur the amendment to limit obligations for certain highway construction programs to \$9 billion. (5510)	No	Passed (297-95)
A bill to make technical and conforming changes in the 1974 act creating a Community Services Administration to replace the Office of Economic Opportunity. (672)	Yes	Failed (346-2)	An amendment to delete from bill provisions creating an Office of Rail Public Counsel in the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5591)	No	Failed (187-224)
A bill to allow elderly persons, regardless of their income, to continue to receive social services at federally supported senior citizens centers. (674)	Yes	Passed (383-0)	An amendment to delete from bill provisions allowing freight forwarders to enter into contracts with railroads. (5592)	Yes	Passed (222-196)
A bill to provide \$125 million through September 30, 1976 to help states comply with health, safety and staffing standards for day care centers serving low-income families. (687)	Yes	Passed (316-72)	An amendment to reduce the level of federal commuter subsidy for rail services to 50% from 75% in a 13 month period from August 30, 1976 to September 30, 1977. (5594)	No	Failed (181-231)
A motion to recommit to conference the bill to provide \$125 million to help states comply with standards for federally supported day care centers. (686)	No	Failed (153-237)	A bill to authorize \$10.9 billion for federal aid highway programs in fiscal 1977 and 1978 and \$4 billion annually for construction of segments of the Interstate Highway System through fiscal 1988. (5602)	Yes	Passed (410-7)
A bill to provide a payment of \$50,000 to the family of any law enforcement officer killed in the line of duty. (6161)	Yes*	Passed (199-93)	An amendment to reduce annual Federal Aid Highway authorizations of fiscal 1977-78 by \$750 million and delete language giving the Secretary of Transportation authority for distribution of the funds. (5598)	No	Failed (103-309)
A separate vote on previously adopted amendment to deduct death benefits paid to the family of a slain officer from the general revenue sharing funds of the employer of the deceased. (6160)	No*	Failed (98-202)	An amendment to provide that the cost of highway projects rejected for mass transit be based on 1972 estimates, the mileage withdrawn from one state's highway system be available in another, and right-of-way sales proceeds be returned to the government. (5599)	No	Failed (122-294)
A bill to provide a \$50,000 payment to the family of any firefighter killed in the line of duty. (6162)	Yes*	Passed (178-80)	An amendment to roll back the maximum weight of trucks allowed on interstate highways to 73,280 pounds from 80,000 pounds. (5600)	No	Failed (139-275)
A bill to pass, over the President's veto, the bill to provide \$125 million through September 30, 1976 to help states comply with health, safety, and staffing standards for federally supported day care centers serving low-income families. (6170)	Yes	Passed (301-101)	An amendment to allow cities of over 200,000 population that supplied over 50% of funds for an area program to plan a highway project and to submit a plan directly to the Transportation Department for funding if the state had not forwarded the plan within a year of the plans' approval. (5601)	Yes	Failed (121-290)
A bill to extend through fiscal 1978 the volunteer programs administered by Action. (6171)	Yes	Passed (367-31)	A bill authorizing \$4.76 billion for airport development and other aviation activity for a five-year period. (5605)	Yes	Passed (368-16)
A bill to require stricter accountability of food stamp vendors. (6315)	Yes	Passed (407-0)			

ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME	ISSUE	MY VOTE	OUTCOME
<i>Transportation and public works</i>			<i>Transportation and public works</i>		
An amendment to delete language placing a ceiling on the use of funds for development of airport terminals. (5603)	Yes	Passed (246-138)	A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to issue aviation war risk insurance until May 7, 1977. (6201)	Yes	Passed (392-1)
An amendment to prohibit federally funded airports from permitting the landing of supersonic aircraft for period of six months. (5604)	Yes	Passed (199-188)	A bill to authorize \$35 million for each fiscal 1977-78 for rail safety programs and to strengthen federal safety regulations. (6266)	Yes	Passed (332-11)
A conference report to authorize \$6.5 billion in financial assistance to the nation's railroads and lessen federal regulation of the railroad industry by the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5612)	Yes	Passed (205-150)	An amendment to give the Secretary of Transportation the discretion to allow railroads fined for safety violations to invest the amount of the fine into the railroads safety programs. (6265)	No	Failed (37-298)
A motion to rescind House and Senate actions in adopting the conference report and recommit S. 2718 on railroad revitalization. (65)	Yes	Passed (383-15)	A bill to appropriate \$5.3 billion in new budget authority and \$8.9 billion in liquidating authority for the Transportation Department. The President requested \$5.4 billion. (6350)	Yes	Passed (376-21)
A bill to authorize \$11.2 million in fiscal 1976-77 for the Transportation Department to carry out the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act, and to strengthen the authority to enforce the prohibition against auto odometer tampering. (612)	Yes	Passed (369-18)	An amendment to prohibit use of funds in Transportation appropriations for commercial flights of SST jets to land at U.S. airports until the aircraft could meet federal noise standards. (6347)	Yes	Failed (126-269)
A conference report to authorize \$6.1 billion in grants and loans for the nation's railroads and to ease federal regulation of the rail industry by the ICC. (615)	Yes	Passed (353-62)	An amendment to prohibit use of funds in Transportation appropriations for commercial flights of SST jets to land at JFK Airport in New York unless the aircraft met federal noise standards. (6348)	Yes	Failed (170-28)
A bill to authorize \$53.5 million to expand the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore on the southeastern coast of Lake Michigan. (639)	Yes	Passed (272-118)	An amendment to delete sections of the Transportation Appropriations bill that placed ceilings on the amount of money that could be obligated for highways and highway safety. (6349)	Yes	Passed (251-146)
A resolution to appropriate \$2.1 billion in order to provide for the purchase of Consolidated Rail Corporation securities by the U.S. Railway Association for fiscal 76, 77, 78, 79 and the transition. (641)	Yes	Passed (298-95)	A conference report to authorize \$5.6 billion for airport development and other aviation projects over the period, fiscal 1976-80. (6369)	Yes	Passed (309-103)
A conference report to appropriate \$2.1 billion for funding of federal railroad programs in fiscal 1976 and the transition and for purchase of Conrail securities by the U.S. Railroad Association. (694)	Yes	Passed (288-105)	A motion to delete from the conference report Title II, which authorized a counter cyclical aid program to help state and local governments to provide basic services. (616)	No	Failed (133-268)

SADAT SPEAKS FRANKLY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Ford administration recently sold six C-130 military air transports to Egypt. At the time, the Egyptian Armed Forces were already gorged with weapons and needed no such additional equipment. I opposed the transaction because I feared it would not only aggravate an already-volatile situation, but would also inaugurate an unnecessary arms supply relationship between Washington and Cairo. Clearly, military support of the Sadat regime would gain no more lasting influence for us than it had for the Soviet Union.

The administration argued vigorously—but without factual support—that the Soviets had cut off all aid to Egypt and that country's defense posture was weakened.

Now we learn from President Sadat that his country is neither so docile nor so helpless as the administration had led us to believe.

One week ago today, President Sadat declared that, despite the Soviet arms embargo, Egypt is now militarily ready to take back occupied lands held by Israel if a peaceful solution falls.

According to Defense Space Business Daily, Sadat stated on August 3:

The Soviet Union, until today, has refused to sell us weapons to replace our losses. But, in spite of this, I emphasize that the armed forces are fully equipped and prepared to perform their mission, which is to defend national soil and liberate occupied lands if the peaceful solution falls.

Does "fully equipped" now include U.S. C-130's?

WASTEWATER FUNDING SECTION VIOLATES INTENT OF JOBS BILL

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a section in the Public Works Employment Appropriation bill which runs exactly contrary to the stated purposes of this legislation and which discriminates against many States with high unemployment. The Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, reported this bill this morning following the Congress' recent vote to override the Presidential veto of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976.

The section to which I object is in both these measures and deals with waste-

water treatment facilities construction grants. Not only does this section fail to target areas of high employment—the objective of the bills as we were led to understand them—but resorts to a back-door method of correcting inequities. The inequities pertain to previous allocations of construction grant funds as disbursed under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. I think it is important that my colleagues are aware of the tactics which were involved to flaunt the intent of this bill.

A total of \$9 billion in construction grant funds, which had been impounded, was made available by court action in 1975. These revenues were allotted on the basis of wastewater treatment needs surveys conducted in 1971 and 1973. A 1974 needs survey indicated that 37 States would have received more funds under a formula based on more recent data plus 1990 population estimates.

A Senate proposal, the so-called Talmadge-Nunn formula—sought to redistribute the \$9 billion in accordance with the more up-to-date figures. The formula was later revised to increase those States which would have gained from the redistribution without reducing States which would have lost. The \$1.4 billion additional which such a redistribution required was added as an amendment to the Public Works Employment Act of 1976 when it was considered by the Senate. This funding was not contained in the House authorization bill. When the

measure was considered in conference, the \$1.4 billion figure was reduced to \$700 million.

The effect of the Talmadge-Nunn formula is to exclude many of the States with serious unemployment problems from receiving additional funds. In fact, of the 10 States where unemployment is the highest, only two would benefit. None of the New England States, where unemployment averages nearly 9 percent, would receive any money. Nor would my own State of Pennsylvania. Nor would many other large industrial States with severe unemployment problems, including New York, New Jersey, California, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, Delaware, Virginia, Indiana, or Minnesota.

On the other hand, some States with relatively low unemployment, but which are deserving under the Talmadge-Nunn proposal, would receive substantial sums. Foremost among these is Texas—the State which would receive the most in Federal dollars. Ironically, it is a State for which unemployment figures are not available.

A complete listing of the States and their anticipated funding under the Talmadge-Nunn amendment follows:

A COMPARISON OF STATES WHICH RECEIVE FUNDS FROM THE NUNN-TALMADGE AMENDMENT WITH UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES IN PERCENTAGES

State	Amount	Unemployment (percent)
Total	\$700,000,000	
Alabama	34,300,000	6.6
Alaska	6,370,000	9.7
Arizona	32,830,000	7.4
Arkansas	26,180,000	5.4
California		9.6
Colorado	21,280,000	NA
Connecticut		9.1
Delaware		7.6
District of Columbia		7.2
Florida	20,790,000	9.9
Georgia	39,900,000	NA
Hawaii	4,200,000	8.5
Idaho	7,420,900	NA
Illinois		6.7
Indiana		5.2
Iowa	2,590,000	4.5
Kansas	20,300,000	3.6
Kentucky	18,900,000	5.6
Louisiana	24,570,000	7.5
Maine		7.3
Maryland	10,570,000	5.8
Massachusetts		8.0
Michigan		9.7
Minnesota		4.8
Mississippi	18,550,000	5.3
Missouri	10,290,000	4.8
Montana	4,410,000	6.0
Nebraska	5,390,000	4.3
Nevada	910,000	8.0
New Hampshire		4.2
New Jersey		9.2
New Mexico	7,910,000	6.1
New York		8.9
North Carolina	46,550,000	5.8
North Dakota	7,420,000	4.4
Ohio		6.9
Oklahoma	25,480,000	7.4
Oregon	1,960,000	9.0
Pennsylvania		7.6
Rhode Island		9.5
South Carolina	20,440,000	5.8
South Dakota	6,230,000	3.8
Tennessee	21,070,000	7.3
Texas	129,220,000	NA
Utah	13,020,000	5.7
Vermont		9.0
Virginia		5.0
Washington	17,430,000	8.3
West Virginia	49,980,000	5.4
Wisconsin	18,550,000	5.4
Wyoming	6,370,000	3.5
American Samoa	1,120,300	NA
Guam	2,100,000	NA
Puerto Rico	8,540,000	NA
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	6,860,000	NA

Source of employment percentages: "Employment and Earnings," U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 1976 figures are used.

Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding about the wastewater treatment facilities, I object not only to the Talmadge-Nunn formula, but also to the wisdom of including these projects in this particular bill. I joined in a successful effort by the full Appropriations Committee this morning to reduce this grant funding from \$700 million to \$200 million, but I hasten to point out that this only reduces the size of the mistake and does not eliminate it. This problem still persists—States with high unemployment do not get most of the money.

As many may not be aware, the Environmental Protection Agency had testified that only \$200 million of the \$700 million authorized could be obligated in fiscal year 1977. The amendment also directed the funding only to those States which have exhausted previous authorizations and currently are prepared to receive and use the additional revenues.

In spite of this reduction, I still object to the inequitable distribution formula and am totally opposed to its inclusion in a bill purported to create jobs and reduce unemployment. If we are going to make a positive attempt to combat unemployment, then we should do just that. We should not include extraneous programs—programs of a political nature—in such a bill.

The Public Works Employment Act was sold to the American people as a high-priority jobs program—one which would stimulate the economy by putting people back to work. The inclusion of money for wastewater treatment facilities grants—money which was not even intended to reach areas of high unemployment—was deceitful, and the public should be aware of this.

REIMBURSEMENT OF PHYSICIAN EXTENDERS UNDER MEDICARE

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill which I originally introduced in May of last year. This legislation would amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for the reimbursement of physician extenders who perform Medicare eligible services when a physician is not actually present.

There is a desperate need in the medically under-served rural and urban areas of our Nation for primary health care services. During the last decade physician extenders have proven that they can provide high quality, professional care at a low cost—if the funds are available to keep their clinics in operation.

To date, their funding has come from various agencies at all levels of Government and from the communities in which these clinics are located. But many of these agencies will soon run out of funds themselves and the clinics will have to close without having become

self-supporting. They cannot become financially secure and continue to serve the medically needy in large part because medicare reimbursement is not available to them for medicare eligible services. This is in spite of the fact that their counterparts in clinics which have a physician on the premises are reimbursed for identical services.

In my opinion, the remedy of this deplorable situation would be enough to recommend the amendment of the Social Security Act to allow for the reimbursement of physician extenders. But there is another, less obvious benefit to be reaped from the proposed amendment of the law:

Reimbursement of physician extenders will result in a net savings to the medicare system.

In a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means during his subcommittee's hearings on the rising costs of hospital care, I set out the savings which have resulted from the use of physician extenders.

Mr. Speaker, so that all of my colleagues can be made aware of the cost savings for which these health professionals have been responsible, I am inserting my letter to the chairman, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1976.

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I greatly appreciate this opportunity to propose for your subcommittee's consideration a solution to the problem of rising hospital costs during its deliberation of this issue.

The solution to this problem, in my opinion, lies in the expanded use of physician extenders (nurse practitioners, physicians' assistants, and "Medex") in situations where a physician cannot always be present. Physician extenders provide readily available primary health care which keeps people well and out of hospitals. I believe that reimbursement under Medicare is of primary importance in order to ensure the continued use and expansion of physician extenders' services.

Physician extender programs have been in operation for over a decade and experience during that time has shown that clinics managed by these professionals are the best solution to the chronic problems of access and cost for under-served rural and urban areas of this Nation. Moreover, study after study has shown that—not only does health service improve with the use of these clinics—but total medical costs, including Medicare costs, actually decrease.

All of the reliable studies conducted on a first-hand basis lead to the conclusion that the use of physician extenders in primary health care clinics lower total hospital costs significantly:

A STUDY OF DIABETES

A study of diabetes mellitus sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health and conducted by the Fogarty International Center this year, made some remarkable findings. In the study, 555 diabetics were transferred from city hospital clinics to decentralized, physician extender-staffed clinics for maintenance care. The results were impressive: the

cost of ambulant care received in the decentralized locations was one-fifth the cost of comparable care rendered in medical center facilities. A visit to a neighborhood clinic cost \$4 compared to \$20 for a hospital outpatient visit and \$35 for an emergency ward visit. When the pattern of hospitalization for the two year period before and after transfer was examined, a 49% reduction in hospital days and a 42% reduction in hospital discharges were found. There was an approximate reduction of 44% in the cost of continuing care as compared to the cost by conventional methods used before the transfer to physician extender-staffed clinics. ("Improving the Organization of Care for the Chronically Ill," *Diabetes Mellitus*, Forgarty International Center Series on Preventive Medicine, Vol. 4, 1976.)

DIABETES, HYPERTENSION, CARDIAC DISEASE

In another study conducted by John W. Runyan, Jr., M.D., and reported in the "Journal of the American Medical Association," similar results were found for those sick with diabetes, hypertension, and cardiac disease. The change in the number of hospital days for diabetics declined 49.4%; for those with hypertension, a decline of 52.3% was found; and for those with cardiac disease a decline of 49.3% was evidenced. Patients with these diseases who continued to be treated at hospital clinics experienced an increase in hospital days over the same period of 43.0%!

What should be of particular interest is the fact that those of Medicare age—those over 60—experienced a decline in total hospital days of 52.7% under the care of physician extender-staffed clinics. ("The Memphis Chronic Disease Program; Comparisons in Outcome and the Nurses' Extended Role," *JAMA*, January 20, 1975.)

FRONTIER NURSING SERVICE EXPERIENCE

A study by Karen Gordon of Yale University School of Public Health, and Gertrude Isaacs of the Frontier Nursing Service, Heyden, Kentucky, indicated that 239 diabetic patients using nurse practitioner clinics averaged 41% fewer hospital days than the national average for these types of patients—or a savings of 3.2 days per patient per year. A spokesman for the Frontier Nursing Service has also testified that their patients over age 65 had 70% fewer hospitalizations than other elderly patients from neighboring communities without physician extenders. (Mr. Harry Teter, Jr., Executive Director, Appalachian Regional Commission and Ms. Gertrude Isaacs, Sc.D., Testimony before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, Knoxville, Tennessee, July 22-23, 1976.)

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION CLINICS

A survey of the 200 Appalachian Commission clinics which serve thirteen States showed that 12% to 25% of their 300,000 users would have been hospitalized were the clinics not available. Moreover, the average patient visit in A.R.C. clinics cost only \$14.00. Physician reasonable charge reimbursement, according to the Social Security Administration, ranged from \$12.00 to \$22.00 for the same service in F.Y. 1975. (Mr. Harry Teter, Jr., Testimony before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, July 22-23, 1976.)

What would explain the astonishing decrease in hospitalization and its resultant costs? The answer seems clear. Several factors were introduced to the group which was treated by physician extenders rather than by hospital staff:

First, professional care and advice are easier for the patients to obtain when the rigid appointment system characteristic of the hospital clinic is removed.

Second, patients are given the opportunity to call the clinics if in need of medical

assistance, and appropriate advice is given or home visits are made.

Third, the same medical protocols and opportunities to obtain selected laboratory tests prevail whether the patient is seen in the decentralized clinic or at home.

Fourth, missed appointments are followed up by clinic staff.

Fifth, drugs are actually dispensed directly to the patient while being seen by the physician extender. This creates the opportunity for patient education and counseling and it is thought that patient compliance is greatly enhanced as a result.

The Federal government has not been oblivious to the valuable role played by physician extenders. The Bureau of Health Manpower of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is already spending in excess of \$15 million per year to train physician extenders. The approximately 2,800 graduates now receive an annual salary of between \$12,000 and \$25,000—and many of these receive part or all of it from Federal programs or grants. The Federal government has made a commitment to physician extenders yet the absurdity is that another arm of the government does not think that the services are valuable enough to qualify for reimbursement under Medicare when rendered in physician extender-staffed clinics! This is in spite of the fact that these professionals have shown that they can save the Medicare system many times the estimated \$10 million per year it would take to reimburse them under Medicare.

In order to correct this incongruity, I introduced legislation in May of 1975 which would allow for the reimbursement of physician extenders for Medicare eligible services rendered when a physician was not physically present. More recently, as you know, Congressman James Symington introduced a similar bill and on the Senate side, Senators Pearson and Huddleston have introduced legislation which would remedy the situation.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that during your subcommittee's deliberation of how best to control rising hospital costs, you will give close and serious study to the outstanding work done by our nation's physician extenders. They have proven their value to the patient and to the Medicare system.

With best regards,

JAMES T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

INFLATION AND TAXES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the debate on tax reform and tax equity often gives scant recognition to one of the most serious tax burdens. This is the problem of increased taxation because of inflated wages. As wages and salaries increase to reflect productivity gains and inflation, the tax rate increases at a greater pace due to the progressive structure of the Tax Code. The attempt to maintain one's income in the face of inflation is frustrated by higher taxes.

Very little information is available about this area of taxation. I have introduced legislation to provide annual statistics on the interaction of inflation, income and taxes. A similar provision was included in the Tax Reform Act by

the Senate. Two articles, one by our able colleague from New York, Mr. CONABLE, the other by a national news journal, U.S. News & World Report, further describe the problem:

TAX PERSPECTIVES

(By Hon. BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, August 12.—I sometimes get embarrassed at the amount of tax information I throw at you in these columns and my newsletters as a result of my primary involvement in taxation through membership on the House Ways and Means Committee. I realize such things are not always thrilling. But perhaps a greater danger than boredom is the possibility that you and I get so close to taxes, so enmeshed in tax details, that we lose our perspective about the total tax system. A group known as the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations recently put out a fascinating report which would have to be called a perspective piece, and I would like to pass on to you some of the information it disclosed.

Forty percent (\$131 Billion) of the federal government's revenue comes from individual income tax receipts in 1976. The next largest item of revenue is the 28% (\$90 Billion) which is raised by payroll taxes, mostly social security. The corporation income tax (\$40 Billion) produces only 12% of our revenues. Roughly 18% (\$58 Billion) comes from a wide range of other taxes, charges, customs duties and receipts; but, of course, these figures do not take into account federal borrowing, which has had to increase by more than \$65 Billion as a result of this year's deficit.

The Advisory Committee's figures show something interesting about the shifts in the tax burden, suspected by average taxpayers for a long time but previously not easy to prove. In 1953, the average family had an income of \$5,000, which by 1975 had risen to \$14,000. Direct taxes (remember, a corporate income tax is an indirect tax on those who own stock or buy goods from a corporation) have gone up by 92% on the average family during those 22 years. Because the average wage earner has moved into a higher bracket (\$5,000 to \$14,000) his federal income tax is up 25%. But that's peanuts compared to the increase in Social Security taxes, up 400%, and state and local taxes, up 533% during the same period.

The last figure is all the more startling when you consider that in the same period of time federal aid has gone from 8% of the revenue of state and local governments to 20%. Taxes have risen during that 22-year period for those who are above average wealth, also, but less than they have risen for the average taxpayer for several reasons: (1) when you get in the higher brackets of the federal income taxes the increases come more gradually, (2) the social security payroll tax is collected on only a limited wage base and (3) wider distribution of real estate ownership places a larger portion of the real estate tax on the average homeowner.

With respect to all types of taxes, some effort has been made by the taxing authorities to redistribute taxes during this 22 years so that the average taxpayer would not be hit so hard (by changing the rates, the wage base or by various sorts of real estate tax exemptions) but despite such effort the other factors at work, including the total tax burden, have more than compensated. Unfortunately, there is no way in which this trend is going to be reversed as long as government spending expands; increasing government expenditures must be financed in large part from the average taxpayer, since he is the only resource sufficiently numerous to return much money from tax increases which are necessarily fractional and marginal.

The pattern of taxes is different in every

country. Among the developed countries of the world we put the most reliance of all on the personal income tax, and the least of all on consumption taxes like the sales tax or the value added tax. However, we are among the lowest in total tax burden. Obviously we can do some redesigning of our system to shift the incidence of the various types of taxes in one direction or other, but working on the total burden of taxation, keeping our government expenditures on all levels as low as possible, will probably accomplish more for the average taxpayer in the long run than anything which can reasonably be expected from tax reform, however enlightened.

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Aug. 9, 1976]

**NOW: A DRIVE TO EASE INFLATION'S TOLL
ON YOUR TAXES**

Pressure is building up on Congress to do something about the way inflation is causing automatic increases in everybody's taxes.

Years of rising prices have taught millions of families that success in keeping incomes in step with living costs is not enough to maintain purchasing power. Taxes go up with inflation, too, and the result often is a serious erosion of living standards and family estates.

That, basically, is what lies behind current moves to increase federal estate-tax exemptions. On July 27, the House Ways and Means Committee gave its final approval to a bill that, in effect, increases the personal exemption from \$60,000 now to \$120,667 in 1977, with a gradual rise to \$153,750 in 1979.

President Ford had asked for a boost to \$150,000.

That exemption has remained fixed through 34 years of generally rising prices. Where it once relieved all but a tiny fraction of the people from all estate taxes, it now leaves many ordinary families exposed to that levy.

The estate-tax exemption is only one tax allowance that has lost much of its value to inflation. The personal exemption for the federal income tax, for example, was increased from \$600 in 1966 to \$750 in 1976, but that's not nearly enough to compensate for the inflation that has occurred.

UPWARD THRUST

Perhaps the most important effect of inflation on taxes is the way it propels millions of people toward the higher reaches of this country's graduated tax.

For single persons and unmarried "heads of household," the rate schedules of the income tax have been trimmed a bit, though far from enough to offset inflation. And the steeply graduated rates of taxes that married couples must pay have not been changed.

The result is that even if a family has been fortunate enough to see its income rise as fast as consumer prices, its purchasing power has been cut back by taxes that take increasing percentages of that income. The family often is worse off financially than it was earlier on a substantially smaller income.

Take, for instance, a married couple with two children and a salary of \$15,000 back in 1966. If their pay has just kept pace with the consumer price index, the income has risen by 75.9 per cent during the past decade, to \$26,385. But that's "before taxes."

With that steep rise in earnings, the family finds that it has jumped from the 22 per cent bracket of the income tax to the 28 per cent bracket—assuming that deductions equal 17 per cent in both of the years.

Result: While income rose by just under 76 per cent, the tax take went up about 113 per cent—from \$1,831 in 1966 to \$3,892 this year, even allowing for temporary cuts granted for 1975 and 1976.

After all adjustments, the family has had a reduction of about 3 per cent in its purchasing power.

Not all families that have managed to keep their before-tax incomes growing in tune

with prices have lost that much. But many others have been hit even harder.

The four-member family that had \$50,000 of income in 1966 has \$87,950 now if it has matched the consumer-price rise of 75.9 per cent. But the Federal Government's tax take has grown by 129 per cent, from \$11,735 in 1966 to \$26,879 in 1976.

The upshot is that this family's real income after taxes is 9.3 per cent smaller than it was 10 years ago.

**SOME WAYS TO BRING TAX RETURNS INTO LINE
WITH INFLATION**

Many parts of Federal tax law have failed to keep up with inflation of nearly 76 per cent in 10 years. For a look at what's needed to match key parts of tax returns with price hikes—

	In 1966	In 1976	Level needed to match inflation
Personal exemption.....	\$600	\$750	\$1,055
Gain on sale of house, share excludable by persons 65 and over.....	20,000	20,000	39,500
Estate-tax exemption.....	60,000	60,000	105,540
Gift tax, annual exclusion.....	3,000	3,000	5,277
Tax brackets (married couples, filing jointly—bottom of bracket).....	1,000	1,000	1,759
	8,000	8,000	14,072
	20,000	20,000	35,180
	40,000	40,000	70,360

But, one important element has more than kept pace with inflation—Minimum standard deduction (family of four) was \$600 in 1966 and is now \$2,100, above the \$1,055 needed to equal 10 years of price rises.

TAXPAYERS AGAINST INFLATION—FOUR LOSING BATTLES

1. Middle-income family—Mr. M married with two children, made \$10,000 in 1966. Pay raises since then have just kept pace with inflation.

	1966	1976
Income.....	\$10,000	\$17,590
Federal income tax.....	981	1,992
Social security tax.....	277	895

After-tax income.....	8,742	14,703
In 1976 dollars.....	15,377	14,703

All told: Mr. and Mrs. M have lost 4.4 per cent in purchasing power in 10 years.

NOTE: Federal tax computation assumes itemized deductions equal to 17 per cent of income.

2. Young graduate—Mary G takes a job for \$8,795 a year, the equivalent of the \$5,000 a year her brother Robert received in 1966. How the two compare—

	1966	1976
Income.....	\$5,000	\$8,795
Federal income tax.....	671	1,066
Social security tax.....	210	515

After-tax income.....	4,119	7,214
In 1976 dollars.....	7,245	7,214

All told: Mary can buy 0.4 per cent less with her salary than Robert could.

NOTE: Federal tax computation assumes standard deduction.

3. Gifts—Mrs. R, a widow, made a \$10,000 wedding gift to one child in 1966 and the equivalent gift, after inflation, of \$17,590 to another child this year.

	1966	1976
Amount of gift.....	\$10,000	\$17,590
Taxable amount after \$3,000 exclusion.....	7,000	14,590
Tax.....	218	754
In 1976 dollars.....	383	754

All told: Buying power of tax on gifts is 97 percent higher this year.

NOTE: Mrs. R does not use her lifetime specific exemption covering \$30,000 of gifts.

4. Death and taxes—Mr. U died in 1966, leaving his wife an estate of \$200,000. This year, his neighbor, Mr. W died, leaving his wife an estate of the same size after price rises, \$351,800. Both estates have debts and expenses of 10 per cent.

	1966	1976
Estate—after debts, expenses.....	\$180,000	\$316,620
Marital deduction.....	90,000	158,310
Specific exemption.....	60,000	60,000
Taxable estate.....	30,000	98,310
Maximum Federal estate tax—before credit for State death taxes.....	3,000	20,277
In 1976 dollars.....	5,277	20,227

All told: Mr. W's estate must pay 283 per cent more in terms of today's buying power than Mr. U's estate paid in 1966.

CONGRESSIONAL HELP

At the bottom of the income scale, Congress has taken steps to offset much or all of the impact made by inflation on the personal income tax.

A family of four with a 1966 income of \$5,000 is now earning \$8,795 if it has kept up with inflation. In the interim, Congress has substantially boosted the automatic "standard" deduction and, for 1975 and 1976, granted some new tax credits.

On that basis, this family's real, spendable income has kept up fully with consumer prices.

But the picture changes if taxes for Social Security also are figured in. Those levies have been boosted sharply in recent years, so that the family with a 1976 income of \$8,795 actually has about 1.6 per cent less purchasing power than it had with its \$5,000 of income back in 1966.

At the top of the income scale, too, Congress has attempted to soften the impact of inflation on income taxes paid by many people—for example, by erecting a 50 per cent ceiling over the tax on earned income. Yet, even for the well-to-do taxpayers, such changes fall short of conferring full immunity from inflation's impact.

For example, a four-member family on a \$100,000 salary in 1966 and an inflation-matching \$175,900 this year has been deprived of 3.5 per cent of its purchasing power by the impact of inflation on taxes.

GIFTS AFFECTED

Much the same thing has happened in the case of the federal tax on gifts, a levy imposed to prevent wealthy people from avoiding estate taxes by giving away their wealth during their lifetime.

A parent who gave a son or daughter \$5,000 in 1966 would have paid a gift tax of \$45. To make a gift of comparable purchasing power in 1976, the amount would have to be \$8,795. The tax on that would come to \$154.

Look, too, at the \$60,000 personal exemption under the estate tax. If it had kept pace with inflation during the past decade, it would be \$105,540 today.

In fact, if the estate-tax exemption had been tied to consumer prices since it was first fixed back in 1942, it now would be \$210,000.

Thus, President Ford's proposed boost in the estate-tax exemption to \$150,000 would fall short of any complete adjustment for price increases.

All this helps explain why proposals are being pushed now to provide full, automatic tax adjustments to take account of inflation.

Recently, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), after a long study, "Inflation and the Individual Income Tax," said that it is seriously considering a recommendation in favor of the indexing of federal and State income taxes.

The ACIR—a permanent, bipartisan commission, composed of federal, State and local officials, along with members of the general

public—noted that, with indexing, "rate brackets and personal exemptions, credits and deductions, measured in fixed-dollar terms, would be adjusted proportionately with the general price-level changes."

At a recent session, the commission decided that it would wait until its September, 1976, meeting to make any recommendations on indexing of taxes.

For example, a married couple with two children and earnings of \$10,000 finds that, without indexing, a pay boost in line with price increases of 10 per cent boosts its tax from \$651 to \$841, assuming use of the standard deduction. That's a jump of 29 per cent.

With the indexed system, the tax would rise by only 10 per cent, to \$716. Indexing would reduce the tax increase from \$190 to \$65.

One problem: How to avoid a huge Government deficit if revenues are cut by indexing at a time when the Government's own expenses are being swollen by inflation?

A new study by the Congressional Budget Office underscores that question. It found that \$5 of every \$8 of federal spending is already indexed or "adjusted automatically for increases in the price level."

Social Security and federal-employee-retirement benefits, for instance, are raised periodically by the automatic action of a cost-of-living provision.

Moreover, the remaining \$3 in each \$8 of federal spending is generally increased by direct action in Congress to take account of inflation.

The result is that a 1 per cent rise in prices can be counted on to generate a 1 per cent climb in federal expenditures rather quickly.

STRONG RESPONSE

Federal revenues, the CBO noted, respond even more strongly than that to rising prices, but not much more.

Specifically, the ACIR study found that, with each 1 per cent of annual inflation, federal revenues can be expected to rise by about 1.2 per cent.

Thus, if Congress were to eliminate more than a very modest part of the inflation-induced climb in income taxes, the federal budget could be seriously undermined.

CLEVELAND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION MARKS 31 YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a leading organization in the Greater Cleveland area which has done much to promote harmony and communication between citizens and neighborhoods.

The Area Council Association of Greater Cleveland was first formed in 1945 by neighborhood residents who realized that they must band together to achieve mutual goals. Since those early years, Mr. Speaker, the Area Councils' membership has grown considerably. The 1975-76 roster reads as follows:

AREA COUNCILS ASSOCIATION, 1975-76 MEMBERSHIP

President, George M. Edwards; First Vice President, Mrs. Bertha Falkowski; Second Vice President, Vacated; Recording Secretary, Mary Ann Lecate; Corresponding Secretary, Booker T. Tall; Treasurer, Dorothy Bugay.

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Mrs. Marjorie Butera, Dr. Earl H. Cunningham, Mrs. Bertha Falkowski, Leonard Danilowicz, James D. Johnson, Mrs. Edythe Lineker.

CITY-WIDE ORGANIZATIONS

Catholic Parent/Teachers League, Citizens League.
Cleveland Board of Education, Council of Churches.
Citizens for Clean Air and Water, Jewish Welfare Federation, N.A.A.C.P.
Cleveland Planned Parenthood Center, Inc., American Indians, Urban League, League of Women Voters.
Cleveland Community Health Network.

MEMBER AREA COUNCILS

Central Area Council, Mrs. Pearl Jackson, Acting President.
Corlett Area Community Council, Mrs. Pinkie Jackson, President.
Forest Hill Parkway Area Council, Muldrow Pearson, President.
Glenville Area Community Council, Ethelene Hall, President.
Hough Community Council, Edna Carlisle, President.
Kinsman Area Council, Rev. John Taylor, President.
Lee-Harvard Community Association, William James Lowe, President.
Lee-Seville-Miles Citizens Council, Drew Chillous, President.
Ludlow Community Association, Marge Jorgensen, President.
Moreland Community Association, Carl Harris, President.
Mount Pleasant Community Council, Booker T. Tall, President.
Southwest Civil Council, Al Lorman, President.
Tremont Area Civic Association, Mrs. Ellen Paul, President.
West Park Community Council, Ellie Mapson, Jr., President.
Area Councils Association, 1975-76 membership.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Constitution: Review Committee, Mrs. Dorothy Bugay, Chairman.
Schools: Birt Smith, Mrs. Victoria Bozeman, Co-Chairmen.
Pollution and Ecology Committee: Leonard Danilowicz, Mrs. Evelyn Stebbins, Co-Chairmen.
Safety Committee: Ellie Mapson, Jr., Floyd Holsten, Co-Chairman.
Health and Welfare Committee: Dr. Earl Cunningham, Donald Fearn, Co-Chairmen.
Nominating Committee: Mrs. Dorothy Bugay, Chairman.
Voluntary Police and Fire Review Board: James D. Johnson, John Ferrante, Co-Chairmen.
Literary Task Force: Birt Smith, Henry Maleski, Co-Chairmen.
Budget and Finance: Mrs. Dorothy Bugay, Chairman.
Personnel: Mrs. Dorothy Bugay, Chairman.
Parks and Recreation: Mrs. Alverna Williams, Drew Chillous, Co-Chairmen.
Leadership Development: Booker T. Tall, Chairman.
Utilities: Mrs. Evelyn Stebbins, Chairman.
Award Dinner: James D. Johnson, Chairman.
Liquor Control: George M. Edwards, Pitzer Bradley, Co-Chairmen.
Housing: Henry S. Maleski, Stafford Williams, Co-Chairmen.
National Health Coalition: Dr. Earl Cunningham, Chairman.
Bicentennial: Dr. Earl Cunningham, James D. Johnson, Co-Chairmen.

STAFF

Mrs. Helen Golub, General Coordinator.
Richard Peterson, Coordinator.
Karen Roscoe, Secretary.
Deloss Drake, Project Coordinator, Voluntary Police Fire Review Board.

On Friday, June 4, 1976, the Area Councils Association joined with the Kiwanis Club of Cleveland in sponsoring the 20th anniversary of the "Good Neighbors Service Awards Dinner," which was held at the Hollenden House. A great deal of planning and organization went into making this event a success. Those who served on the dinner committees should be commended for their hard work:

AWARDS COMMITTEE

James D. Johnson, Chairman.
Dr. Earl H. Cunningham, Co-Chairman.

TICKET COMMITTEE

Dr. Earl H. Cunningham, John Armstrong, Dorothy Bugay, Co-Chairmen.
Ruth Buckner, James W. Calge, Geneva Campbell, Drew Chillous, Joseph Haggerty, Carl Harris, Floyd Hostein, Pearl Jackson, Pinkie Jackson.

Marge Jorgensen, Rita Laquatra, William James Lowe, Ellie Mapson, Jr., Muldrow Pearson, Grey Roberts, George H. Smith, Rosie Williams.

FLOWERS

Rita Laquatra and Floyd Holsten.

AWARDS SELECTION COMMITTEE

Donald Fearn, Chairman.
Dorothy Bugay, Rev. Oliver L. Campbell, John Wesley Fields, Joseph Haggerty, Carl Harris, Ethelene Hall, Pearl Jackson, Pinkie Jackson.

Malenda Jones, Marge Jorgensen, Josie Lawson, Ellie Mapson, Jr., Ellen Paul, Muldrow Pearson, Greg Roberts, Rev. John H. Taylor.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Edythe Foote Lineker and Booker T. Tall.

HOSTESSES

Edith M. Alexander, Chairman.
Ruth Buckner, Vivian Eady, Gail Freeman, Karen Roscoe, Erna Scott, Pat Storey, Bess Vrettos, Sylvia Whiting.

STAFF

Helen Golub, Richard A. Peterson, Karen Roscoe.

AREA COUNCILS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL GOOD NEIGHBOR AWARDS AND BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, JUNE 4, 1976

Patron list

We thank the following persons and organizations for their special patron contribution:

Advisory Committee on Aging, Dr. Charles L. Carlton, Citizens for Clean Air and Water, Cleveland Trust Company, Dr. Earl H. Cunningham, East Ohio Gas Company, Mr. Donald E. Fearn, Director, Planned Parenthood of Cleveland, Dr. Donald G. Jacobs, Director, Greater Cleveland Inter-Church Council.

Mr. Blair Kost, Director, Citizens League, National City Bank of Cleveland;

Mrs. Berthina E. Palmer, Member, Cleveland Board of Education; Honorable James V. Stanton, Congressman, 20th District of Ohio; Honorable Louis Stokes, Congressman, 21st District of Ohio, the Urban League of Greater Cleveland.

This program is sponsored in part by a grant from the Ohio Program in the Humanities, a state based program of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. Speaker, the Annual Good Neighbors Awards Dinner has always been an exciting and rewarding evening, well-attended by many noted government officials and business and community leaders. The Headtable guest list included:

Reverend Edward J. Camille, Dorothy Bugay, Rita Laquatra, Alverna Williams, Josie Lawson, Floyd Holsten, Dr. Earl H. Cunningham, John Armstrong.

Lucille Edwards, George M. Edwards, Sara Johnson, James D. Johnson, Carl T. Rowan, Booker T. Tall, Mr. and Mrs. Pitzer B. Bradley, George Vossnik.

Donald E. Fearn, Mayor Ralph J. Perk, Helen Galub, Jean Calhoun, Rachael Redinger, Kenneth Kovack, Reverend Roy W. Neal.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to submit to you the excellent program prepared for that evening which featured Carl T. Rowan, the renowned journalist, as the keynote speaker.

PROGRAM

Toastmaster: James D. Johnson.
Pledge of Allegiance and National Anthem.
Invocation: Reverend Edward J. Camille, MSW, Secretariat of Social Concerns, Diocese of Cleveland.

DINNER

Welcome: George M. Edwards, President, Area Councils Association.

Introduction of speakers table and special guests: James D. Johnson, Chairman, Annual Dinner.

Introduction of area council presidents and area councils association officers: Mrs. Helen Golub, General Coordinator, Area Councils Association.

Installation of new officers: Pitzer B. Bradley, President, United Area Citizens Agency.

Introduction of speaker: Booker T. Tall, Director, Department of Black Affairs, Cuyahoga Community College.

Speaker: Carl T. Rowan, Syndicated Columnist.

"Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness."

Presentation of Bicentennial Commission awards: Kenneth Kovack.

Ohio State Presentation: Charles L. Butts.

Nominees Presentation: George Vossnik, Chairman, Kiwanis—Citizenship Services Committee.

Good Neighbors of the Year: Donald E. Fearn, Chairman, Selection Committee.

Benediction: Reverend Roy W. Neal, Pastor, Cory United Methodist Church.

The highlight of the evening, Mr. Speaker, came with the announcement of the Nominees for the 1976 Good Neighbors Awards. These dedicated Clevelanders deserve your admiration and recognition:

Fairfax Area Council: Carolyn Greene, 2232 East 95th St.; Sam Marable, 2342 East 82nd St.

Forest Hill Parkway Area Council: Mrs. Ruby Stewart, 557 East 117th St.; Mr. Posey Mallory, 730 Eddy Road.

Glennville Area Community Council: Mrs. Audrey Jeter, 1405 East Blvd.; James D. Johnson, 10114 Ostend Avenue.

Hough Community Council: Mrs. Geneva Campbell, 1338 East 82nd St.; Abraham N. Shepherd, 7704 Melrose Ave.

Kinsman Area Council: Mrs. Emma Baird, 2699 Tennyson Ave.; Mr. Jewel Griffin, 9110 Harris Ave.

Ludlow Community Association: Vera Diekhoff, 3102 Van Aken Blvd.; C. Bushnell Olmstead, 3045 Keswick St.

Lee-Seville-Miles Citizens Council: Marie Rubin, 16210 Seville Rd.; Mason L. Jackson, 15207 Sunview Ave.

Lee-Harvard Community Association: Clara S. Flack, 4255 East 175th St.; Mr. Howard Hyche, 3860 Lee Hts. Blvd.

Moreland Community Association: Bette A. Webster, 3618 Lindholm Rd.; Perry L. Johnson, 3623 Lindholm Rd.

Mt. Pleasant Community Council: Mrs. Eula M. Thornton, 3355 East 137th St.; Horace L. Otkinson, 14013 Milverton Rd.

Southeast Civic Association: Mrs. Evelyn Keselica, 3857 West 15th St.; Mrs. Rita Laquatra, 3925 Mapledale Ave.

Tremont Area Civic Association: Mrs. Winifred Duncan, 2363 West 6th St.; Mr. George Von Davis, 2379 West 7th St.

West Park Community Council: Mr. John Ferrante, 17413 Bradgate; Rev. John F. Uhle, 15470 Triskett.

Mr. Speaker. At this time, I would like to call upon my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me in citing the Area Councils Association of Greater Cleveland and their outstanding president, George M. Edwards. Their exemplary work in the area of community affairs and human relations has done much to make Cleveland a vital and growing city. I would like to end my

statement with an Anonymous poem which appeared on the back cover of the good neighbors program booklet. I am certain that my colleagues will find that it conveys a challenging message:

THE DELINQUENT

We read in the papers and hear on the air
Of killing and stealing and crimes every-
where.

We sigh and we say as we notice the trend
"This young generation! Where will it all
end?"

But can we be sure that it's their fault
alone—

That maybe a part of it isn't our own?
Are we less guilty who place in their way
Too many things that can lead them astray?
Too much to spend and too much idle time;
Too many movies of passion and crime,
Too many books not fit to be read
Too much of evil in what they have said;
Too many juke-joints and too many bars;
Too many hot-rod and rattletrap cars;
Too many reasons for children to roam
Because of too many parents who don't stay
at home!

Our children are heirs to the sins we commit.
They couldn't go on if the older folks quit.
Kids don't make the movies, they don't write
the books that paint a gay picture of
gangsters and crooks;

Kids don't make the liquor; they don't run
the bars;

They don't make the laws and they don't
buy the cars;

They don't sell the reefers that addle the
brain;

That's all done by older folks greedy for gain.

Delinquent Teenager? Oh how we condemn,
decry, disparage and criticize them.

We're shocked at their morals; amazed at
their crimes

And grieve that we live in such perilous
times.

By the "Rule of the Blameless" that the
Savior made known—

"Who is there among us to cast the first
stone?"—Anonymous.

SENATE—Monday, August 23, 1976

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, Lord of all the years, we thank Thee for this good land, for her rocks and rills, her woods and templed hills, her homes and schools and churches, for fields and factories, for diverse peoples with varied talents, for the institutions of government, and for those in every generation who undertake the stewardship of public office.

We thank Thee for this place, for its great moments in the past, for the work of the present, and for the promise of the future. May all who labor here be given grace and wisdom to meet great needs with daring deeds, to make decisions in accord with Thy will and thus set forward Thy kingdom on Earth.

We pray in His name, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 10, 1976, be dispensed with.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet today to consider the honor codes at the service academies; that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet on August 24 to consider nominations, an international tin agreement, and S. 1439, and on August 26 for a briefing on the situation in the Aegean Sea; that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to meet on August 24 to consider nominations for