

consideration of a concurrent resolution disapproving the rule or regulation, and neither House has adopted such a resolution, the rule or regulation may go into effect immediately. If, within such 60 calendar days, such a committee has reported or been discharged from further consideration of such a resolution, or either House has adopted such a

resolution, the rule or regulation may go into effect not sooner than 90 calendar days of continuous session of Congress after its promulgation unless disapproved as provided in paragraph (1) (A).

"(b) (1) The agency may not promulgate a new rule or regulation identical to one disapproved pursuant to this section unless a

statute is adopted affecting the agency's powers with respect to the subject matter of the rule or regulation.

"(2) If the agency proposes a new rule or regulation dealing with the same subject matter as a disapproved rule or regulation, the agency shall comply with the procedures required for the issuance of a new rule or regulation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MUNICIPAL CHILD HEALTH SERVICES, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, during this period of rising health costs and the Congress commitment to enact national health insurance I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a health care program from my hometown of Cambridge, Mass., that has actually reduced the cost of health care for children. The success of this program is described in the following memorandum given to me by the city of Cambridge and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

MUNICIPAL CHILD HEALTH SERVICES, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Cambridge, Massachusetts is successfully providing comprehensive medical and hospital services to 9,000 inner-city children, mainly through nurse practitioner staffed clinics located in schools, and at a cost of \$100 per child per year. Furthermore, the program has been created by shifting existing public health, municipal hospital and school resources and has not required federal or foundation grants or large increases in local taxes.

Since the program began in 1968, it has:

Cut in half the inappropriate use by children of emergency services at Cambridge Hospital, while use of these services by a control group went up or remained stable.

Dropped the prevalence of blood lead levels in preschoolers from 7% to 0.5%.

Cut the rate of anemia in one to two year olds from 16% to 4%, and in two to three year olds from 22% to 7%.

Increased the immunization level city-wide from 55% in 1966 to 97% in 1974 for children entering school.

The program has been developed by Philip Porter, M.D., Director, Department of Pediatrics at Cambridge Hospital. When he came to Cambridge in 1965, he was confronted with a pediatric emergency service that was heavily used for routine medical care by parents from the eastern half of Cambridge. The reasons for this "misuse" were clear. These families—approximately 60,000 people in all—were blue-collar or on welfare and were served by one pediatrics at the point of retirement and twelve general practitioners (no new physicians had entered practice in the poorer half of Cambridge in 15 years).

In 1967 the city voted to merge the municipal hospital and health department, and Dr. Porter became overall director of all pediatric services. Determined to develop a pediatric care system within a few years which cared for children from birth to age 16, he replaced retiring school nurses with pediatric nurse practitioners and stationed

them in five primary care clinics, four of which are located in schools. Cambridge has a neighborhood school system, so these clinics are all within easy walking distance for the people with the greatest need for medical services. They are staffed five days a week, twelve months a year by the nurse practitioners who serve as combination school-public health nurses and primary care practitioners for school and preschool children in the neighborhoods.

As the school nurse, the nurse practitioner manages medical problems and keeps the required records, but the annual physical has been abandoned. Instead, each year teachers are interviewed by the pediatric nurse practitioners to identify kids that seem to have physical or behavioral problems. When questioning reveals anything that suggests possible pathology, the child is seen by the nurse practitioner, who then refers to Cambridge Hospital pediatricians all children who are suspected of having either medical or behavioral problems requiring definitive diagnosis and care.

The clinical activities of the pediatric nurse practitioners encompass all of the routine procedures in a general pediatric office practice. This includes the "routine, periodic look, weigh and measure" of well-baby care, plus diagnosis and treatment of upper respiratory infections, sore throats, otitis media, and skin problems. The nurses also counsel mothers on problems related to raising children.

The pediatric nurse practitioners are specifically charged with the responsibility of ensuring that all referral appointments are kept and that problems they identify are managed or resolved by a physician or other appropriate specialist.

The health department's part of the system—the primary care network and the school health program—costs less today in 1965 dollars than the ineffective 1965 operation did. Total cost of the pediatric system—hospital and primary care network, including school health—is estimated at \$100 per child/year. The primary care network alone accounts for \$35 per child/year of the total.

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO LIFE OF UNBORN CHILDREN

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a joint resolution to amend the Constitution and protect the right to life of unborn children and make abortions illegal except to save the life of a mother.

The right to life is sacred, and along with many of my colleagues and millions of Americans, I am alarmed by the

indiscriminate spread of abortions in this country, thus violating that right. I believe very firmly that something should be done to reverse that trend. This bill is my attempt to do that.

According to the latest figures available at the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Ga., in my home State of Utah in 1975 there were 2,146 reported abortions, or 68 for every 1,000 live births. The national average was 274 abortions per 1,000 live births, for a total of 854,853 in the Nation.

And the most shocking statistic was right here in Washington, D.C., where there are more than 1,000 abortions for every 1,000 live births—and those are only the reported ones. New York City came in second, sharing the same distinction of reporting more abortions than live births. To me, that is an alarming and unacceptable trend.

The notion that a human fetus is not a person is apparently the major justification for such a situation. Well, that is purely and simply wrong. An embryo is an individual. True, it depends on its mother for life-supporting fluids and nutrients, but it has its own biological system, needing only time and the proper nourishment to become a self-supporting human being.

My resolution would clarify the terminology in the 5th and 14th amendments, where it says all "persons" have the right to life and are protected from the government or anyone else taking that life away.

With my amendment, the word "person" would be interpreted to include "unborn human offspring." Thus, our embryonic citizenry would be guaranteed the same rights the rest of us boast so loudly about but so casually deny the defenseless, unseen, unborn child. The only exception should be when the life of the mother is threatened by an impending birth.

There is little need, as I see it, to refute the idea that an individual have complete control over another life simply because it would inconvenience his lifestyle. To destroy a life simply to avoid the responsibility of rearing a child is narrowminded and selfish and goes against the grain of any right-thinking person. If there is a question about the life of the mother, that is a different story. But embarrassment over a pregnancy is no justification for abortion. Even in cases of rape, the resulting child would be considered a blessing by couples who cannot have children of their own and would be willing to adopt it.

The question of overpopulation is also

a fallacious excuse for abortion. We have the technology and resources to feed and house many times the number of people in America. We need to concentrate on making America a better place to live for the children of the future rather than stopping them from coming here.

And what about mentally and physically deficient parents? Should not a child from such a union be done away with so as to spare it a life of misery and unhappiness? Here is a case that will answer that question without doubt: A doctor was once presented with a case involving a man and wife who discovered they were going to have a child. The father was syphilitic and the mother had epilepsy. When asked what he would do with the unborn child, the doctor replied, "Abort it."

"Then you would have killed Beethoven," came the answer.

None of us can ever know what potential unborn children have, and I do not think young potential mothers really want the responsibility of denying precious life to their own flesh and blood. I have seen too many sadly remorseful girls who have had an abortion and are haunted constantly by the impact of their decision.

I sincerely hope this amendment is accepted by both Houses and then is subsequently ratified by the States, so that we can put an end to the indiscriminate spread of abortion and protect the God-given rights of future generations.

TRIBUTE TO ILLINOIS' CFC CHAIRMEN

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly commend 22 Federal employees in Illinois who recently served as chairmen in their area for the Combined Federal Campaign. This annual fundraising drive, conducted among Federal civilian and military employees across the country, benefits a variety of health and social service organizations.

Mr. Richard Lockhart who serves as the coordinator for the 14 national health agencies in Illinois has informed me that this year's drive in Illinois was the most successful to date producing a total pledged amount of \$2,735,426. Contributors have the option of designating their donations to specific agencies. Through this method the health agencies of Illinois will receive \$284,286—32 percent, the United Way, \$559,927—63 percent, and the international service agencies, \$46,316—5 percent. Final distribution of contributions to these fine organizations is \$656,943—24 percent—to the health agencies; \$1,894,831—69 percent—to the United Way; and \$180,204—7 percent—to the international service agencies.

These excellent results are in large part due to the time and effort put forth by each CFC chairman. Their work on the fundraising drive comes in addition to their regular duties in Government. Because of their fine demonstration of leadership and generosity, I would like to commend them at this time.

Adams County CFC: Ernest Bickhaus, Social Security Administration.

Aurora CFC: Ernest Grob, Air Route Traffic Control Center.

Carbondale CFC: Hubert Goforth, U.S. Post Office.

Carroll County CFC: Arien Dahlman, Savannah Army Depot.

Champaign County CFC: Colonel Daryl Rhyner, Chanute Air Force Base.

Cook-DuPage Counties CFC: Frank Resnik, GSA.

Elgin CFC: George Beckwith, Post Office.

Jefferson County CFC: Boyd Holmes, Social Security.

Kankakee County CFC: Clark McKenna, Post Office.

Knox County CFC: Bill Tipsword, Post Office.

Lake County CFC: Capt. William Lamm, Great Lakes Naval Base.

LaSalle-Peru CFC: Joseph Zandecki, Post Office.

McLean County CFC: Robert Buhrke, Post Office.

Macon County CFC: J. D. Myers, IRS.

Peoria County CFC: Emmett Russell, Post Office.

Rock Island County CFC: Robert Glese, U.S. Army Arsenal.

Sangamon County CFC: Ben Thompson, FFA.

St. Louis (Madison & St. Clair Counties) CFC: Col. James St. Clair, Defense Mapping Agency.

Vermilion County CFC: Dee Schaffer, Social Security.

Will County CFC: Charles Caton, Post Office.

Williamson County CFC: B. J. Tolson, U.S. Penitentiary.

Winnebago County CFC: Alfonso Mera, Post Office.

CONSUMER PROTECTION IS MORE THAN LAWS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Congress is being requested to create a Federal agency to protect the consumer interest. Even if the consumer interest can be defined with sufficiency, it is questionable whether another layer of Federal bureaucracy could adequately protect it.

The proposed function of the Agency for Consumer Protection does not include addressing consumer complaints. Rather, it would possess broad powers, without any accountability, to challenge the platform of any Government activity on the behalf of "consumer interest."

The granting of this unchecked power is unwise. Additionally, the new layer of bureaucracy would only add to the red-tape and regulation that encumbers the Federal Government and erodes the consumer interest. Finally, the new agency

would add to the financial burden of running the Federal Government without any guarantees or certainty of corresponding benefits.

These disadvantages and the availability of more promising alternatives have raised many objections from those who are truly concerned with the consumer interest. In a recent editorial, reproduced from the Wall Street Journal, the Daily News-Banner, located in Greenville, Mich., in the 10th Congressional District, expressed the growing concern of many taxpayers and consumers concerning the Agency for Consumer Protection.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues this editorial which I think expresses well the problems of this legislative proposal:

[From the Greenville (Mich.) News-Banner, Apr. 22, 1977]

CONSUMER PROTECTION IS MORE THAN LAWS

Congress is once again considering creation of a Consumer Protection Agency and since Jimmy Carter, not Jerry Ford, is President, it has a better chance than last time around. We've been wondering once again why it is that we don't think much of the idea, since we count ourselves consumer defenders of long standing.

The answer boils down to one thing: We have doubts whether the backers of the CPA, and thus the people who would likely have influence in the staffing of this new government agency, are philosophically attuned to the consumer's interests. Do they really want consumers to have a wide choice of products and services at the lowest possible prices or do they just want more laws?

The two approaches may in some instances be compatible, but usually not. Laws that affect the manufacture and distribution of consumer products usually are restrictive preventing manufacturers or distributors from doing this or that—like maybe putting saccharine or cyclamates in a diet soft drink.

Restrictive laws reduce the consumer's range of choices—between say, a shoddy but cheap product and a high quality but expensive one. They also, by definition, reduce the potential for competition.

This newspaper has always felt that the interest of consumers were best served by a minimum of barriers to market entry and free competition. That is why it has supported, at odds with segments of the business community, such causes as unrestricted international trade—so that U.S. consumers will be free to buy Datsuns and Sonys if they choose—or elimination of the so-called "fair trade" laws, which barred retailers from cutting prices on certain branded merchandise.

Now it just might be possible that a CPA would be staffed by people who would fight crusades to break down legal barriers to entry into the various markets. If so, it could perhaps be useful.

But given the past crusades of the Naderites and others who style themselves "consumerists," we have stronger visions of a CPA that would lobby for laws that would actually deny consumers goods and services by trying to legislate prices down and quality up. Such laws end up serving as legislation against the consumer rather than for him. The word "market" is simply another name for consumers everywhere making free, voluntary choices of what to sell and how much to ask. Anything that thwarts this process is not consumerist at all. Until we are firmly assured that the CPA would promote rather than thwart free markets, we will view it with skepticism.

—Wall Street Journal.

UKRAINIAN ARRESTS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was completed in 1975, it raised many hopes among the peoples of Europe and the whole world. The completion of the Conference was truly an outstanding achievement—a landmark in worldwide diplomacy.

The issues negotiated at the historic Helsinki Conference were considered under four categories or "baskets": First, political-military security in Europe; second, economic, scientific, technical, and environmental cooperation; third, cultural and humanitarian cooperation; and fourth, the consideration of a follow-up conference. Already several initial steps have been taken to implement many of the "confidence-building" measures of the act such as improved cooperation in the areas of economics science, technology, and the environment. At the same time, however, progress in the very important humanitarian area known as Basket Three, has been uneven, to say the least. In particular, there have been numerous difficulties in providing for the freer movement of people, ideas, and information, as recently reported by the congressional mission to the Commission of Security and Cooperation in Europe.

To some extent, difficulties over Basket Three have resulted because of several escape clauses to this particular part of the agreement. Just as importantly, however, has been the idea that some of the signatory states do not desire the full implementation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki agreement. For these reasons, citizen groups were formed in some of the signatory states in order to better monitor full compliance with the terms of the Helsinki accord.

Throughout the Soviet Union, for example, citizen groups were formed to insist on the full and true implementation of the agreement. One such group has been the Ukrainian public group to promote the implementation of the Helsinki accords. Led by Mykola Rudenko, a writer and poet, this group has tried to better acquaint the Ukrainian public with the Helsinki agreement and provide for a freer flow of information and ideas.

On February 5 of this year, Mykola Rudenko and a Ukrainian group associate, Oleksa Tykhy, were arrested by the KGB. These arrests were followed by the arrests of two more group members, Mykola Matysevych and Myroslav Marynovych. All four arrests are indicative of the continued Soviet policy of harassment for dissidents, and in particular, Ukrainian dissidents.

Recently, there has been a sharp increase in the Soviet repression of stubborn opposition to "Russification," the

long term goal of Soviet authorities to homogenize all minorities into one "Soviet nation." This has been especially true in the Ukraine, an area large and fertile enough to be a major European nation.

Just as importantly, the arrests of these Ukrainian dissidents who not only insist that national rights but also human rights be respected by Soviet leadership, continues to damage the spirit of the Helsinki accords. On June 15 of this year, the first post-Helsinki meeting of the 35 signatories is to begin. We must, to the fullest extent possible, express our concern for the continued Soviet repression of these dissidents and insure that the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries do not attempt a post-Helsinki whitewash. It is only in this way that we can provide for a new and better Europe and in particular, fully guarantee the dignity and the rights of all individuals affected by the Helsinki accords.

THE 31ST ANNIVERSARY OF
DEMOCRACY IN ITALY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 31st anniversary of democracy in Italy, I feel it is appropriate for us to reflect on the many contributions made by every generation of Italians.

When Italy cast aside its final days of monarchy to embrace democracy, it did so knowing of the firm foundation of past greatness on which it could build. Beginning in the days of the Roman Empire and continuing through the present, Italians have made important contributions to the arts, engineering, political thought, and religion. No one would deny that Italian genius has ranked in the forefront of those serving the greater good of mankind.

From Giotto and Cimabue in the 13th century, through Da Vinci and Raphael, Titian and Michaelangelo, Italian artists ranked second to none. In music, such noteworthy developments as the musical staff and the refinement of operatic style can be attributed to Italians.

Italian writers, from Dante to Petrarch, have ranked among the world's greatest. Luigi Pirandello, the Nobel prize winning playwright, is an inspiration to the young playwrights of today. And in the most modern of arts, the cinema, Italian film makers such as Fellini, Antonioni, and deSica are recognized among the greats of the film world.

The list could go ever on: Columbus, Galileo, Machiavelli, Marconi, Fermi. Obviously, without the contributions of these and others, the world would be a poorer place in which to live.

And so, today, with the memory of consistent Italian greatness fresh in our minds, let us also be mindful of Italy's

current struggle to sustain democracy. It is my utmost hope that the Italian nation, which has done so much to shape the world as we know it, will achieve the success and freedom for which it has so long striven.

EDUCATION FOR VIETNAM
VETERANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 2231, the Comprehensive Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1977. Since that time this legislation has been cosponsored by more than 70 of my colleagues in the House.

As many of my colleagues are aware, there presently exists a structural inequity in the GI Bill which denies many of our most needy and deserving Vietnam veterans access to readjustment programs. The legislation which I have introduced would cure these deficiencies by establishing a system of accelerated entitlement and, under certain circumstances, extend the present 10-year delimiting date for a maximum of 2 years for those veterans who were unable to initiate or complete their education.

I am pleased to be able to inform my colleagues who have joined with me in cosponsoring this legislation that the Washington Post, in a Memorial Day editorial, endorsed this legislation stating that it deserves the "immediate attention" of the Congress. For the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed this editorial, I now submit it for the RECORD:

THOSE WHO SERVED—CONTINUED

Among those reflecting upon the meaning of Memorial Day, we would assume, are approximately eight million veterans of the Vietnam years. For many of them, it comes as one more painful reminder that this country still lacks a comprehensive program to deal with their needs and entitlements. It cannot have escaped their notice that a nation capable of prolonged discussion and strong emotion on the merits of amnesty for no more than 10,000 young men who did not serve—by evading the draft—is strangely incapable of dealing equitably with those who served, including two and a half million who actually went to Vietnam and 400,000 who suffered wounds. To examine some of the current attitudes about Vietnam-era veterans is to see graphically why so many of them feel ignored or frustrated. It is also to understand why those who are trying to help them are finding it so difficult.

There is, to begin with, the GI Bill itself. At the moment, many of the most needy veterans are denied meaningful access to educational assistance. The GI Bill was inadvertently structured to provide benefits to veterans with access to low-cost public institutions. The problem is that many states and cities have few, if any, of these institutions. Sen. Alan Cranston, chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, has spoken of this unfairness and has pledged to "explore the matter and to come up with a remedy." Un-

fortunately, the leadership of the House Veterans Committee and, surprisingly, the new administrator of the Veterans Administration, Max Cleland, have not made a similar commitment. Another group with limited access includes some veterans who are married and have children; for them, the GI Bill's allowances are too low to be meaningful. Veterans with less than high-school educations are often left out also. Still another group is the one comprised of veterans who fought during the years 1966 to 1972; they were discharged at a time when benefits in many states were effectively so low that the most needy could not afford to go to school.

A second problem is the lack of attention given to the personal adjustment problems of Vietnam veterans, especially the disabled. Many came home unthanked and unnoticed for their sacrifice. Being forgotten became one of the heaviest emotional burdens, particularly as South Vietnam collapsed and the country's leaders were content, as President Ford urged, to put Vietnam behind us. One of the government's failures is that it hasn't conducted the research to learn how widespread the emotional problems may be. One unofficial VA estimate holds that one out of five new veterans suffers serious and prolonged readjustment problems.

From these examples alone—and there are others—it is clear that, despite the efforts of a few public officials as well as some of the more alert veterans groups, there is no coherent national policy for dealing with the problems of returned service personnel. It is not as though solutions are unknown, or that teachers, counselors and others are unwilling to work individually with the veterans. An article on the opposite page today tells the story of a few people involved in programs that are as worthwhile on the local level as they are deserving of support from higher levels.

In other words, it can be done—it just isn't being done enough.

At the moment, Congress is considering an across-the-board increase in GI benefits. This approach, as a recent report to the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors notes, is far from ideal: It may overcompensate those veterans who already are receiving too much, while others will remain without access to schooling. Rep. Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.), along with 75 cosponsors, has introduced legislation that would accelerate the availability of GI Bill benefits. This bill and another—providing tuition equalization—deserve immediate attention.

Evidence suggests that the veterans have a number of supporters scattered throughout Congress. But it is the responsibility of the President to pull together that support, as well as coordinate the energies of his own administration. In January, the Secretary of Labor, with considerable fanfare, announced a \$1.3 billion program to provide more jobs for veterans. Four months later, unemployment among veterans remains high with veterans groups still awaiting signs of effective followup. One issue that has aroused the anxiety of these groups is that the mandatory veterans quotas—ones assuring that the jobs go to veterans rather than others—have been dropped from the administration's bill now on its way through Congress.

The President has spoken movingly of the plight of the Vietnam veterans. But his actions—the efforts to provide a form of amnesty for deserters and veterans with "bad paper" discharges, the hastily assembled jobs program—fall short of the sort of comprehensive, high-priority approach that is needed. Today, as always, we salute those who served and suffered in all wars—and, above all, those who gave their lives. But our urgent concern is with the veterans of the Vietnam

years—and with the unfinished business of that war.

TV AND CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has demonstrated the effectiveness of television in promoting programs and policies of his administration. The Members of the Congress are becoming more aware each day of the disadvantage which they are experiencing while the President—and the executive branch—tend to dominate the TV medium while sessions of the Congress are never seen by television viewers except when the President himself appears at a joint session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as some of our States have shown, there is wide public interest in the sessions of State legislative bodies—particularly when issues of great importance are being debated.

Mr. Speaker, for too long the efforts to authorize the televising of sessions of the House of Representatives have languished in the Rules Committee with no definitive policy having been established for televising our sessions. I am confident that limited televising of the debates which occur here in this Chamber would attract widespread attention, increase public knowledge—and add to the reputation and respect for the Congress as an institution.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished journalist, Roscoe Drummond, commented upon this subject in a most constructive way in a recent May 18 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. I am attaching hereto Mr. Drummond's column:

TV AND CONGRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—I should like to offer a postscript to The Christian Science Monitor's insightful series on how TV is changing our society.

It has changed some things well and many things badly.

But it hasn't changed the Congress of the United States at all.

It is time they got together. Both would benefit—and the public most of all. Live commercial television ought to get acquainted with Congress and Congress ought soon to make peace with TV. They have been strangers far too long. A respectful alliance between the two could go a long way—at a very needed time—to bring Congress closer to the voters and to enable it to do its job better.

Each has its reasons for ignoring the other and most of these reasons are outworn, outmoded, and disproved. Live commercial TV just automatically assumed that covering Congress effectively at firsthand would produce too small an audience and too little profit. And the congressmen feel that living color would make them seem more inept or irrelevant than they sometimes are.

It seems fantastic bordering on the incredible that floor debates in both the Senate and the House are being blacked out 53 years

after the first piece of legislation was put forward to permit radio coverage and 33 years after the original bill was introduced to allow television coverage!

Congress prides itself on being a great deliberative body, but isn't this carrying deliberation a little too far?

Especially when experience in the use of television in the state legislatures has proved altogether acceptable to the legislators and welcome by the public.

At first state legislators were apprehensive that TV would turn the sessions into a circus that would make voter opinion even more critical than it already is.

It hasn't worked out that way and Congress ought to take notice and bring itself into friendly terms with the one instrument of communication which can do most to make government into a better and more responsive partnership between those who vote in the elections and those who vote in the legislatures.

In nearly every state the results of broadcasting the debates have been positive. The substance of legislation has visibly improved under its impact and public interest in the business of government has been heightened.

And right now is the moment when it can render the greatest service. Watergate and cynicism have been largely dissolved. Voters are demanding the right and the opportunity to make their views count in the decision-making process of government. The movement is toward a greater voter participation. To bring Congress into closer contact with its constituents and to bring the voters into more direct communication with Congress will be a boon at the most opportune moment.

After watching the instrument of television from the sidelines, as if they weren't quite sure it is here to stay, and holding back more than three decades, the congressmen ought to quit fooling around and make television a tool of democratic governing.

A minute beginning is in prospect. Last year the majority leader of the House stonewalled a bill which would have authorized such broadcasts and thereby kept it from going to a vote. This year he has moved an inch or two; that is, he is prepared to allow a test of closed-circuit television—not to the public—but to the offices of the members!

Time was when the state legislatures were the experimental proving ground for new social legislation. Now the states are leading the way in the modern use of television to put government in the drawing rooms of the voters. It's working well. Congress, please take notice.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE BETH SHALOM

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, in just a few days, a noted house of worship in the 34th Congressional District of California will be celebrating its silver anniversary.

I hope all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join with me in commemorating this most joyous anniversary of Temple Beth Shalom in Long Beach.

For the past quarter-century, Temple Beth Shalom has served as a leading community resource for Greater Long Beach and as a spiritual asset for its

large and vibrant congregation. Mr. Speaker, I have personally watched Temple Beth Shalom grow and serve the community, and I feel that no institution is more worthy of our congratulations.

Let today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect the heartfelt best wishes of the 95th Congress on this landmark in the history of Temple Beth Shalom. May God's blessings continue to protect this holy place.

WHEN THE DOOR IS CLOSED TO ILLEGAL ALIENS, WHO PAYS?

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, few problems we face are as complex and perplexing as the problem of illegal aliens. We have a serious unemployment problem in this Nation which compounds all the difficulties. I have met with fruit-growers who have given me their side of the story. I have talked with the aliens and the relatives of the aliens. Perhaps our colleague Representative E DE LA GARZA summarized it best when I asked him a few weeks ago what the answer is, "The answer primarily rests in Mexico rather than in the United States." His answer—which increasingly I believe is correct—is a good illustration why we have to work with other countries to solve problems of poverty and population explosion.

Yesterday's New York Times had an article by Prof. Wayne A. Cornelius, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which sheds some light on this problem. I am having it inserted into the RECORD:

WHEN THE DOOR IS CLOSED TO ILLEGAL ALIENS,
WHO PAYS?

(By Wayne A. Cornelius)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—A very predictable thing happens in this country whenever the economy takes a sharp turn for the worst: The illegal alien is rediscovered. Politicians, journalists, organized labor, and other interest groups rush to blame him for every imaginable problem afflicting American society, from high unemployment to rising crime rates, escalating social-service costs, overpopulation, and balance-of-payments deficits.

Immigration authorities crank out ever-more-frightening "guess-timates" of the numbers of illegal aliens "silently invading" the country. The public is warned in urgent and ominous tones that illegal aliens are out to take their jobs away and add billions of dollars to their tax bills.

We are now witnessing yet another "rediscovery" of the illegal alien. Pressures for new restrictive measures—particularly legislation that would impose civil or criminal penalties and fines on United States employers who "knowingly" hire illegal aliens—have mounted steadily. Such restrictive measures form the core of the policy package reportedly recommended to President Carter by his Cabinet-level task force on illegal aliens, and they have been proposed repeatedly by various members of Congress.

The case for a more restrictive immigration policy is based on three principal assumptions: that illegal aliens compete effectively with, and displace, large numbers

of American workers; that the benefits to American society resulting from the aliens' contribution of low-cost labor are exceeded by the "social costs" resulting from their presence here; and that most illegal aliens entering the United States eventually settle here permanently, thus imposing an increasingly heavy, long-term burden upon the society.

There is as yet no direct evidence to support any of these assumptions, at least with respect to illegal aliens from Mexico, who still constitute at least 60 to 65 percent of the total flow and more than 90 percent of the illegal aliens apprehended each year.

Where careful independent studies of the impact of illegal immigration on local labor markets have been made, they have found no evidence of large-scale displacement of legal resident workers by illegal aliens. Studies have also shown that Mexican illegals make amazingly little use of tax-supported social services while they are in the United States, and that the cost of the services they do use is far outweighed by their contributions to Social Security and income tax revenues.

There is also abundant evidence indicating that the vast majority of illegal aliens from Mexico continue to maintain a pattern of "shuttle" migration, most of them returning to Mexico after six months or less of employment in the United States. In fact, studies have shown that only a small minority of Mexican illegals even aspire to settle permanently in the United States.

While illegal aliens from countries other than Mexico do seem to stay longer and make more use of social services, there is still no reliable evidence that they compete effectively with American workers for desirable jobs. The typical job held by the illegal alien, regardless of nationality, would not provide the average American family with more than a subsistence standard of living. In most states, it would provide less income than welfare payments.

Certainly in some geographic areas, types of enterprises, and job categories, illegal aliens may depress wage levels or "take jobs away" from American workers. But there is simply no hard evidence that these effects are as widespread or as serious as most policy-makers and the general public seem to believe.

The notion that curtailing illegal immigration will significantly reduce unemployment among the young, the unskilled, members of minority groups, and other sectors of the United States population allegedly being displaced by illegal aliens may prove to be a cruel illusion.

Many of the jobs "liberated" in this way are likely to be eliminated through mechanization or through bankruptcy of the enterprises involved, and many others cannot be "upgraded" sufficiently—even with higher wages and shorter hours—to make them attractive to native workers.

While the benefits of a more restrictive immigration policy to the American worker have been grossly exaggerated, the costs of such a policy to both the United States and the illegal aliens' countries of origin have been consistently underestimated.

The impact of "closing the door" to illegal aliens will be felt by the American consumer, in the form of higher prices for food and many other products currently produced with alien labor. Failures among small businesses—those with 25 or fewer employees, which hire more than half of the illegal aliens from Mexico—will also increase, eliminating jobs not only for illegals but for native Americans.

But the adverse impact of restrictive measures will be felt most intensely in Mexico, which is currently struggling to recover from its most serious economic crisis since the 1930's. At least 20 percent of the population—

and a much higher proportion of the rural labor—depend upon wages earned in the United States for a large share of their cash income.

An employer-sanction law that is even partly effective in denying jobs to illegal aliens is likely to produce economic dislocations and human suffering on a massive scale within Mexico. This will not be simply a problem for Mexico; the implications for United States economic and foreign policy interests are obvious.

All available evidence indicates that employer sanctions and other restrictive measures—short of erecting a Berlin-type wall—will fail to deter economically desperate Mexicans from seeking employment in the United States.

In the long run, every dollar that is spent trying to enforce new restrictive policies would be much better spent on programs to reduce the "push" factors within Mexico and other sending countries that are primarily responsible for illegal immigration: rural unemployment and underemployment, low incomes, and rapid population growth.

For example, studies indicate that resources invested in labor-intensive, small-scale rural industries could significantly reduce the flow of illegal aliens within five to eight years.

In the short run, the best approach would be an expanded program of temporary worker visas permitting up to six months of employment in the United States each year. A temporary-worker program that did not require a prearranged contract between the alien worker and a particular United States employer (in contrast to the former *bracero* program of contract labor) would minimize exploitation of alien workers while reducing illegal immigration and keeping open a critically important safety valve for Mexico. It would also benefit United States workers, since the use of legal alien labor is likely to have a less depressing effect on wages and working conditions than the use of illegal alien labor.

It is ironic that a more restrictive immigration policy is being advocated by many at a point in our history when declining birth rates, the end of unlimited legal immigration, and an American labor force with more education and higher job expectations than ever before all foreshadow a shortage of workers to fill low-skill, low-wage, low-status jobs in the United States economy. When this occurs, in the not-to-distant future, the aliens who are now viewed as a burden on United States society may be seen as a highly valuable asset.

OSHA FINALLY FACING UP TO MORE OF THE REAL ISSUES

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the new Occupational Safety and Health Administration focus announced recently by Labor Secretary Ray Marshall and Assistant Secretary of Labor Eula Bingham has been hailed by the Washington Post in an editorial on May 26, 1977.

The Carter administration deserves high praise from all Americans for taking an agency plagued with troubles and giving it new direction, without once relaxing its commitment to the saving of human lives at the workplace.

The Post editorial speaks for itself and I submit it herewith:

OVERHAULING OSHA

OSHA—the name has become synonymous with federal regulation gone awry. In part it's a bum rap, because the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has taken effective action against vinyl chloride and some other serious threats to workers' health. The agency has suffered, though, from indifferent leadership and a tendency to dissipate its resources on nit-picking programs and trivial rules. While many of the tales about OSHA inspections and requirements have been overblown, there has been enough truth in them to fuel the folklore about bureaucratic paternalism and pettiness. In short, OSHA has not been as bad as its critics maintain—but neither has it been as persistent and purposeful as it should be.

Labor Secretary Ray Marshall and Assistant Secretary Eula Bingham are now setting out to give the beleaguered agency more focus and force. Their plan, announced last week, includes something for everyone. Organized labor, congressional committees and the General Accounting Office should like the decision to concentrate on substantial health and safety problems in high-risk industries such as construction, manufacturing, transportation and petrochemicals. Business groups should applaud the new emphasis on simplified regulations, voluntary compliance and consultation, and fewer inspections of small businesses in low-risk fields.

If pursued with enough determination, this sensible strategy should make OSHA much more effective—but not necessarily more popular. Indeed, a vigorous regulatory campaign, especially against health hazards, is bound to take OSHA even farther into areas full of scientific uncertainty and political strain. Workers these days are exposed to a host of substances whose effects on human health are not fully understood. Even where something is known to be toxic, the precise degree of risk—or an acceptable amount of exposure—may be very hard to calculate, and the costs of full protection can run very high. There are no simple formulas for weighing all the variables and determining how much a company, an industry or society in general should invest to safeguard a given number of lives.

The Carter administration is not shying away from these tough problems. Last month the Labor Department announced an emergency crackdown on workers' exposure to benzene, a petroleum derivative generally believed to cause leukemia. Though the United Rubber Workers and other unions have been urging such a step for years, some labor spokesmen have criticized the proposed 90 percent reduction as inadequate. Petroleum companies, on the other hand, are challenging the order as excessive in some respects.

As the OSHA overhaul proceeds, more controversies of this sort are bound to arise. Indeed, they should be welcomed, as evidence that government and society are finally facing up to more of the real issues of industrial health and safety in a world of complex technology.

HUMAN RIGHTS RESOLUTION OF
CAPITOL REGION CONFERENCE
OF CHURCHES

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share the following declaration on human rights

with my colleagues. It was adopted recently by the Capitol Region, Hartford, Conference of Churches:

THE CAPITOL REGION
CONFERENCE OF CHURCHES,
Hartford, Conn., May 27, 1977.

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

DEAR PRESIDENT CARTER: The Spring Assembly of the Capitol Region Conference of Churches at which 150 delegates were present adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, God's love is magnificent and extends to all beings,

Therefore be it resolved that the General Assembly of the Capitol Region Conference of Churches recognizes a universal demand and God-given purpose of inalienable human rights, applauds the commitment of this nation to human rights as expressed by President Carter in his Inaugural Address and commends him for his valiant and steadfast actions to fulfill that commitment.

We are encouraged by your concern for human rights and applaud your efforts.

Sincerely,

Rev. Dr. DAVID D. MELLON,
Executive Director.

FIDDLING WITH HEALTH

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Carter's proposal to place an artificial limit on hospital costs is contrary to every basic law of economics and commonsense. The Banner, published in Cambridge, Md., suggested in a recent editorial that the President would be well advised to propose something besides the "thoroughly discredited and thoroughly dangerous tool" of price controls if he wants to do something worthwhile to stop the cost spiral in health care. I strongly agree with the Banner's comments and commend them to the Congress:

FIDDLING WITH HEALTH

The American economy is such a complex thing that if you push down here, something far over there is likely to pop up. Flip this switch, and the ground shakes miles away. Pull that lever, and the whole thing might collapse like a house of cards.

The interrelationship of cogs and wheels and gears and cams and levers and shafts is so intricate that no man or group of men can comprehend the whole machine. Most men, however, are wise enough not to fiddle.

President Jimmy Carter is fiddling. His proposal to clamp a lid on runaway hospital costs undoubtedly strikes a resonant chord among millions of wheezing, irregularly thumping American breasts. Not just the sick, however, but all Americans who pay taxes are suffering from rising costs of medical care.

In 1976, when the consumer price index increased about seven per cent, health care costs increased at double that rate. In 1950, hospital care cost \$16 a day. By 1966 that figure had risen to \$48. Now it is \$154 to \$175 a day. An American family of four pays an estimated \$2,600 per year on health care, or about \$650 per person. Twelve cents of every dollar the federal government spends goes to health care. Other statistics could be cited, and they are equally disturbing.

The motivation to fiddle, therefore, is very strong. But, as we have stated in an earlier editorial, price control cannot be imposed on one part of the health care system—hospital costs—without leading to price controls throughout the system and, inevitably, throughout the entire economy.

The American Hospital Association has vowed "united opposition from both hospitals and physicians" to the Carter plan. We hate to say it, but the "heavies" in this little drama are correct.

The federal government has a constructive role to play in keeping hospital costs and all other costs from going through the roof. It can ensure greater efficiency and better utilization of medical resources. It can make it harder on crooked doctors and malpractice-happy attorneys. But it cannot do any of these things through price control, a thoroughly discredited and thoroughly dangerous tool in the hands of fiddlers.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
PRESENCE OF THE SISTERS OF
NOTRE DAME DE NAMUR IN THE
SACRED HEART PARISH, SPRING-
FIELD, MASS.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending a liturgy of thanksgiving marking the 100th anniversary of the presence of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur in the Sacred Heart Parish, Springfield, Mass. On May 15, I joined with hundreds of other parishioners of Sacred Heart in a Mass celebrated by the bishop of Springfield, the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, his coadjutor, the Most Reverend Joseph Maguire, and 18 other concelebrants to pay tribute to the devotion of these holy women. Mayor William Sullivan of Springfield, an alumnus of the school, acted as a lector, as did Sister Eileen Sullivan, the provincial superior of the order.

The sisters became the first faculty in the Sacred Heart Elementary School, which opened in 1877 in the first parish building, a combination school and parish hall dedicated in 1874. The sisters first came to Sacred Heart at the invitation of Father McDermott, the first pastor of Sacred Heart Parish. They have taught and trained the youth of the parish for the last 100 years in the same spirit of giving which prompted their arrival in the parish's formative years.

Three hundred thirty students were enrolled the first day that the parochial school of Sacred Heart was opened, and the school was staffed with seven sisters. Sister Johanna acting as superior. Today the enrollment is 1,000 students and there are 29 teaching sisters under the direction of Sister Superior Agnes Philipps. From a humble beginning—down through the years to the present—the sisters of Notre Dame have labored endlessly for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the children of Sacred Heart parish.

The record of the sisters of Notre Dame at Sacred Heart is a glorious one. Their

ideals are as real today as they were when their foundress, Saint Julie, first directed them to teach and train the little ones to love God and devote themselves to duty. The parish of the Sacred Heart is perpetually grateful to the Order of Notre Dame for the Christian family education which the good sisters have given to so many hundreds of boys and girls these past 100 years.

As time has passed, there have been many changes in educational methods and Notre Dame has modified its courses of study as conditions demanded or warranted. Yet, there has been no change in that ideal of devotedness to duty that is a mark of the sisters of Notre Dame.

So, it is in this memorable year, as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of Notre Dame at Sacred Heart, that I wish to raise my voice in recognition of the splendid achievements of these beloved sisters, to witness their love and loyalty to Notre Dame and pray God to bless their work—not only at Sacred Heart, but in their worldwide mission, so that they may continue to draw souls closer to God and His Mother, to whom their lives are dedicated.

THE FLYING DUTCHMEN

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, we often hear complaints to the effect that today's youth is largely an aimless group, hardly the peer of young people in years past. However, every day I am encouraged by evidence that such complaints are, for the most part, unfounded.

Today, I take considerable personal pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues, one such encouraging event. During the week of June 5 through June 11, the Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers of Reading, Pa., will hold a 6-day model air show. The aeromodelers' program helps publicize a hobby which has brought great recreational enjoyment to young and old alike. Not only does aeromodeling provide young people with an educational pastime, but through its broad appeal to all age groups, it helps bridge the generation gap. Members of the Flying Dutchmen, for example, range in age from 9 to 78.

The Flying Dutchmen show team is one of seven groups in the country nationally sanctioned by the Academy of Model Aeronautics, the national governing body of airplane model clubs. At the request of the national headquarters, 12 members of the 50-member group will represent model aviation in exhibits in Pennsylvania as well as in other States. Among the seven designated show teams, the Reading group is the only one flying control line planes rather than radio-operated models. The Flying Dutchmen have promoted their activities by conducting 6-week courses on a regular

basis for civic groups and other organizations.

It is a source of great optimism in view of the quickening pace of American life, that clubs such as the Flying Dutchmen Aeromodelers continue to flourish and grow, attracting people who, regardless of age, are young-at-heart. The value of the group's activities such as Berks County Model Aviation Week is best summarized by a recent statement made by Mr. Alvah Schaeffer, show team president:

My wife files with me. It's a family hobby, and as a matter of fact we look for Flying Dutchmen members who apply to the club as a family unit.

The aeromodelers have my most genuine admiration and my highest commendation for their outstanding contributions to the community of Reading and Berks County.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our country is silently being invaded by an army of illegal aliens. While illegal immigrants are here to seek the American dream, many persons fear they may be destroying it for others.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service—INS—which administers the immigration laws, reports there are between 6 and 8 million illegal aliens now living in the United States. At a time of high unemployment, illegal aliens are taking hundreds of thousands of jobs away from Americans, because of their willingness to work for low wages.

The INS estimates that today there are over 1 million jobs held by illegal immigrants that could be filled by Americans. If U.S. workers held those jobs, our unemployment rate could drop from 7.3 to 6.3 percent.

In addition, illegal aliens are burdening our severely strained social welfare system. Aliens are getting on Medicare and Medicaid rolls, sending their children to public schools, and getting free medical treatment at hospital emergency rooms. All told, INS believes that illegal aliens cost American taxpayers \$13 billion per year in social services.

It is not surprising, then, that Americans favor changes in immigration policy. According to an April 24 Gallup poll, an overwhelming 82 percent of the public say they support a law prohibiting employers from hiring aliens without proper papers. And some 42 percent favor a decrease in present immigration levels.

A task force created by President Carter has sent him a legislative package dealing with the problem of illegal immigration. While there may be some points that need further consideration, the basic thrust of the proposals is sound.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my

colleagues' attention to an article I have written for my weekly news column on the subject of illegal immigration:

THE SILENT INVASION OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

(By Representative MORGAN F. MURPHY)

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free . . .

These words, inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, are America's welcome to immigrants seeking a better life. Traditionally, America has enjoyed and clung to its image as the land of opportunity to the rest of the world.

But as our population has grown and economic conditions have worsened, the U.S. has had to take a second look at its immigration policies.

The reason: our country is silently being invaded by an army of illegal immigrants. As a recent article in Time magazine pointed out, these "invaders," eager to share in America's bounty, are coming by land, sea, and air. Some hop planes, others jump ships, and some even pass through the San Antonio sewer system. While illegal immigrants are here to seek the American Dream, many persons fear they may be destroying it for others.

Who are the illegal aliens? Eight out of ten come from Mexico, which has an unemployment rate of almost 40 per cent. Mexicans who are able to find a job may be paid as little as \$1 per day.

Where do they live? Most illegal immigrants work on farms in the South or Southwest. But a growing number live in large Northern cities, where they work as dishwashers, porters, laundrymen, and busboys.

Currently, only 290,000 persons are allowed to migrate to the U.S. each year. That contrasts with the four million immigrants who settled in our country shortly after the turn of the century.

But this seemingly strict immigration quota has not been enforced. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), which administers the immigration laws, reports there are between six and eight million illegal aliens now living in the U.S.

The number of illegal immigrants has increased dramatically over the past sixteen years. For instance, last year the INS apprehended and expelled 875,000 illegal aliens—almost ten times the number expelled in 1961.

Because of the recession, the problem of illegal immigration finally has caught the eye of the public and government officials. At a time of high unemployment, illegal aliens are taking hundreds of thousands of jobs away from Americans because of their willingness to work for low wages.

For example, Time magazine reported that even though Houston is enjoying a building boom, there is widespread unemployment among union carpenters. This is because contractors are waiting to hire Mexican immigrants who will work for less than the minimum wage. The INS estimates that today there are over 1 million jobs held by illegal immigrants that could be filled by Americans. If U.S. workers held those jobs, our unemployment rate could drop from 7.3 per cent to 6.3 per cent.

In addition, Time noted that illegal aliens are adding new burdens to our social welfare system. Aliens are getting on Medicare and Medicaid rolls, receiving free medical treatment at hospital emergency rooms, and sending their children to public schools. In 1975, 370 illegal aliens seized in New York were found to have received \$500,000 in welfare payments. All told, the INS believes that illegal aliens cost American taxpayers \$13 billion per year in social welfare services.

It is not surprising, then, that Americans favor changes in immigration policy. Accord-

ing to an April 24 Gallup poll, an overwhelming 82 per cent of the public say they support a law prohibiting employers from hiring illegal aliens without proper papers. And some 42 per cent favor a decrease in present immigration levels. (Only 7 per cent favor an increase, and 37 per cent support present immigration levels.)

What can be done about illegal immigration? On April 27, a task force created by President Carter sent him a legislative package dealing with this problem.

Among the recommendations:

Civil fines for employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens. (Currently there are no penalties.)

Stricter enforcement of wage-and-hour laws to reduce employers' incentives to hire aliens.

Tougher patrol of the 2,000 mile-long Mexican border.

Economic aid to Mexico, with an emphasis on farming projects, to help reduce that country's persistent unemployment problem.

Amnesty for illegal aliens who have lived long enough in the U.S. to build up substantial "equity."

Not all of the recommendations have been readily accepted. Some employers insist that many low-paying or high-risk jobs would go unfilled if they could not hire aliens. Others believe that the risk of penalties could result in discrimination against Hispanics, since employers might be afraid of hiring potential illegal aliens.

While there may be problems with some of the particulars of the package, the basic thrust of the proposals is sound. America should maintain its image as the land of opportunity, but we must also send out a sobering message to the world that our resources are not unlimited.

CITY'S MOST DISTINGUISHED SERVANT

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a special event that is about to take place in the city of Newport Beach, Calif. on June 9, 1977 in honor of one of the city's most distinguished public servants. A retirement testimonial dinner is being held for Newport Beach Police Chief B. James Glavas by the "10-4" Club of the Newport Harbor Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the Newport Beach Employees Association.

The event is designed to thank Chief Glavas for his outstanding service and reflect on his 16-year tenure as the city's top law enforcement official and on his numerous professional accomplishments.

Chief Glavas has served as president of the Southern California Juvenile Officers Association—1959, president of the California State Juvenile Officers Association—1961, president of the Orange County Chiefs of Police Association—1967, president of the California Peace Officers' Association—1972-73. Currently he sits on the executive board of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

In addition to his professional accomplishments he has made a major contribution in the field of teaching and

youth services. An instructor for 17 years in police science, he has taught at both the University of Southern California and at the California State University at Los Angeles. He has served on many community advisory committees, including: The Pueblo District Council for the Boy Scouts of America; Youth Study Center at USC; Citizens Advisory Committee to the Attorney General on Juvenile Violence; and the Harbor Area Boys Club.

It is with a touch of regret I say goodbye to Chief Glavas because my constituents of the 40th Congressional District as well as myself and my family who live in Newport Beach are losing a fine law enforcement official and administrator. But I extend my hearty congratulations on the conclusion of a fine career and best wishes to Jim and Melva Glavas for a happy and prosperous retirement.

TREASURY TAX AND LOAN ACCOUNTS

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee and the Ways and Means Committee considered and passed legislation which would permit Treasury to realize net earnings of \$50 to \$100 million annually. This legislation, which grants Treasury investment authority over its tax and loan account funds held in commercial banks, was subsequently passed by the House on April 25 by a margin of 384 to 0. Efforts to push this measure through began in the early 1970's, and during the last Congress a similar measure was laid to rest in the Senate in the final days of the second session due to the inclusion of several controversial provisions.

As a staunch supporter of the investment authority embodied in H.R. 5675 and its inclusion of savings and loan associations into our tax and loan account system, as well as its special consideration for softening the impact of the investment authority on small and minority-owned banks, it is with great interest that I anticipate upcoming Senate activity on a comparable proposal. It can certainly be said that this legislation is long overdue and that among its most impressive features is the advocacy of efficient cash management by the Federal Government, reducing potential revenue losses to taxpayers. Furthermore, H.R. 5675 would permit reimbursement to depository institutions for certain services rendered in connection with maintaining T.T. & L. accounts on a more equitable basis than is currently the case. As a Treasury Department study on the tax and loan account system revealed, during 1972 commercial banks were able to utilize Federal T.T. & L. funds to generate earnings which exceeded the expenses of handling these accounts by \$170 million.

Mr. Speaker, recently, however, Treasury has taken certain steps to limit its losses from the current system. In 1976, for instance, average T.T. & L. balances in commercial banks declined to 21 percent of Treasury's operating cash as opposed to 65 percent during 1974. The average T.T. & L. balance in fiscal year 1974 was \$3.9 billion compared to \$1.4 billion in fiscal year 1976. Thus, Mr. Speaker, Treasury has been able to reduce potential earnings losses. Yet, as Fiscal Assistant Secretary David Mosso stated before the Domestic Monetary Policy Subcommittee, a substantial loss occurs through the inability to turn tax and loan funds in-transit between commercial banks and Federal Reserve banks into an earning asset. While no firm estimates of this loss are available, the amount of in-transit funds may be as high as \$1 billion.

T.T. & L. INVESTMENT AUTHORITY AND MONETARY POLICY

Mr. Speaker, an occurrence in late April involving Treasury's tax and loan account funds and the Fed's conduct of monetary policy illustrates why the proposed new tax and loan system is far superior than that which exists. As a New York Times article on April 29 discloses, 3 days earlier, on April 26:

The Fed could not complete its reserve adding operations . . . because of "an acute shortage of collateral," or Treasury securities which the Fed purchases from dealers, frequently for short periods of time.

A few days earlier, Treasury had withdrawn almost \$3 billion of noninterest bearing T.T. & L. funds from commercial banks. With the shortage of Treasury securities on the market, however, Treasury was forced to redeposit the amount withdrawn. This cumbersome action resulted in Treasury's losing interest for that day on about \$3 billion. The full sum of that loss, moreover, will probably never be recouped even though some adjustments for that loss will be attempted. In addition, this redeposit represented a temporary but destabilizing influence on the money market with potential adverse effects on short-term interest rates. Under the new system granting Treasury an income-earning capability for T.T. & L. funds, "massive swings" of Treasury funds could be eliminated. Thus, with the avoidance of redeposits, the smooth conduct of monetary policy by the Federal Reserve can be enhanced. Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I request that the article mentioned above be printed in the Record at this point:

BIG SWINGS IN TREASURY'S BALANCE ROILS FED OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS

Massive swings in the Treasury's balance at Federal Reserve Banks last week caused difficulty in the Fed's open market operations and uncertainty in the credit markets about the level at which the Fed wishes to peg the target for the trend-setting Federal funds rate.

Tax receipts in the latest week, being larger than expected, were a major factor in draining an average of \$3.4 billion a day from the banking system, according to a spokesman for the central bank.

To offset the large drains, the Fed's trading desk added a total of \$1.9 billion to its holdings of United States Government secu-

rities during the week. However, that was not enough to do the job and on Tuesday, the Treasury had to make the unusual move of redepositing \$2.4 billion of tax and loan accounts at large commercial banks to aid the Fed in adding reserves to the system.

The central banker said the Fed could not complete its reserve adding operations on Tuesday because of "an acute shortage of collateral," or Treasury securities which the Fed purchases from dealers, frequently for short periods of time. The Fed sells securities when it is draining reserves.

SHORTAGE IN TREASURY BILLS

The shortage in Treasury bills was caused by Treasury paydowns on maturing debt, strong demand for the bills by foreign borrowers and, according to some analysts, caution on the part of dealers who are carrying smaller inventories in anticipation of rising short-term interest rates.

The central bank spokesman said it was the first time in a couple of years that the Treasury had redeposited receipts in its accounts at large commercial banks.

He indicated, however, that it had been routine at one time. In 1975, the Treasury, at the urging of Congress, initiated a policy of minimizing its tax and loan balances and maximizing its balances at the Fed. Congress had argued that banks were getting to use Treasury cash balances on which interest is not paid for long periods of time.

Most key short-term interest rates moved up slightly in the latest week. The Federal funds rate, an important indicator of monetary policy, averaged 4.82 percent, up from 4.71 percent. This was its highest average in five months.

Whether the rise in the Fed funds average signals a slight firming in Fed policy appeared to be a key issue in the money markets last week as the task of interpreting Fed moves was complicated by the Fed's timing and difficulty in conducting open market operations.

By the end of the statement week, however, many analysts had concluded that the Fed had indeed moved.

Robert H. Ried of McCarthy, Ried, Crisanti & Maffei, a money market research firm, said yesterday, "the rate has firmed to at least 4 1/2 percent but could be 4 3/4 to 5 percent."

Mr. Ried added, "It doesn't have tremendous implications for price changes and was probably based on money supply forecasts for double-digit growth in the April-May period."

RESERVE REPORT

(In billions of dollars)

	Latest week	Previous week	Year ago
DAILY AVERAGES			
Adjusted credit proxy ¹	547.9	547.1	519.8
Monetary base ¹	131.985	132.394	123.331
Total reserves ¹	34.96	34.79	34.77
Narrow money supply:			
Money supply ¹	321.0	321.3	303.4
Money supply plus time deposits ¹	761.9	762.8	691.8
Net free (+) borrowed (-) reserve	396	330	396
Member bank borrowings	84	75	53
WEDNESDAY FIGURES			
Business loans:			
April 20: All large banks ^{1,2}	116.878	117.182	112.894
April 27:			
New York banks ³	33.530	33.750	34.830
Chicago banks	11.245	11.206	10.814

¹ Seasonally adjusted.

² Revised.

³ Millions.

Note: Year-ago reserve totals not comparable due to change in reserve requirements.

RHYS CAPARN RETROSPECTIVE

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, currently at the Bethel Gallery in Bethel, Conn., is a show by one of America's foremost sculptors, Rhys Caparn. This show which recently opened on May 28 will continue to June 22. I would urge all of my colleagues to come to Connecticut to see this collection of sculptures which Miss Caparn has done over the past 47 years.

Rhys Caparn was trained in the classical traditions of sculpture and her early work might have led one to believe that here was yet another traditional sculptor. Yet she became one of the most original and experimental sculptors of her time, bringing to an ancient art new insights to expand the hitherto unexplored potential of her medium.

Her early work consisted of portraiture and the human figure. But in retrospect, these works have played but a minor role in her overall work which has proved to be of a much broader content, based on the whole of nature, on natural forms and natural forces. And though, over the years, there have been intervening trends, there is an essential order to her work. It is a movement from animals that stand upon the Earth, to birds released from the Earth, then to landscapes of the Earth itself and finally toward abstractions inspired by the quiet and distant spaces of the Moon.

About her sculpture, Miss Caparn has said:

I believe that sculpture must render visible through form that which lies beyond appearance. The artist is responsible for growth of consciousness. The manner in which he achieves this is his own, and has no limits. Sculpture is a monumental art, whatever the size of its execution. To have permanence it must make a complete statement: at once violent and serene. It is no medium for the frenetic. It must be highly organized, have aloof unity, and always come to rest. Its eloquence depends upon depth and density of volume, either stated or suggested.

I gather my forms from the apparitions of life: man, animals, birds; the lines of trees, the bulk of rocks, the shadows of ravines and crevasses, the slope of hills under snow. I am interested in the sound of movement: the round sound of birds beating their wings near water; the thin sound of wind in trees; and the silence of flight. The bas-relief, with its suggestions of light, remains yet almost unexplored. I have used the arch not only for its symbolism of passage and therefore change, but because in the midst of ruins it remains at ease with nature.

Besides the sculpture of Rhys Caparn, the Bethel Gallery in Bethel, Conn. is itself a work of art. The gallery is housed in a magnificent Federal structure which was formerly used as an opera house. Its dramatic proportions—40 feet by 65 feet with 15-foot ceilings and tall, small-paned windows—make it literally one of the most beautiful art galleries in the country and is particularly appropriate for the showing of sculpture.

I hope none of you will miss this opportunity to see some of the most beautiful

sculpture in this country as well as one of our finest art galleries.

U.N. AMBASSADOR ANDREW YOUNG

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, last week, our ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, was quoted as saying that "the Swedes are terrible racists," which caused the Swedish Ambassador to ask our U.N. mission for an explanation.

Also last week, Mr. Young was quoted as saying he was not very concerned about the presence of Cuban military advisers in Ethiopia, although he noted that our State Department was expressing "grave concern." Mr. Young said that "maybe the Cubans might be a little more rational than the Ethiopians at this point."

But these are only the latest in a series of astonishing statements by the Ambassador. We all recall his statement that Cuban troops were bringing "a certain stability and order to Angola."

Mr. Speaker, there is much confusion as to our foreign policy. If Mr. Young is not representing American foreign policy, then obviously he should not be the Ambassador to the U.N. If he is representing our foreign policy, then we certainly ought to know more about that policy and how it was derived. Perhaps we should just inquire as to whether there is a foreign policy.

Frankly, I am becoming embarrassed, not to say alarmed. Diplomacy should not be conducted in the manner of random pie throwing. It should be conducted with carefully measured language representing policy decisions made by the President after consultation with his advisers. We are involved in some very sensitive negotiations in this world, and it is necessary to cultivate good will and trust to pursue our goals.

Without further comment, I am listing some newspaper accounts of the activities of Ambassador Young.

On April 18, the London Times carried an article by Fred Emery which said:

It is becoming time-consuming as well as tedious keeping track of Mr. Young's dicta. The latest furor concerns his United Nations Arab colleagues who are still upset about his offhand comparison of their hatred for Jews with the Ku Klux Klan's hatred for blacks.

On April 17, The Washington Star reported that "Twenty Arab U.N. delegations have criticized Ambassador Andrew Young for saying that Arab hatred of Jews reminded him of Ku Klux Klan hatred of blacks." Young gave the Arabs a clarification.

On April 16, the Washington Star reported on the controversy that erupted when Ambassador Young said that the South African Government was "illegitimate." "Secretary of State Cyrus Vance telephoned Young to tell him that the remark about illegitimacy was wrong."

On April 15, a Chicago Tribune article said that "Young jolted the world with an impolitic charge, in a BBC interview, that the British were 'a little chicken on race,' and had, in fact, 'invented racism.'" Young apologized.

On April 13, a column by Jack W. Germond and Jules Witcover in the Washington Star said that:

The U.N. ambassador is less Jimmy Carter's point man on foreign policy, as Young himself once described it, than a cannon rolling loose on the deck of a pitching ship.

On April 12, the Washington Star reported that:

The White House has again defended U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, this time for his controversial statement that Americans are "paranoid about a few Communists" in Africa.

The article quoted Young as saying:

The only thing I'm thinking is, don't get paranoid about a few Communists—even a few thousand Communists. Americans shouldn't be afraid of Communists—they just shouldn't. It offends me, really.

On March 20, the Manchester Guardian editorialized:

Mr. Andy Young is a jolly fellow. He thinks (in a southern Africa context) that "no one has any confidence in the British." He would like to see a U.N. Force—of American Marines—run Rhodesia. He reckons "there's some sense in which the Cubans bring a certain stability and order to Angola." He has "a queer understanding" with Mr. Cyrus Vance.

This editorial went on to say that "Washington's foreign policy voice these days is more babble than baritone."

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to join with the citizens of Italy and Americans of Italian descent in celebrating the anniversary of the founding of the Italian republic.

Not until 1870 were all the many independent city states of the Italian peninsula united into one nation under the constitutional monarchy of King Victor Emmanuel II.

Following the Second World War, a referendum, open to all adult citizens, was held on June 2, 1946, and a decisive vote was cast in favor of the establishment of a republican form of government. Under the able leadership of Alcide De Gasperi the new republican government formulated policies along moderate lines, and was supported by the allied powers.

For over 30 years, the freedom-loving Italian people have maintained their cherished republic, often in the face of serious adversity. Through international associations, Italy has demonstrated its commitment to free world goals by participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Council of Europe, and the European Economic Community.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of Italians both to this country and to the

entire world are far too numerous and well-known to need detailing in this brief tribute. Needless to say, I personally take deep pride in my own heritage as an American of Italian origin. I am sure that all Americans join me in my sincere hope that the Italian republic will continue to vigilantly guard the liberties of its people, and will endure.

BRIG. GEN. EBENEZER LEARNED REVOLUTIONARY HERO: TRIBUTE BY THE OXFORD, MASS., HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Ebenezer Learned served his native town of Oxford, Mass., in many capacities. His outstanding contributions to Oxford, to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to the fledgling United States of America will be the subject of a special program this fall in Oxford. The historical commission of the town has provided me with a short synopsis of General Learned's career and accomplishments. I include this material in the RECORD at this point:

OXFORD HISTORICAL SOCIETY NOTES ON GEN. EBENEZER LEARNED

Ebenezer Learned began his distinguished career at the age of 28 in 1756, when he commanded a company raised for service in the French and Indian War. During the summer of 1756, he enlisted, equipped and drilled his company with the valuable aid, as tradition informs us, of Reverend John Campbell, who was skilled in military tactics. On the ninth of September, we find him at the head of 51 men at Lake George, where he had marched from Oxford. We have very little of the details of his services here. Mr. Jennison, in his papers (now in the archives of the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester) says that Ebenezer Learned served from 1756 to 1763, and was at Fort Edward when Fort William Henry was beleaguered and marched without orders to its relief. There is reason, however, to believe that he returned home as early as 1758, as he was elected selectman in that year and each year following until 1764.

The troubles with the mother country began soon, and in the excitement which followed, he took a decided stand with the patriots and officially was active in influencing the doings of the town in that period of doubt and perplexity.

His patriotism has never been questioned. He was unwavering in his devotion to his country, standing almost alone in his family and among the people of his neighborhood in his loyalty. At the time of Shay's Rebellion, he was almost the only man in his section of the town who adhered to the government. He was a marked man in this controversy, and as related, the Shays men decided on a certain night to pay him a visit. Having heard of their plan, he took down a favorite gun which he carried in his Revolutionary campaigns, and procuring a musket for his son-in-law, Adjutant Pray, Ebenezer Learned put them in order and loaded them with powder and ball—making no secret of what he had done. The visit was indefinitely postponed.

General Learned was prominent in civil affairs and, in the 25 years between 1758 and 1794, he was a selectman. He was moderator several years and in 1772 he was one of a Com-

mittee of three to make answer to the petition of the inhabitants of the northeasterly part of the town—which with parts of Worcester, Leicester and Sutton, asked to be set off as an independent corporation and later, a Ward. In 1778 he was chosen as one of the first board of assessors. As selectman, and having previously acted in that capacity, he became in 1779 a delegate to the convention at Cambridge to form a state government. In 1783 he became a representative. In August, 1776, the Court of Sessions at Worcester appointed General Learned one of a committee to superintend the inoculating hospitals in Worcester County. He was a justice of the peace and officially present at the terms of court at Worcester for 1776, 1778, 1789 and 1783, and every year from 1787 to 1795.

In person, he is said to have been above the average in size, erect and in manner, sedate and dignified. He was esteemed as a townsman and as a neighbor, was a devout member of the First Congregational Church of Oxford, a constant attendant on public worship and for many years active in ecclesiastical affairs.

General Learned possessed the prerequisites of a great soldier, and so far as he had opportunity, developed those qualities. Although hampered by a lack of early educational advantages, and in later years by ill health which cut short his service, he was able to establish for himself a worthy military reputation. Whatever his faults may have been, no hint of them appears in the records. We may point with pride to his achievements during the two major battles of Saratoga. On October 7 and October 20, 1777, when the action peaked, as the fate of our country was trembling in the balance, he did in his sphere invaluable service—and there earned for himself the gratitude and honorable remembrance of succeeding generations.

During the Bicentennial Anniversary, the current generation of citizens in Oxford recalled with gratitude the sacrifices of Ebenezer Learned, who also rendered invaluable service at the Battle of Bunker Hill and the Evacuation of Boston. During the winter of 1777-78, Learned and two of his fellow Oxford citizens camped at Valley Forge with General George Washington.

On April 2, 1777, the Congress recognized his accomplishments by appointing him Brigadier General. General Learned retired from the Continental Army after the Battle of Saratoga due to ill health, but he remained an active patriot for which we can all be grateful 200 years later.

Preserved in the Oxford Museum are a 24-pound cannon ball that Ebenezer Learned brought home from Bunker Hill and a silver spoon (inscribed "J.A.B. 1776") which once belonged to General Burgoyne, that General Learned brought home from the Battle of Saratoga.

A bill has been filed in the Massachusetts Legislature to honor Oxford's native, General Ebenezer Learned, on October 7, 1977, the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Battle of Saratoga.

HEARINGS ON CHILD PORNOGRAPHY REVEAL GRAVITY OF PROBLEM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 31, I had the occasion to chair a hearing of the House Select Education Subcommittee examining the shock-

ing spread of child pornography in this Nation. We conducted the hearing at the Covenant House in the Times Square area of New York City. The Covenant House is an agency dedicated to providing care and services for runaways. The program is aimed at preventing these nomadic children from being swooped up by a vicious multi-million-dollar child pornography industry.

The committee was pleased to receive testimony from the executive director of Covenant House, Father Bruce Ritter. His testimony was eloquent and depicted in a most graphic form, the horrors which befall victims of child pornography. I offer his testimony for the close consideration of my colleagues.

Legislation including my bill H.R. 5522 has been proposed to slap new penalties on those persons procuring children 16 and under for pornography as well as those who transport, ship, or use the mail to distribute these materials. The legislation needs careful deliberation if we are to effectively deal with this menace.

I feel that the close attention of the Congress must continue to be focused on this problem and we should not rest until we have dismantled the child pornography industry and assisted its helpless victims.

At this point I offer Father Ritter's testimony as well as my opening statement delivered at the hearing:

TESTIMONY OF FATHER BRUCE RITTER

I am Fr. Bruce Ritter, a Franciscan priest, and executive director of Covenant House, a child care agency in New York City, that specializes in caring for runaway and homeless teenagers. I am delighted that Covenant House has been able to offer our facilities to host these important public hearings, and I am honored to have this opportunity to testify before this distinguished House Subcommittee on Select Education concerning the proposed Child Exploitation Prevention Act.

I think it important that I establish my credentials to address this subcommittee on the subject of children and pornography. Ten years ago, in order to exercise a ministry of services to the urban poor, in 1968, I left a teaching career at Manhattan College and moved into a tenement on East 7th Street in the East Village of Manhattan. Almost immediately I became involved in the tragic problem of many thousands of homeless, drifting children in our city. One night, six kids, all under 16, knocked on my door at two o'clock in the morning. They asked if they could sleep on the floor of my apartment. I said yes and gave them some food and blankets and they lined up in a row on my living room floor and went to sleep. The next day—it was very cold and snowy outside—the kids did not want to go away. One kid did go outside and brought back four more kids: this is the rest of our family, he said. I asked them where they had been staying and they told me: in one of the abandoned buildings on the block, but that they had been burned out the night before by some junkies because the junkies wanted to exploit the kids sexually and they had had quite a bit of that. They had arrived in the East Village via Yonkers where a friendly couple had taken in these runaway kids for several days. The price they had to pay was to star in a pornographic movie, which they did. They were good kids and really did not want to do that so they came down to the East Village . . .

I tried very hard to find a place for these kids in the child welfare system, but could not. So (feeling chagrined and angry that I had been caught by my own rhetoric—I was

in the East Village to be useful, I had a bed and these kids did not) I kept them. I moved some bunk beds into my apartment—four small rooms—and the kids moved in with me. Overnight I became the unwilling Father of ten street kids—something that a background in medieval theology does not quite prepare one for. I thought the solution a temporary one—that human ingenuity would find a way to solve their problem, but the next day two more kids came in, and the day after that, a couple more, so as the junkies in my building died or got busted or moved away, I would take over the apartment, clean and paint it, and move kids in, using volunteers from Manhattan College and Fordham to help me care for them.

That was the beginning of Covenant House. For four years we operated extra legem, as an illegal child care agency, caring for thousands of drifting, homeless children, very many of them victims of sexual exploitation, as were my first ten kids. (Life on the street inevitably, inexorably leads to that for many thousands.) We did not have a charter, a staff, a budget or any funding sources. We did have hundreds and hundreds of runaway and throwaway kids knocking on our doors at any hour of the day and night. In 1972 because of the pressures of these kinds and the lack of money and staff we decided to become legal and Covenant House obtained a charter empowering us to care for a large variety of homeless kids especially nomads and runaways. Today we operate nine residences with a capacity of 120 children and a 24 hour no-questions-asked crisis intervention center here on Eighth Avenue called Under Twenty-one. It is located next to this auditorium.

Times Square as you well know, is the entertainment mecca of New York City and many other Eastern States as well. It is also, as you know, the unofficial redlight district of New York City and one of the centers of the sex industry in the world. It is estimated that this sex industry in the ten blocks surrounding the site of these hearings is a billion and a half dollars a year. Every day hundreds of young people are in this area to make their living in the sex business. Most of them are runaway, walkaway, throwaway, self-emancipated kids, urban nomads, quite easily victimized and exploited by our sex merchants.

When boys or girls are 14 or 15 or 16—or 17 and 18—and they are cold, hungry, homeless, very scared, with no place to stay and no marketable skills, they market themselves. Here in Times Square the sex industry is quite willing to employ them. Indeed, they are vigorously sought out and recruited: the raw materials, the commodities for a sick, savage industry that preys on the children of the poor. The Minnesota Strip and 42d Street are a huge meat market where hundreds of children are forced to display their wares every day.

Because of the concern of the Roman Catholic Church of New York for the thousands of exploited young people in the Times Square area of our city, His Eminence, Cardinal Cooke has directed us to open our Under Twenty-one Center. In the first two months of operation, almost 1,000 children have come to us for help, seeking a bed, food, shelter, protection from their pimps, a job, a chance to go to school. Some desperately want to return home. Others simply can't because they are just not wanted or because no home exists for them.

Let the distinguished members of this committee think I am speaking in generalities, the following are recent occurrences at our center next door. Last Tuesday a boy came to Under Twenty-one—he was 15—a very good looking kid, a runaway from Connecticut. He was approached in Port Authority Bus Terminal and offered quite a bit of money to star in a filmed sex orgy. Last week, Wednesday, a girl, also fifteen, a runaway from Queens was wine and dined and almost persuaded by a so-called "fashion

coordinator" who just happened to run a model studio on 49th Street to pose for photographs and to join him and some friends at a "party" for some film making. Before that, a girl that came to our program for help had accepted a similar offer, did pose, and was then raped. Before that, a boy of 17, a go-go boy who danced on a bar on Second Avenue—if the Johns liked him they would stick a 5 dollar bill in his jock strap. He was also a stripper in a male burlesque house on Eighth Avenue: four performances a night. His performances were filmed. Before that a 14 year old girl, a runaway from out of state, was seduced, raped, held prisoner by a friendly couple in the neighborhood who got her a false I.D., saying she was 18 and got her a job as a stripper on Eighth Avenue.

The horror stories are literally endless. Our society has permitted to develop an enormous sex industry that we seem powerless to do anything about. Under the protection of the First Amendment we are witnessing an almost anything goes explosion of exploitation and abuse that is destroying thousands of young people every year. Our political leaders our law enforcement agencies, the judiciary blame each other and point accusatory fingers elsewhere.

In the last three weeks I have received, in response to a column about Under Twenty-one by Mr. William Reel that appeared in the New York Daily News May 6, 1977, almost two thousand letters from people who are outraged and sickened by the enormous outpouring of filth, particularly regarding the sexual exploitation and abuse of our children for money by our sexual entrepreneurs. One common theme runs through these letters: why don't the politicians and judges and police do something about it. Why do they permit it. Many are concerned that this recent interest in pornography by just about everybody, and in particular the abuse of children, will, like most popular interests of the moment, soon fade and that nothing will be done. I applaud the distinguished members of Congress who are here today to show their interest in this problem. I hope they will take back to the full membership of their committee and the Congress the urgent concern of the citizens of this city that something in fact be done to protect our children.

I would like now to address myself specifically to the actual legislation, H.R. 4571, the so-called Child Exploitation Prevention Act:

1. The focus of this act is, I feel, much too narrow, since it does not also explicitly address the problem of child prostitution. Child pornography and child prostitution are two sides of the same coin. I have never met a child involved in pornography that was not also somehow involved with prostitution or that did not soon get into it.

2. Our children must also be protected from a too compliant, too lenient judiciary that apparently looks on the sexual abuse of children as a minor peccadillo. The new legislation should not only contain stiff penalties but make them mandatory.

3. The age up to which children should be protected from these abuses should certainly be 18, bringing this legislation in line with that general understanding of our society that brings a child to majority at 18, giving them the right to vote and to serve in our armed services, etc. The legislation, already passed by the Assembly in Albany, and pending before the New York State Senate, and your own proposed legislation, established only that children 15 and under receive the protection of law. In my view, a child of 16 and 17 needs the same protection. There is nothing particularly magical about a sixteenth birthday cake. It surely cannot be the seems to be the intent, if only by default, of this legislation.

4. Furthermore, if it is going to be a crime to make and distribute these films involving children, it should be a crime to show them. If it is a crime to make, distribute and watch

a snuff film because it shows a crime of murder actually being committed—forget the very horror of it—it should be a crime to make, distribute and show a film that depicts the crime of child abuse being committed.

Distinguished members of this subcommittee, how much filth must we wallow in before our lawmakers will give us the relief we obviously are crying out for? Many of our citizens are quite frankly questioning the will and intent of our political leaders to do something about this mess. We have a pure food and drug administration in our country that does not hesitate to take off the market very lucrative cosmetics and drugs that are found to be harmful to our people. The fact that children are being exploited and destroyed for money is such a self-evident reality that it is beyond question. Can we not take off the shelves of our sex super markets up and down this street the poisonous materials that show people in the very act of corrupting our young people? Can we not pass effective legislation that will protect them and us from these purveyors and producers of every kind of grossness?

We all look with a kind of sick sympathetic horror at the voyeur found peeping under some window blind. Yet we permit thousands of such voyeurs to crowd our porno book stores and theatres to be educated in depravity, buying books that teach them how to seduce a child and watching films showing pre-teens engaged in all kinds of sexual activity. And we blame the First Amendment.

Most of the legal efforts to establish safeguards for our children seem to run afoul of the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech. Surely no right thinking person can hold that the First Amendment was written by the framers of our constitution to protect pornographers and the sex lords that use up children to make money. The First Amendment does not give anyone the right to cry fire in a crowded theatre. It does not give anyone the right to abuse sexually and use and exploit children either. It is inconceivable to me and to many Americans why our Congress and our legislators cannot pass effective legislation.

The time for pious rhetoric and expressions of concern is long past. We need appropriate, effective action. I doubt that the voters of this country will be satisfied with less for much longer. A great city is dying at its heart because nothing can be done. We are wallowing in unspeakable filth and we wring our hands about the First Amendment. More importantly, our children are being daily, used and exploited and sometimes being killed while we stand around helplessly.

Is it wrong to be outraged? Did we not see this coming long ago? Has outrage become too unsophisticated for us? Are we incapable of saying very simply that this is wrong and we will not tolerate it any longer? For God's sake, gentlemen, and for the sake of the children, do something about it.

OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARIO BLAGI

As chairman of this morning's hearing of the House Select Education Subcommittee, I welcome my colleagues, our distinguished witnesses and guests. This promises to be a sobering day for we will be discussing a shocking and deplorable subject—the use of children in pornography.

There is a highly sophisticated and organized child pornography industry operating in this Nation. It has already captured an estimated 300,000 children nationally as victims. It has produced more than 264 different publications sold nationally depicting pornographic activities involving children as young as three years old. The industry is both national and international in scope. Large quantities of pornographic materials are imported each year, primarily from

Europe. Hundreds of children from Mexico are smuggled into this Nation each year to engage in child pornography.

Who are the victims of child pornography? They vary in age and circumstance. Some come from broken homes—some are victims of child abuse and neglect, some are even foster children recruited from homes for pornography. While the particulars about each victim may vary—they do share some things in common.

As victims, they endure sexual abuse and exploitation. They become helpless victims of extortion—many are induced into pornography through drugs—subsequently forming an addiction. Some eventually turn to serious crime. In reality, we are talking about children being transformed into merchandise in a massive sex for sale operation.

We know that some of the victims of child pornography come from the ranks of the one million runaway children of this Nation. Our hearing this morning is being conducted in a facility which assists the thousands of nomadic children of New York City. We will receive testimony from Father Bruce Ritter, discussing the relationship of runaway children to pornography.

It is obvious that the great public outcry condemning the spread of child pornography must be translated into legislation on the local, State and Federal levels. A main focus of this morning's hearing will be on a number of Federal legislative proposals, including my bill, H.R. 5522, which proposes new and stiff penalties on those persons procuring children under 16 for pornography. Penalties under my bill also apply to those persons transporting, shipping or mailing such pornographic materials using interstate commerce. Finally, we also hope to discuss the feasibility of imposing criminal sanctions against those parents and guardians who knowingly consent to their child being used for pornography.

As an original sponsor of the 1974 child abuse prevention and treatment act, I am aware of the relationship between child pornography and child abuse. My concern was reflected in an amendment I offered, which was accepted by the full House and Education and Labor Committee, to the child abuse act extension, adding sexual exploitation as a definition of child abuse. The purpose of this amendment is to allow some of the treatment funds under the act to aid victims of child pornography.

We have seen movement on the part of States to deal with this problem. Legislation imposing strict new penalties against pornographers has already been passed in the Louisiana legislature, and most recently in the New York State assembly. Numerous other States are considering new legislation in this area. The concern of Congress can in part, be reflected in our appearance here today. One thing is obvious, we must wage the war against child pornography from all fronts. Child pornographers who are nothing more than traffickers in human perversion, must be punished. The victims of child pornography must be helped.

The scourge of child pornography has shocked the conscience of a nation. It must be dealt with before its poison is allowed to spread.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT AWARD IS GIVEN TO PHILADELPHIA'S MAYOR RIZZO

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce that

Philadelphia Mayor Frank L. Rizzo has received an award from the U.S. Treasury Department for his efforts in increasing the number of city employees who purchase U.S. savings bonds.

The framed plaque was presented by Larry Lowder, Regional Director, U.S. Savings Bonds Division, Treasury Department, at a ceremony in City Hall.

Since Mayor Rizzo came to office, city employee participation in the savings bond plan rose from 19 percent to 25 percent or 7,171 bond buyers to 9,017.

The presentation by Lowder was accompanied by Mayor Rizzo's proclamation designating the month of June as "U.S. Savings Bonds Month in Philadelphia."

The proclamation urges Philadelphians to use the payroll savings plan where they work or the bond-a-month plan where they bank.

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH OF JUDGE ALDONA APPLETON

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish all Americans had the spirit that the Polish veterans who joined the U.S. Forces in Italy have. Many of them crossed the channel with General Eisenhower.

This past Monday, I attended the Polish Veterans Memorial Service in city hall in Perth Amboy, and that spirit was shown by my good friend, Judge Aldona Appleton.

I wanted to share her comments with my colleagues today:

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH OF JUDGE ALDONA APPLETON

We have gathered here today to pay tribute to those men who gave their lives for us—they who accomplished their duty in this world and left an indelible mark on our hearts.

For the sake of these men who gave their lives for us let us resolve that their lives were not given in vain.

Let us resolve that the principles which actuated them have inspired us to carry on their work.

I am proud to join you in preserving the memory of these fine men. May I congratulate you, the Polish veterans of World War II, for holding these annual services to preserve the memory of these honored men.

As we honor these men, let us recall that they gave their lives so that we may continue to enjoy the happiness of meeting freely (as we are doing now)—of speaking freely—of praying freely and of living in dignity as decent human beings.

Let us learn from these men, that even during the days of peace we must continue to keep fighting to preserve our democracy. We must be as ready to meet the obligations of peace as they were ready to meet the obligations of war.

Today we are all soldiers of peace—and as such we must be ready to come to the aid of our country.

This country must be prepared at all times during peace and war.

When it needs to be protected from enemies on the outside it is the responsibility of the men in uniform—of Congress and the President of the United States.

But when our country needs to be kept safe from dangers inside of our country—then we, as soldiers of peace—must keep fighting at all times to keep our country safe.

To accomplish this we must work together in one whole part. Only then will we have greatness and peace.

Our Nation has been strong because we had faith in God and faith in our fellow men—we were willing to help one another.

We in the United States have so much to teach the world and so much to give the world, but we must continue to keep faith with each other.

There is too much weakness—too much selfishness and too much greed today.

How long can America stand this erosion of faith and morals?

We must carry on the things which made America great. That's what these men died for—those things which are guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution.

We, Americans in whose veins flows Polish blood, let us be guided by Kosciuszko and Pulaski—the ideas for which they sacrificed everything—their fortunes and one gave his life. Let them not have died in vain.

As we pay tribute to these men today—let us include all the Americans of Polish descent who fought for peace and freedom in every battle this country had since the beginning of America. And let us include those who fought with you at Monte Cassino when you helped turn the tide of war towards victory for peace.

Now let us bow our heads in prayer for all these men and ask that God give us strength to carry on the principles which actuated these men whom we honor today.

Towards that end—may God guide us.

DEALING WITH ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of dealing with illegal aliens in the United States is one of the most complex and controversial issues facing the new administration and the Congress.

I commend to my colleagues an excellent and important article from the June 1 New York Times written by Prof. Wayne Cornelius of MIT, who has done a substantial amount of research in this field. The views expressed deserve careful study.

The text follows:

[From The New York Times, June 1, 1977]
WHEN THE DOOR IS CLOSED TO ILLEGAL ALIENS,
WHO PAYS?

(By Wayne A. Cornelius)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—A very predictable thing happens in this country whenever the economy takes a sharp turn for the worst: The illegal alien is rediscovered. Politicians, journalists, organized labor, and other interest groups rush to blame him for every imaginable problem afflicting American society, from high unemployment to rising crime rates, escalating social-service costs, overpopulation, and balance-of-payments deficits.

Immigration authorities crank out ever-more-frightening "guess-timates" of the numbers of illegal aliens "silently invading" the country. The public is warned in urgent and ominous tones that illegal aliens are out to take their jobs away and add billions of dollars to their tax bills.

We are now witnessing yet another "rediscovery" of the illegal alien. Pressures for new restrictive measures—particularly legislation that would impose civil or criminal penalties and fines on United States employers who "knowingly" hire illegal aliens—have mounted steadily. Such restrictive measures form the core of the policy package reportedly recommended to President Carter by his Cabinet-level task force on illegal aliens, and they have been proposed repeatedly by various members of Congress.

The case for a more restrictive immigration policy is based on three principal assumptions: that illegal aliens compete effectively with, and displace, large numbers of American workers; that the benefits to American society resulting from the aliens' contribution of low-cost labor are exceeded by the "social costs" resulting from their presence here; and that most illegal aliens entering the United States eventually settle here permanently, thus imposing an increasingly heavy, long-term burden upon the society.

There is as yet no direct evidence to support any of these assumptions, at least with respect to illegal aliens from Mexico, who still constitute at least 60 to 65 percent of the total flow and more than 90 percent of the illegal aliens apprehended each year.

Where careful independent studies of the impact of illegal immigration on local labor markets have been made, they have found no evidence of large-scale displacement of legal resident workers by illegal aliens. Studies have also shown that Mexican illegals make amazingly little use of tax-supported social services while they are in the United States, and that the cost of services they do use is far outweighed by their contributions to Social Security and income tax revenues.

There is also abundant evidence indicating that the vast majority of illegal aliens from Mexico continue to maintain a pattern of "shuttle" migration most of them returning to Mexico after six months or less of employment in the United States. In fact, studies have shown that only a small minority of Mexican illegals even aspire to settle permanently in the United States.

While illegal aliens from countries other than Mexico do seem to stay longer and make more use of social services, there is still no reliable evidence that they compete effectively with American workers for desirable jobs. The typical job held by the illegal alien, regardless of nationality, would not provide the average American family with more than a subsistence standard of living. In most states, it would provide less income than welfare payments.

Certainly in some geographic areas, types of enterprises, and job categories, illegal aliens may depress wage levels or "take jobs away" from American workers. But there is simply no hard evidence that these effects are as widespread or as serious as most policy-makers and the general public seem to believe.

The notion that curtailing illegal immigration will significantly reduce unemployment among the young, the unskilled, members of minority groups, and other sectors of the United States population allegedly being displaced by illegal aliens may prove to be a cruel illusion.

Many of the jobs "liberated" in this way are likely to be eliminated through mechanization or through bankruptcy of the enterprises involved, and many others cannot be "up-graded" sufficiently—even with higher wages and shorter hours—to make them attractive to native workers.

While the benefits of a more restrictive immigration policy to the American worker have been grossly exaggerated, the costs of such a policy to both the United States and the illegal alien's countries of origin have been consistently underestimated.

The impact of "closing the door" to illegal aliens will be felt by the American consumer,

in the form of higher prices for food and many other products currently produced with alien labor. Failures among small businesses—those with 25 or fewer employees, which hire more than half of the illegal aliens from Mexico—will also increase, eliminating jobs not only for illegals but for native Americans.

But the adverse impact of restrictive measures will be felt most intensely in Mexico, which is currently struggling to recover from its most serious economic crisis since the 1930's. At least 20 percent of the population—and a much higher proportion of the rural poor—depend upon wages earned in the United States for a large share of their cash income.

An employer-sanction law that is even partly effective in denying jobs to illegal aliens is likely to produce economic dislocations and human suffering on a massive scale within Mexico. This will not be simply a problem for Mexico; the implications for United States economic and foreign policy interests are obvious.

All available evidence indicates that employer sanctions and other restrictive measures—short of erecting a Berlin-type wall—will fail to deter economically desperate Mexicans from seeking employment in the United States.

In the long run, every dollar that is spent trying to enforce new restrictive policies would be much better spent on programs to reduce the "push" factors within Mexico and other sending countries that are primarily responsible for illegal immigration: rural unemployment and underemployment, low incomes, and rapid population growth.

For example, studies indicate that resources invested in labor-intensive, small-scale rural industries could significantly reduce the flow of illegal aliens within five to eight years.

In the short run, the best approach would be an expanded program of temporary worker visas permitting up to six months of employment in the United States each year. A temporary-worker program that did not require a prearranged contract between the alien worker and a particular United States employer (in contrast to the former *bracero* program of contract labor) would minimize exploitation of alien workers while reducing illegal immigration and keeping open a critically important safety valve for Mexico. It would also benefit United States workers, since the use of legal alien labor is likely to have a less depressing effect on wages and working conditions than the use of illegal alien labor.

It is ironic that a more restrictive immigration policy is being advocated by many at a point in our history when declining birth rates, the end of unlimited legal immigration, and an American labor force with more education and higher job expectations than ever before all foreshadow a shortage of workers to fill low-skill, low-wage, low-status jobs in the United States economy. When this occurs, in the not-too-distant future, the aliens who are now viewed as a burden on United States society may be seen as a highly valuable asset.

FOOD AND POPULATION: X

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Wayne Smith, the president and general counsel of the National Parks and Conservation Association of Washington, D.C., has written a beautiful edi-

torial in the June 1977, edition of this organization's environmental journal.

Spring has arrived to most parts of America. We all can see it in the birds, the flowers, the cool rivers and the farms beginning to bloom. Yet another spring has come to America, says Smith. Our public life has once again become free, more open. We have a new President and a new Congress.

There is hope now that conservation and the protection of America's natural environment and agricultural heritage will become a moral imperative, rather than simply an occasional fad somewhere down the list of America's concerns.

As Mr. Smith explains:

The humane purposes of an industrial society are not served by a squandering of natural resources or the dissipation of the industrial product. The true industrial purpose is the release of human beings from drudgery and poverty into a life of security, sufficiency, leisure, and opportunity for esthetic and intellectual fulfillment. Towards these ends conservation is a moral imperative.

But much will depend on decisions in matters which have not thus far had much attention. Whether we are interested in energy, water, or the control of urban sprawl, the quality of life in America cannot be improved, nor even sustained, unless we can bring our numbers under control.

What is true of America is also true for the world. Unfortunately, too many of the proposed solutions to alleviate world poverty rely simply on redistributing wealth or resources. These answers will make little difference if the foundation upon which our economies rest—our natural resources and environment—is being irreversibly destroyed by the pressures of growing populations.

Striking a theme which he underlined as a participant in the Environmental Agenda's Task Force report in February, Mr. Smith wisely points out:

Suppose it to be true, for the sake of argument, that the world could feed its present population adequately, without destructive effect on the planetary ecosystem, if the wealth were equitably distributed. It is not so distributed, and there is small chance that this will happen before famine overtakes us and solves the problem brutally by a rapid rise in death rates. Direct approaches to the problem of proliferation become imperative in the name of humanity. If our overseas aid is to be coupled with libertarian issues and to economic efficiency, then let it be linked as well to effective efforts at the reduction in birth rates.

The editorial by Anthony Wayne Smith is eloquent and I wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues at this time:

AN AMERICAN SPRINGTIME

Springtime came late this year after the hard winter, but poured its abundance of new life into the world with its old extravagance. After the melting snows, the spring peepers and chorus frogs awoke as always and filled the warming nights with ancient music. And then came the birds, and the morning choruses, robins searching the lawns, meadowlarks calling in the fields, red-winged blackbirds dropping metallic notes from tree-tops. You may follow the cool

creek through the pasture, discover the fragile trout lily in an earthy nook, and everywhere bluebells. You can breathe more freely again, looking ahead toward the abundance of the unfolding year.

Spring came also to the public life of America. For those who remembered an old mission toward freedom but found themselves too often locked in partnership with tyranny, there was a new call for liberty. In place of the habitual acceptance of a deadly weight of armaments, there was a voice for at least a beginning cut in the arsenals of insanity. And instead of drifting with the tide of nuclear proliferation, the new President proposed to stem it.

In keeping with the spirit of Spring, the rivers of America may once again run free. No doubt the last useless and destructive dam has not yet been built, but the challenge has been raised. We look ahead to strong programs for the reforestation of the land, for the rigorous control of strip mining for the protection of farmlands, for the recovery of the forests. And we have confidence that as the mortal dangers of nuclear power are constantly more clearly understood, this nation first, and others perhaps later, will turn toward the sun and the winds to harness by an advanced technology the energy needed by an industrial society.

The revolution which has occurred may be much more profound than supposed. When the new people arrived, in many cases there had indeed been nobody there. Youthful enthusiasts stepped into positions of power, and no one to gainsay them. Their judgment in some instances has been poor, and their inexperience occasionally colossal. But their spirits are high, and their desire for change; new deeds are afoot in the land.

For our part, with our particular mission for the wildlands of America, we shall press for the better protection of the great primeval national parks with more confidence that our voices will be heard. We shall concern ourselves with the difficult problems of plans and money for the recreational parks near the cities with more assurance that the needs of city people for contact with nature will be understood by those in power. We shall believe it possible once again to unfold programs for the restoration of generous open space in the cities, coupled with industries and homes for all.

We shall believe that the new legislation governing the forestry agencies will be administered for the restoration of natural balances, not for simple-minded economic productivity. We shall dare to suppose that an Administration concerned for human rights will lend its aid toward the humane treatment of animals and the survival of endangered species everywhere.

We shall watch for and support a rigorous restraint upon the deadly chemicals, pesticides, herbicides, additives, nuclear wastes, the modern multiplicity of carcinogenics, which have been poisoning our world. A vast indignation has been building up throughout the nation about these atrocious dangers; the new President will have strong support from the people in these matters, in spite of the interests, and he has proposed to stay close to the people.

We welcome the emphasis on conservation expressed in the President's message on energy and elsewhere. The humane purposes of an industrial society are not served by a squandering of natural resources or the dissipation of the industrial product. The true industrial purpose is the release of human beings from drudgery and poverty into a life of security, sufficiency, leisure, and opportunity for esthetic and intellectual fulfillment. Toward these ends conservation is indeed a moral imperative.

There may well be a closer conjunction between the President and Congress than

some of the first skirmishes have suggested. The new men and women who came to the Capitol in recent years arrived during a winter of adversity in Presidential attitudes. It was not Congress which failed the nation in respect to strip mining. Nor was it Congress that denied funding to the national parks. Many of the obstructionists have taken their seniority and departed. A revitalized committee structure promises new energy, greater competence, a more magnanimous outlook in Congress in the years ahead. The new Congress can be expected to welcome the new leadership in the White House in most matters, and to support, not resist the fresh initiatives.

Much will depend on decisions in matters which have not thus far had much attention. The quality of life in America cannot be improved, nor even sustained, unless we can bring our numbers under control. The younger generations have done well in recent years in establishing the small family as the moral norm. The natural increase of the American nation will soon level off; but the tides of illegal immigration threaten to submerge all these good efforts. Conservationists should be making common cause with organized labor to protect American jobs and the American environment. Programs should be developed for jobs on farms for the unemployed of the cities; farm organizations should support such programs instead of resisting immigration controls. There is strong sentiment in Congress for action; when will the Administration move?

The population issue worldwide is more deadly. Suppose it to be true, for the sake of argument, that the world could feed its present population adequately, without a destructive effect on the planetary ecosystem, if the wealth were equitably distributed. It is not so distributed, and there is small chance that this will happen before famine overtakes us and solves the problem brutally by a rapid rise in death rates. Direct approaches to the problem of proliferation become imperative in the name of humanity. If our overseas aid is to be coupled to libertarian issues and to economic efficiency, then let it be linked as well to effective efforts at the reduction of birth rates.

As environmentalists we are inveterate internationalists. The world movement for national parks was an early-blooming flower of planetary cooperation. One of America's most generous gifts to the world was the example of its National Park System. It was a gift that belied our supposed materialism. That it was accepted so readily and spread so rapidly around the planet is a tribute to the love of life and beauty which lies serenely nonetheless in the depths of the human heart everywhere and always. But the contribution of Western Europe was of incalculable historic significance. And more recently the heroism of so many of the people who inherited responsibility for the great parks of Africa has set an example for devotion everywhere.

The United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea resumes its sessions as we go to press. Unfinished, hardly begun, is the vast work for the protection of the oceanic fisheries, vital to the food supply of a hungry planet, and the restoration of the endangered marine mammals. Unfinished also is the salvation of the oceans from the pollution which is the evil hallmark of irresponsible economic systems. Also unsolved as yet is the administration of the great wealth of minerals which is thought to lie on the deep floors of the oceans, whether for the benefit of a few or of all, and whether with care for the environmental matrix of life, or ruthlessly, with the death of the world just ahead. The President's choice of Ambassador Richardson as the head of the American delegation to Law of the Sea, one

of the most experienced and talented public servants America has produced in recent years, bodes well for the outcome. Environmentalists everywhere should support these efforts.

Three million years or so: a long, long time have man-like creatures walked the earth. Just recently we left the savannahs for the cultivated fields, exploring the ways of agriculture. More recently we built the sprawling cities, centers of intense cooperation, but of lost contact with surrounding life. A short, short time ago came writing; later the ways of science; and now our powers outrun our sense.

The crisis deepens; on every hand the danger seems to mount; as persons and as nations we live in fear and trembling. Yet now perhaps, here in America, the winter may be lifting. Faith, hope, and charity, as in other dark days long ago, will be needed to warm our hearts until the springtime be fulfilled.

CONSUMER EDUCATION PROJECTS EXPANDING

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the current consumer education project of the Office of Consumer's Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I feel that this joint effort by labor officials, educational institutions, and community organizations is most commendable and worthy of note. The following article appeared originally in the AFL-CIO News, and is reprinted here in its entirety. "Consumer Education Projects Expanding."

The article follows:

CONSUMER EDUCATION PROJECTS EXPANDING (By Sidney Margolius)

In a number of States, labor officials are joining with schools, colleges and community organizations to help operate the most thorough nationwide effort yet to provide urgently needed consumer education for both school students and adults.

In the first year of this new national consumer education effort, the federal Office of Consumer's Education (OCE) has financed 66 diversified projects in various states, selected from 839 applications, for a total of \$3 million. The OCE recently has been accepting applications for another \$3 million worth of financing of grass roots projects, with the deadline Mar. 10. The government grants are used to supplement cash and other resources supplied by the community groups running the educational projects.

While somewhat over half the projects are being sponsored by traditional educational institutions such as schools and colleges, the OCE sees its effort as different from much of the traditional consumer education in schools. Such classes usually are related to homemaking business education or industrial arts.

In this new concept, school students would get consumer education in a wide variety of subject areas, such as consumer math in a regular math course.

But just as important, the projects include consumer education for adults, and especially those with special needs or those trying

to manage on relatively small incomes. The nonschool groups include senior citizens, handicapped people, industrial workers, and low income families.

They share common consumer problems, of course, such as high food costs, but have their own special problems. The classes, consumer information clinics and service activities in which these special groups are now engaged, are aimed at developing the knowledge needed to cope with their special problems.

Several of the projects seek to teach consumers their legal rights. One, operated by the Tampa, Fla., Legal Services, helps answer individual legal questions but also tries to educate the public through group discussions of rights and responsibilities.

Another project, in Flagstaff, Ariz., is concentrating on consumer legal education for low income people.

An interesting program sponsored by the New York City Community College, called "seniors teaching seniors," is training older people to be consumer educators. This is a job at which seniors can be very useful and effective with their long experience in surviving depressions and inflations.

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

Several projects are aimed at helping handicapped consumers, such as the deaf. Also noteworthy are projects being developed to help people returning to society. The Southern Illinois University Dept. of Family Economics is planning consumer education for prison residents and parolees. The University of Alabama is sponsoring a project for prerelease mental patients.

A project under way in San Francisco, which is potentially useful for other communities, is concerned with health education. It aims especially to educate consumers against useless and sometimes even harmful quack medical products and services.

In general the projects have been designed so that the methods and materials they develop can be used in other communities and schools around the country. Thus, the \$3 million authorized so far by Congress for each of the three years should have a very useful ripple effect.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday, June 1, I was absent. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 292, "yea."
Rollcall No. 293, "yea."
Rollcall No. 294, "yea."
Rollcall No. 295, "yea."
Rollcall No. 296, "yea."

THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TAX INCENTIVE ACT

HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Public Transportation Tax Incentive Act of 1977. This legislation would stimulate public transportation use in the United States by permitting persons to deduct from their Federal tax bill the costs of commuting to and from work on public transportation.

I am convinced that we must encourage greater use of mass transit if we are to make a dent in our Nation's energy problems. There are simply too many cars on the road today. This fact is especially true in urban areas where public mass transportation could have a significant impact in lowering energy usage and traffic congestion.

Since its inception, the Urban Mass Transit Administration has received a grand total of \$16.1 billion in budget authority. This is obviously a significant amount of money, but it pales in comparison to the funding we have provided for highway projects in this country. As of December 31, 1976, the Federal Government has provided \$55.6 billion in funding for the Interstate System and another \$26.1 billion in Federal aid to primary, secondary and urban highway systems. That works out to some \$81 billion, or more than five times the amount spent on mass transportation.

I certainly do not want to disparage the interstate, primary, secondary and urban highway systems. They have brought economic growth and prosperity to almost every section of our country. But we must work to achieve a greater balance between funds for highway projects and those of mass transit. The Nation's energy shortage makes this need doubly urgent.

My legislation would permit the deduction of costs incurred by individuals using public transportation between one's residence and his place of employment. Any public transportation system which provides scheduled common carrier passenger land transportation, along regular routes is eligible for the deduction. This includes such transportation systems as subways, buses, commuter trains, trolleys and other light rail systems. It would not include taxis, since that vehicle does not follow a scheduled and regular route nor would it allow persons to deduct the cost of airfare between cities as a commuting expense.

Mr. Speaker, most public transportation systems operate at a loss. Obviously, if new ridership is encouraged by our Nation's tax policy, that operating loss could be significantly cut, thus allowing more Federal dollars to go into capital programs and less into operating subsidies.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that my proposal would decrease

tax revenues by approximately \$300 million. Yet when this figure is compared to the social benefits it would bring to our society as well as the economic benefits it will bring to public transportation systems throughout the country, I say that it is money well spent.

Our Nation's cities are in trouble. One of the reasons for this condition is the lack of adequate transportation resources. Urban transportation is caught in a vicious circle. On one hand, ridership is low because service is generally poor. Yet, on the other hand, service cannot improve in most localities because user revenues are not sufficient to cover even operating expenses, much less capital improvements.

My bill would break this vicious circle by encouraging people to make greater use of mass transit. Some would prefer to encourage ridership through punitive means, such as high gasoline taxes or parking fees, or even banning cars from downtown areas. That is a "stick" approach. I prefer to use the "carrot" approach by rewarding people economically who use mass transportation.

We need a better mass transit system in this country. The Public Transportation Tax Incentive Act is one way to encourage development of that system, and I urge the House to consider it promptly.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THAILAND

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, while in Bangkok recently I met with several non-political representatives of various religious groups concerned about the severe infringement of human rights presently directed against dissidents and minorities in Thailand. The religious groups have been working fervently to protect the rights of individuals arbitrarily detained on the vague charge of endangering society. These human rights groups, and the political prisoners they seek help for, eagerly look to the United States to fulfill President Carter's commitment to human rights abroad. I submit this "Summary Report on the Human Rights Situation in Thailand" to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as this problem deserves our closest attention:

COMPILED BY THE COORDINATING GROUP FOR RELIGION IN SOCIETY, THAILAND

After the military coup on 6th October, 1976, many thousands of people were arrested under martial law edicts, and have still not been brought to trial.

Those arrested fall into main categories:

Over 3,000 people arrested at Thammasat University prior to the coup. Most of those were rapidly released on bail. Most were refused to thirty, however a large number of poor people who could not possibly afford the \$1,000.00 bail stayed in jail for almost five months. Most of these had nothing to do with the Thammasat demonstration but included Janitors, Noodle Vendors, and ordinary spectators. Now, all except for 30 of those arrested at Thammasat have been released. Only 110 of those arrested are

being charged, (mainly for being communists) and will be tried at an unspecified time in a military court. They are not entitled to legal representation during their trial (which must take place before February 1978).

Up to 8,000 people have been arrested as "Danger to Society" since October 6th, 1976, and probably at least 2,000 are still being held. According to Decree Number 22 of the National Administration Reform Council (NARC) those people can be held for 30 days at a time, renewable, and need never be brought to trial.

In addition to the arrests there have been many other abuses on human rights, namely: Up to 50 intellectuals, writers, journalists, and university professors have had to flee the country and take up residence in various Western countries. Some have had to leave their family and friends behind them.

At least 600 students, workers, and farmer leaders have had to flee to Laos to avoid arrest and detention, whilst a larger number have had to go underground.

Since the coup, Communist insurgency has taken a dramatic upturn with increasing casualties both amongst troops and insurgents as well as amongst innocent villagers. In its effort to deal with the insurgency problem, the government has declared increasing areas of the country out-of-bounds to the general public, has introduced long curfews, and restricted the freedom of villagers to a great extent in other ways.

All political parties have been banned, and labour unions have been made inoperative (meetings and strikes have been banned and those organizing the most legitimate of strikes have been arrested as "dangers to Society"). Many members of socialist parties, leaders of trade unions, and peasant unions are amongst the arrested.

Strict censorship regulations have been imposed on all mass media. Many left wing newspapers have been permanently closed (and the journalists working on them put out of work), and other newspapers have been temporarily closed—thus muzzling criticism of government. In terms of the electronic media, all those high level officials who had opposed the army controlled T.V. and radio stations have been replaced, and only moderate right wing stations allowed to broadcast. Magazines, newspapers, and radio stations on the extreme right have also been closed.

Hundreds of thousands of books have been burnt and banned since October 6, 1976, including books actively promoting socialist or communist ideologies, but also including many less radical books advocating more egalitarian and just development policies. Many of the banned books seemed to have been banned more because of their authors or titles than for their content. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of copies of books written by the Prime Minister have been printed at government expense and distributed to educational, religious, and other institutions all over the country.

All in all it can be seen that the present military backed government has taken action against all normally accepted principles of human rights.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate habit of politicians to leap for

almost anything having the name reform, to give the appearance of doing something about real or imagined problems, and to ignore the possible harmful consequences flowing from the proposed solution.

I offer a current example: The proposal to abolish the electoral college and install direct national elections of Presidents. There is a real temptation to endorse such a simple and direct system. It has the virtue of being efficient.

But efficiency is not everything, and in this instance would be downright destructive of the constitutional foundation of our Federal Republic. The National Government is a creation of the States. The Constitution was ratified by the States. The States elect the President after each has determined its choice for President in a popular election. The radical change proposed by the Carter administration would remove the States from this vital process of electing our national Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, the fathers of our Republic conceived a "separation of powers" as a system for preventing tyranny from arising in our land. There is more to this concept than the separation of the legislative, judicial, and executive powers at the national level. There is also the principle of federalism. The Constitution reserves powers and responsibilities to the States, which created the Federal Union.

The authors of our Constitution profoundly feared the power that could be exercised by a strong central government. They favored a dispersal of power. They carefully provided for perpetual conflict and friction not only between the branches of the National Government, but also between the States and the National Government.

Under our constitutional system, the President of the United States must be concerned about how Maryland votes, how Massachusetts votes, and how California votes in a Presidential election. He is politically accountable to the States.

If direct national elections of Presidents replace our electoral college system, the candidates would be less concerned about States. They would be concerned about appealing to voters en masse, acquiring power independently of the States, and ultimately using that power without regard to the States.

There are those who advocate the consolidation of power in central authority, but the liberty of the people is safer when power is dispersed among rival authorities. That is the genius of the American system.

It is true that the reservation of powers to the States has become blurred in the passage of time as the National Government has grown to an enormity never envisioned by the Fathers. Congressional enactment of aid programs for an almost limitless list of State and local governmental functions has brought a large degree of control from Washington. Court decisions have permitted Federal

regulation of interstate commerce to stretch to the outer limits. It has been necessary for the National Government to protect the constitutional rights of racial minorities.

But we should not be scrapping all vestiges of States rights. We should not be reducing the political leverage of the States and completely wiping out the small States, which is what the proposed constitutional amendment would do. It would guarantee that the Presidential campaigns would be targeted on the large population centers to the exclusion of other areas.

One further word of caution I would add. The Carter administration proposal would invite creation of multiple political parties, some formed to pursue a single issue. It is likely that a Presidential general election would have several candidates dividing the national vote. It is also likely that such a splintering would leave no candidate with a majority, and possibly not even a respectable plurality. Our political structure could easily become fragmented with several parties struggling to form coalitions.

I shall not pass judgment on the merits of multiparty politics. I note only that the proposed constitutional amendment would probably lead to the end of our traditional two-party structure. Presently, it is very difficult for a minor party to have an impact on Presidential elections because of the winner-take-all character of the electoral contest in each State. The direct national election of the President would probably become a free-for-all.

I submit these reservations, Mr. Speaker, because I believe they deserve profound consideration by every Member of this body.

PHILADELPHIA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACTIVE IN CREATING JOB OPPORTUNITIES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, the economy of the city of Philadelphia has been in a sharp decline. Some of this economic loss can be traced to the misguided economic policies of the Nixon and Ford administrations, which believed there was a trade-off between inflation and unemployment and found out, to the sorrow of the American people, that they were dead wrong. The rest of the problem stems from the determination of the Nixon and Ford administrations to dismantle the Federal establishment in Philadelphia—efforts which have cost us more than 100,000 direct and indirect jobs.

Philadelphia has not taken this economic setback lying down. The city has pressed forward with efforts to hold present industries and to help them expand, and to attract new industries which could create new employment opportunities for citizens of the Greater Philadelphia area.

I am proud to be able to report that the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation has played a major role in this continuing effort toward recovery. But this is not a new role for the PIDC, because in the past 18 years, it has assisted in the financing of over 900 industrial and commercial projects in the city of Philadelphia. The long-term capital investment financing provided through the PIDC now exceeds \$600 million.

While these programs have been quite successful, the PIDC is the first to concede that they did not, of themselves, provide adequate long-term financing for small businesses. With this thought in mind, the PIDC recently took steps to use the SBA 502 program to meet this need.

The SBA 502 program is designed to alleviate the relocation of employment opportunities from the inner city. Working through local development companies, the SBA can guarantee up to 90 percent of a commercial loan for a firm which could not otherwise obtain financing. In addition, the 502 program can make direct loans through a local development company at more favorable terms to act as an incentive for a local firm to remain in the city.

The SBA program working through local development companies is, in the opinion of PIDC Executive Vice President M. Walter D'Alessio, the most powerful tool of economic development for creating and maintaining employment opportunities in small inner-city business. In fact, for the small and intermediate sized business, there is no other assisted program to sustain growth while remaining within the city.

Mr. D'Alessio informs me that now that the PIDC is at the point of maximum use of this program, the SBA district which includes Philadelphia is experiencing a shortage of funds. It has been forced to borrow from other regions and commit funds from its next fiscal allocation to meet commitments made this year.

Meanwhile, of course, the PIDC's program goes on, and it will require more funds to sustain its efforts to assist Philadelphia businesses.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Congress this year will not only continue the SBA 502 program but that it will increase the funding to meet needs in cities such as Philadelphia. I recognize that the competition for Federal dollars is intense, and that we are operating under serious budgetary constraints. But the need is urgent to fund this program properly so that efforts can go forward to put people back to work in the private sector.

THE SERBSKY TREATMENT AND VLADIMIR BUKOVSKY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, nearly everyone is aware that on occasion perfectly sane persons have been committed to mental hospitals for devious reasons, but, the Soviet Union is unique in the world today for making large scale use of special mental hospitals in which to incarcerate great numbers of political dissidents in order to silence them and treat them with drugs in order to render them ineffective upon release. The magazine, *Psychology Today* for June 1977, published an interview with Vladimir Bukovsky on this subject and since he had firsthand experience with this treatment, this article is worthy of our closest attention. Bukovsky estimates that more than 2,000 political dissidents inhabit these hospitals, which are run by the MVD—Ministry of Internal Affairs—at the present time. The article follows:

THE SERBSKY TREATMENT

(Vladimir Bukovsky read the wrong books, defended the wrong writers. His government declared him legally insane and committed him to a mental hospital. In this conversation with psychiatrist E. Fuller Torrey, he tells what happened next.)

Vladimir Bukovsky was born 34 years ago in Moscow, the offspring of a professional writer and a journalist. As a first-year biology student at Moscow University he was expelled for becoming involved with a literary journal. In 1963, when he was 20, Bukovsky was first arrested for possessing copies of *The New Class*, a book by dissident Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas. After being examined at the notorious Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry he was declared insane and sent to Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital where he spent 15 months. Released, he almost immediately became involved in the defense of writers Andrei Sinavsky and Yuli Daniel who were under arrest, and organized a small demonstration to demand that the freedom guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution be honored. This earned him confinement in three more psychiatric wards, including an eight-month return visit to the Serbsky. Following his release, he continued his fight for civil liberties in the USSR, and in 1967 was arrested again for organizing a demonstration to protest the arrest of four other dissidents. This time Soviet authorities decided to try a new tack, and rather than call him mentally ill, they sentenced him to prison for three years, which he served in a labor camp.

His ensuing freedom lasted just over a year. In 1971 he gathered together case records of six dissidents who had been declared insane and held in mental hospitals, and had these records smuggled out of Russia to the West. Simultaneously he appealed to Western psychiatrists, and especially to the World Psychiatric Association (WPA) who would meet in Mexico City later that year, to examine the records. A group of 44 British psychiatrists eventually did examine them and concluded the six were not mentally ill, but Soviet psychiatrists and the leadership of the WPA prevented the issue from being discussed in Mexico City. These records were the first hard evidence that Soviet author-

ities were systematically abusing mental illness as a label for dissidents, and mental hospitals as prisons with indeterminate sentences. They were also the first hard evidence that some Soviet psychiatrists were allowing themselves to be prostituted by the State. The reaction of Soviet authorities to Bukovsky's act was fast and furious—12 years in prison, labor camps, and internal exile.

By this time Bukovsky had become known in the West, and had been "adopted" as a political prisoner by Amnesty International. Not deterred by his sentence, he began a series of hunger strikes and demands for better prison conditions. In 1974 while in a labor camp with dissident psychiatrist Semyon Gluzman, they collaborated and produced "A Manual on Psychiatry for Dissidents," instructing dissidents how to avoid being labeled insane when they were arrested. A copy of the Manual was subsequently smuggled to the West and joined the growing volume of data on the abuse of psychiatry in the USSR. As Bukovsky's physical condition deteriorated through both punishment and hunger strikes, his mother, as well as Amnesty International and other groups, increased demands for his release. Finally, on December 18, 1976, he was released and exiled in exchange for imprisoned Chilean Communist leader Luis Corvalan. As an exchange of one political prisoner for another, it was the first implicit admission by the Soviet Union that they do indeed hold such prisoners. Two months later Bukovsky addressed a joint Commission of the United States Congress, and the following week he met with both President Carter and Vice-President Mondale. He had become a symbol for human rights.

E. Fuller Torrey: What was it like, being a sane man in an insane asylum?

Vladimir Bukovsky: Well, I found many people in the place who were quite sane.

Torrey: So you were only one of several sane people in the mental hospital?

Bukovsky: Yes, and we formed a sort of group to communicate with each other. With the other patients it was impossible to communicate, for some of them were extremely ill. So those of us who were sane formed a sort of club.

Torrey: A club of sane people in an insane asylum. That must have been a very interesting club. How were you personally treated by the doctors there?

Bukovsky: I was lucky in that hospital I wasn't given any forced medicine.

Torrey: Was that unusual?

Bukovsky: Yes, very. Almost all the other dissidents there were forced to take medicine that made them sleepy and hard for them to think.

Torrey: How did you escape it?

Bukovsky: When I got to the hospital I was assigned to an old Russian psychiatrist. I think he was around 80. After our first interview he told me he thought I was quite sane. He thought I had pretended to be crazy to get into the hospital and escape a prison sentence or something, that I was a malingerer. I tried to explain that he had it wrong but he had made up his mind and fought very hard to get me released. He would go in front of the commission (which determines when a patient may be released) and say I was sane. This made the KGB mad, but they didn't know what to do with this old psychiatrist who didn't understand or wouldn't understand that he was supposed to find me insane. Anyway he didn't give me drugs because he thought I was sane.

Torrey: This was at the Special Psychiatric Hospital in Leningrad?

Bukovsky: Yes, right in downtown Leningrad, near the train station.

Torrey: The Finland Station, where Lenin returned to lead the Revolution?

Bukovsky: Yes, I could hear the trains in the distance, but there was a big factory that cut off the noise of the station.

Torrey: How ironic. I wonder what Lenin would have said if he had known that the Revolution would eventually lead to putting you in a mental hospital so you couldn't be heard by the people. How many special psychiatric hospitals like the one you were in are there?

Bukovsky: There are at least 12. I am not sure how many more there are.

Torrey: And how many sane people were in your insane asylum?

Bukovsky: Out of 1,000 inmates I think about 150 were political prisoners and perfectly sane.

Torrey: That means that there are probably over 2,000 political dissidents in mental hospitals in the Soviet Union?

Bukovsky: Yes, there are probably at least that many. We do not know for sure how many there are.

Torrey: Besides the psychiatrist who was in charge of you, what were the other psychiatrists there like? Did they realize that you weren't mentally ill?

Bukovsky: Yes, of course. They all understood quite well that we were sane people. Many of them were quite cynical. One of them once told me that the hospital we were in was really more like a concentration camp. It is our own little Auschwitz, he said. Yes, they understood how things were very well, but they were not in a position to do anything about it. They had neither the desire nor the power to change things.

Torrey: What kind of psychiatrists are these people who would work in an insane asylum with sane people? Why would they take the job?

Bukovsky: They probably do it because they earn more money than if they work in a regular mental hospital. They get special pay because it is a special hospital.

Torrey: Are they army psychiatrists?

Bukovsky: Not exactly. They are military, but not army. They work for the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which is the Ministry responsible for the special psychiatric hospitals. Regular psychiatric hospitals are under the Ministry of Health. So these psychiatrists in the special hospitals have ranks, like captain, major, and are promoted from rank to rank if they do a good job and don't cause trouble.

Torrey: And doing a good job includes testifying that people like yourself, who wish to protest the lack of civil rights, are insane and should be kept in a mental hospital?

Bukovsky: Exactly.

Torrey: When you first entered the Leningrad Special Psychiatric Hospital, how long did they say they were going to keep you?

Bukovsky: It was quite clear from the beginning that they would keep me as long as they liked. I was told that it all depended on my behavior. If I would recant, if I would be good, how do you say?

Torrey: Tractable?

Bukovsky: Yes, tractable. If I would be tractable then they would let me out.

Torrey: It sounds like what Victor Fainberg (another Soviet dissident) said when he was in the same hospital as you. He said his psychiatrist told him that his disease was dissent, and as soon as he renounced his opinions and adopted the correct ones he'd be free.

Bukovsky: Yes, that is how it is. But of course I would never recant or renounce my opinions.

Torrey: They could have kept you there for 20 or 30 years if they had wanted, and if you hadn't had an older psychiatrist who wouldn't cooperate with them.

Bukovsky: Oh yes. I knew some who had been in for over 10 years. It is an indeterminate sentence.

Torrey: Is that why Soviet officials put you in a psychiatric hospital rather than in prison?

Bukovsky: That is one reason. If they had put me in prison originally I would have had a sentence to serve and then I would be released. There wouldn't be the same pressure on me to recant. Of course sometimes they just sentence you again to a new term when you finish your term, but that's harder to do. It's much easier to put you away in a mental hospital.

Torrey: What are the other reasons they use mental hospitals rather than prison?

Bukovsky: Well, it discredits the person. Especially if the person is prominent and speaking out, that's a big problem for the Soviet leaders. For instance, General Grigorenko, who was a great general, spoke out against the invasion of Czechoslovakia. That made a big problem. It would have been hard to bring him to trial so they called him insane and sent him to a mental hospital. Then people won't pay attention to what he says. And people understand that other people can become mentally ill.

It's easy to explain to common people, the people in the street. Also, sometimes they put people who speak out into mental hospitals when they don't have a very strong case against them, when it would be a difficult trial.

Torrey: Is it true that mental patients have fewer rights than civil prisoners in the Soviet Union?

Bukovsky: Yes, absolutely. As a mental patient you have no rights. Any sort of protests you make they just say is because you are mentally sick. Anything you say or do becomes part of your case record, which can then be used against you to justify keeping you there indefinitely. Anything you write, letters or anything, may turn up in your case folder to be used against you. If you recant they say, see, it proves he was crazy. If you refuse to recant, and protest, they say, see, it proves he is crazy. You take your choice.

Torrey: When they first picked you up in 1963, do you think they intended then to send you to a mental hospital?

Bukovsky: No, I think they wanted me to recant. They wanted to make a traitor out of me and make me inform against my friends. They wanted some information from me, then probably they thought they would put me in prison for a little while. They put me in solitary confinement to change my mind.

Torrey: But you didn't cooperate with them, I guess.

Bukovsky: No, I refused to speak with them at all.

Torrey: That must have made them furious.

Bukovsky: Yes, and after they had tried for a month they gave up and turned me over to psychiatry. That was the end of my case legally. From then on I was just a psychiatric patient.

Torrey: They diagnosed you as a schizophrenic, isn't that correct?

Bukovsky: With schizophrenia of the continuous type. But some of the psychiatrists said that schizophrenia was the wrong diagnosis and that really I had a paranoid development of personality. They couldn't decide between these two diagnoses.

Torrey: I have been to the Soviet Union twice and am familiar with how schizophrenia is classified there. The continuous type of schizophrenia is said to begin very slowly but is progressive. This is especially true of the "sluggish" or "creeping" subtype in which a person is said to only have mild personality changes in its early stages.

Bukovsky: Most of the political prisoners are diagnosed as schizophrenics. Anything they do, any protest they make, even a hunger strike is said to be proof of the diagnosis.

Torrey: G. V. Morozov, the head of the Serbsky Institute, has even written that argumentativeness is an important symptom of schizophrenia.

Bukovsky: Then I guess it's a pretty common disease even in the United States if that is its definition.

Torrey: The man who is responsible for the classification of schizophrenia in the Soviet Union is Professor Snezhnevsky of the Institute of Psychiatry in Moscow. He is the one who has stressed that misbehavior in adolescence or even earlier is often a symptom of early schizophrenia especially if there is any family history of mental illness.

Bukovsky: I have read some of Snezhnevsky's works. He has also been one of the main psychiatrists behind the scenes who sees that dissidents are labeled mentally ill and put away.

Torrey: Do you think his theories of schizophrenia developed to accommodate the needs of the state, or that he was selected out for advancement because his theories were convenient.

Bukovsky: Probably the latter, a kind of selectivity. Survival of the most convenient theory so to speak. In a socialist state that is supposed to be perfect there can, by definition, be no social condition that could create true dissenters. Therefore, the dissenter must be crazy, sick. The logic is very neat.

Torrey: Some people have written that the Soviet Union has a long history of calling dissidents mad, and that this was also used by the czars. For example Czar Nicholas called the philosopher Chaadaev mad over one hundred years ago because Chaadaev had disagreed with him.

Bukovsky: To begin with, Chaadaev was never put into a hospital. It was just a statement that he was insane.

Torrey: When did it begin, then, in a widespread way as it is now found in the Soviet Union?

Bukovsky: It began under Stalin. But at that time there were only two mental hospitals, in Leningrad and Kazan, for dissidents. Stalin didn't need many. He could just destroy people if he wanted. But if they were prominent he might use the mental hospital.

Torrey: And what happened after Stalin?

Bukovsky: It is interesting. There was an old Communist Party member named Sergei Pisarev who was a member of the Party's Central Control Commission. He prepared a report that the cases against the Jewish doctors prepared by an investigating committee in 1952 were concocted and he handed the report over to Stalin. Two weeks later Pisarev found himself in a mental hospital and labeled insane. In 1956, after Stalin's death, he arranged to get rehabilitated. He even made the psychiatrists reconsider their diagnosis and say he was sane. He got to know the chairman of the committee for rehabilitation, and persuaded him that an investigation should be made into the abuse of psychiatry. This was a golden age after Stalin's death when such things were possible. He succeeded in getting such a commission created. They investigated both hospitals and concluded that psychiatry had been abused, and got a lot of people released.

Torrey: So then it got worse again?

Bukovsky: Yes, especially under Khrushchev. Then it became a common practice and new hospitals started to be opened.

Torrey: So that by the time you were arrested in 1963 it was a common practice to label sane people insane and put them away to get them out of sight.

Bukovsky: Yes, I wasn't unique at all. The only way I am unique is that I am here to be able to talk to you about it. There are many hundreds of dissidents in the mental hospitals even today as we talk.

Torrey: When you were at the Perm labor

camp with Semyon Gluzman, the young psychiatrist who had publicly said that General Grigorenko was not mentally ill and was then thrown in jail for saying it, you wrote a manual together, "A Manual on Psychiatry for Dissidents." I read it several months ago and was profoundly impressed by it, impressed that manuals should be needed for people to defend themselves against my chosen profession. It is an excellent document. How did you manage to write it while in a labor camp?

Bukovsky: We put it together in bits and pieces. We had a small symposium that met under the pretense of having tea. We used to sit quietly in a circle, and one of us who had prepared a report would give it and then we would discuss it. We started out to do it because some people in the labor camp needed to know how to defend themselves from psychiatrists. Even though they had been sentenced to prison sometimes when their sentence was up they would be taken to a psychiatrist and declared insane and sent to a mental hospital. So it had a very practical value.

Torrey: Then how did you get it out?

Bukovsky: People started saying that the "Manual" would be useful to others as well. So we tried to smuggle it out. The first time we tried it we failed and the authorities seized it. But the second time it was a lucky case and it made it. Everything had to be done in secrecy.

Torrey: The KGB must have been furious with you.

Bukovsky: Even now they are threatening to start a new criminal case against Gluzman. They are threatening to sentence him to many more years in prison. It is only the agitation of Westerners on his case so far which has stopped that from happening.

Torrey: How can Westerners help dissidents in the Soviet Union? How can we help to bring about basic civil rights there? Should we cut off contact with Russian professionals? Should we not attend meetings attended by them?

Bukovsky: I am opposed to a complete boycott altogether. Rather you should boycott selectively and make contact with the good psychiatrists there. For example, you should have nothing to do with Snezhnevsky; he is a criminal and you should never sit at the same table with him. Your National Institute of Mental Health should not deal with him as they do. They are just supporting a criminal and making him respectable.

What you should do is to make contact with the good psychiatrists in Russia, the ones who will not allow themselves to be prostituted. For example, Professor Melekhov and Professor Lukomsky both sat on the commission in 1971 to determine whether I was sane. Both behaved extremely honestly in the face of obvious pressure on them by Soviet authorities. And there are honest young psychiatrists who too refuse to abuse their profession. For instance, when I was arrested in 1965 I was first taken to the psychiatric ward of Moscow City Hospital Number 13. There I was examined by two young psychiatrists, Drs. Arkus and Dumbrovich, and declared to be sane. The KGB was furious so they took me to another hospital, where I was also declared to be sane. The KGB was even more furious now, so they took me back to Serbsky Institute. It was difficult for them to declare me to be insane when two other sets of psychiatrists had just declared me sane so they just kept me there for eight months.

What you should do is to invite doctors like Melekhov, Lukomsky, Arkus, and Dumbrovich to your professional meetings in the West. Publish their papers. Give them recognition. Visit the psychiatric ward of City Hospital Number 13 when you come to Moscow. But don't cut off all contacts, just cut off selective contacts.

Torrey: It sounds like we should draw up a blacklist of Soviet psychiatrists who have compromised themselves and not attend any meeting with them or invite them.

Bukovsky: Exactly right. And at the top of the blacklist you might put Snezhnevsky, Morozov, and Lunts, but there are many more.

Torrey: And on your visits to the Soviet Union make the effort to contact psychiatrists who are not on the blacklist.

Bukovsky: Yes. You won't get much help from Intourist but it can be done.

Torrey: I know that psychiatrists in England have provided more support for you than psychiatrists in the United States. For example, when you sent the six case histories out in 1971 it was only the English psychiatrists who evaluated them. How did you feel when you heard that the World Psychiatric Association meeting in Mexico City in late 1971 had ignored your plea? Weren't you angry and disappointed?

Bukovsky: We are all human, and we are all subject to pressure on us. In Mexico City there was strong pressure on some psychiatrists to do nothing. And so nothing was done. You were all afraid to offend Snezhnevsky.

It was sad, yes.

Torrey: Some of us, including myself, are afraid that psychiatry could also be abused on a large scale in the United States. How can we prevent it happening here?

Bukovsky: The best way to fight a battle is to fight it on someone else's territory. You can prevent it here by fighting the abuses of psychiatry elsewhere.

Torrey: I suspect that all countries have psychiatrists who will allow themselves and their profession to be prostituted given the right circumstances, and that in every country there is a Lunts or a Morozov waiting to do his job if given the opportunity.

Bukovsky: Most certainly there is. Look at France in 1941. Here was a country that was supposed to love freedom. You know, the French Revolution. And look what happened. Many of the people tripped over each other in their rush to collaborate with the enemy, willing to allow themselves to be used.

Torrey: If we don't fight the abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, what are the consequences?

Bukovsky: If the abuses begin in your country then it will be too late. If you try and fight it once it begins they will probably just call you insane and put you away.

(A note on Vladimir Bukovsky's mental health: Bukovsky had been diagnosed in the Soviet Union as having schizophrenia. Following his release in December 1976 he met with a group of British psychiatrists and was declared to be eminently sane, and with no evidence whatsoever of schizophrenia. The author, a clinical psychiatrist presently responsible for two wards of schizophrenic patients and doing research on this disease, strongly concurs with the opinion of the British psychiatrists after interviewing Bukovsky for over an hour. Bukovsky is a modest and self-effacing man, proud that he never compromised, and for whom principle is a way of life and not just a word. He retains a wry sense of humor, and an unusual ability to step back and look at himself and the world.)—E. FULLER TORREY

NOT JUST A SOVIET PROBLEM

The blossoming of psychiatry in the 20th century brought with it some very large thorns. Mental illness could be invoked as an explanation for the ideas and behavior of people, thereby discrediting them and even rationalizing the necessity for involuntary hospitalization. Jesus was one of the first intended victims: between 1905 and 1912 four books were published purporting to prove that He was a paranoid schizophrenic. Albert Schweitzer, an obscure philosopher at the time, responded to the assault with his

Psychiatric Study of Jesus. In the United States the first major case of involuntary psychiatric hospitalization to discredit and punish was that of Ezra Pound, accused of treason in Fascist Italy but declared insane and unfit to stand trial on the charges. Instead he was incarcerated at Saint Elizabeths Hospital from 1945 to 1958. General Edwin Walker was another. As one of the leaders of the segregationist forces resisting the integration of the University of Mississippi in 1962, he was involuntarily hospitalized in a federal hospital for determination of his sanity and thereby effectively discredited and removed from the scene. (Thomas S. Szasz reviews these cases in *Law, Liberty and Psychiatry and Psychiatric Justice*.) And then there are the many more nameless and forgotten, not poets or generals who get newspaper headlines but undereducated stubborn men and women who incurred the wrath of somebody (often a prison warden) and found themselves transferred to a hospital for the criminally insane with an indeterminate sentence. It still occurs in this country. Recently there have been charges that such abuses also are occurring in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Brazil, Argentina, and other countries. It is not just a Soviet problem.

A TRIBUTE OF RECOGNITION TO ODELL BROADWAY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to Odell Broadway, a remarkable woman from Flint, Mich. Odell Broadway has won scores of awards from civic, educational, and church organizations in recognition of her outstanding service and dedication to the Flint community. Her most recent award was being named "Woman of the Year" by the Zeta Beta Zeta chapter of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

I am proud to bring the story of this remarkable, distinguished woman to the attention of my colleagues, and I am inserting in the RECORD an article on her background that was part of the program printed for the Zeta award:

ODELL BROADWAY

(By Dorothy N. McNeal)

How does a woman become a legend in her own time? How does it happen that the mere mention of a name brings forth not only instant recognition, but all manner of testimonials to her record of solicitude and service?

When columnist Ann Landers neglected to credit Odell Broadway with writing the "Ten Commandments of How To Get Along With People" quoted in her column of January 13, 1977, little did she realize the storm which that oversight would brew. She had, after all, done an injustice to Flint's "First Lady of Community Service"!

"If you have a good attitude, you can do anything" is her watchword and she has woven that theme into nearly a half-century of unique personal involvement in the life of the Flint community. Mrs. Broadway takes great pride in "her children and young people" whose lives she has touched as teacher, counselor, home economist, benefactor, sociologist, psychologist and confidante. Once described as "a kind of mini-social agency," she has inspired, instructed and inspired hundreds of young people

and their parents to maximize their own resources and potentials for full growth and development. Many adults who function effectively in the Flint community and elsewhere, in the professions, education, business and industry, reflect the "Broadway" influence and indoctrination in their enterprise, pride of achievement and sense of personal self-worth. Three generations of Flint citizens have benefitted from her philosophy and her example.

The record of Odell Broadway's activities and contributions sparkles with "firsts" and innovative human services projects in which she perfected the technique of using her own resources as well as those of others, to make things happen. As a homemaking teacher and community counselor at the old Fairview School, she developed the concept which resulted in a new occupation: Home School Counselor. Today, 33 Home School Counselors carry forward the "Broadway" tradition of liaison between the school and the community. As a certified teacher of the Bishop Method of Sewing, she has introduced hundreds of men and women to that skill, encouraging many to continue education and training for successful employment in the garment and millinery trades.

Among other efforts, she has served as Arts and Crafts Instructor, Consumer Education Advisor for mothers in three housing projects, Big Sister, "Tot Lot" Leader, Stepping Stone, Homemaker Club and Girl Scout Leader.

Currently employed by the Mott Foundation as a Consultant, Mrs. Broadway travels throughout the country to participate in training programs for community and consumer education. Between trips, she serves on the Trustee Board of Metropolitan Baptist Church, where she was Sunday School Superintendent for 25 years, on the NAACP Credit Union and RSVP Boards and scores of others. She is a Life Member and Past Vice President of the Flint BPW Club and Past Worthy Matron of Capr Jasmine, Chapter 2, O.E.S.

Marianna, Arkansas may well be proud of Odell Garret, one of two girls raised by their stepmother, a professional dressmaker who inspired Odell's love for sewing and choice of home economics as her major at Rust College in Mississippi. Chicago can take a small bow for encouraging her interest in church work when she lived there as a young bride, but now, she belongs to Flint and much of what is inherent in the "community spirit" of Flint belongs to her.

FOREIGN OIL TANKERS WEAKEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the tanker cargo preference bills pending in Congress right now would strengthen both our national security and our economy by reducing U.S. dependency on foreign-flag ships to bring imported oil to our ports.

I am deeply concerned about the national defense aspect of the present tanker crisis, Mr. Speaker, and in order to make sure that my colleagues are aware of the seriousness of this situation, I am placing in the RECORD today a fact-sheet prepared by the U.S. Maritime Committee to Turn the Tide.

I am also putting in the RECORD a copy of an executive order issued by the Government of Liberia in 1973 at the height

of the Yom Kippur war, when the Liberians ordered ships flying their flags to refrain from carrying shipments to the Middle East. This executive order is crucial to an understanding of the defense implications. Those who support the runaway-flag vessels—vessels owned by Americans but registered abroad—contend that these vessels remain under "effective American control." The Liberian executive order proves how false that claim is.

Mr. Speaker, the material to which I refer follows:

FOREIGN OIL TANKERS WEAKEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

In times of war, the United States merchant fleet has transported 95% of our total military supplies, yet in 1977 our merchant marine ranks 10th in the world. We are effectively at the mercy of foreign shipping. No other major world power allows its trade to be dominated by merchant fleets of foreign nations.

Multi-national companies have long stressed their premise that flags of convenience tankers remain under "effective American control." They indicate these foreign flag vessels would be available to the United States in a national emergency. Such ships would not be under the real control of our nation, since only the state of registry has the right to requisition and control vessels flying its own flag. Thus, the Liberian flag fleet was ordered to boycott Israel in the 1973 Yom Kippur War, contrary to American policy. (See attached Liberian Executive Order No. IV, Nov. 2, 1973.)

The Liberian maritime system is operated by the International Trust Company of Liberia, which is 80% owned by the International Bank of Washington, an international holding company of banking and insurance interests. This company maintains its own office building in Washington, D.C. Among the tenants is the economic section of the Liberian embassy.

How could we count on a vessel owned by a Bahamian corporation, flying a Liberian flag, sailing in the Persian Gulf, with a Chinese crew and Indian officers? This is no substitute for a strong U.S. national merchant marine.

Without cargo assurances, the capability of U.S. shipyards to meet our defense needs will be jeopardized. The cost of outfitting and constructing naval vessels would increase substantially if our private shipyards became idle.

It's time to turn the tide and restore the independent security offered by U.S.-flag tankers.

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. IV

Realizing the continuing desire of the Government of Liberia to ensure the maintenance of peace in all areas of tension in the world in general and the Middle East in particular, and

Considering the allegation that Liberian Flag ships engaged in commercial navigation have been carrying arms, armaments and implements of war to combatants in the Middle East;

Now, therefore, effective immediately, the following shall govern commercial intercourse of Liberian Registered vessels:

1. No vessel with a Liberian Registry shall be permitted to carry any cargo of arms, armaments or implements of war to countries in the Middle East involved in the conflict so long as a state of war exists in that geographical portion of the world.

2. Any Liberian registered vessel found violating the provisions of the Executive Order shall be subject to a fine of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00), and the cancellation of the Certificate of Registry.

3. The Commissioner of Maritime Affairs and all Deputy Commissioners are hereby directed and ordered to ensure the faithful observance and execution of the provisions of this Executive Order.

DUAL USE ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE CLEARLY NECESSARY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for the past year and one-half as a result of defense planners' speculation and premonition, there has been a reassessment of American needs in civil defense.

Concern has been expressed as is contained in the article appended hereto by my good friend and civil defense planner, John E. Bex, Regional Director of the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, Region Two, called "America's Achilles Heel."

Others like T. K. Jones of Boeing in Seattle can unravel a scenario at the drop of a hat showing a diabolic Soviet capability to outstrip U.S. efforts in an all-out confrontation.

Last year I chaired the House civil defense panel and our panel agreed unanimously that the U.S. civil defense slumber should terminate but that we should not attempt to compete—shelter for shelter—with the Soviets.

We raised the budget last year and amended the law giving a strong boost to dual use civil defense which I am pleased to see is fully supported in the materials appended after the Bex article which was just delivered to my office by the new Director of the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, Bardyl Tirana.

The question now arises, "Is the current House civil defense authorization of \$134 million too much?"

My friend, and former civil defense strategist, Walmer E. Strobe, answers this question clearly "No" with the following analysis:

MEMO FOR BOB LEGGETT

Attached is a conversion of civil defense appropriations since passage of the Civil Defense Act of 1950 from current (actual) millions of dollars to constant (1972) value using GNP deflators for goods and services procured by the federal government. The conversion was made by Dr. Francis W. Dresch, Senior Mathematical Economist at the Stanford Research Institute.

The lowest actual appropriation (\$31.8M) was for a partial year, 1951. In 1972 dollars, it was worth \$71.8 million in purchasing power. The FY 1977 appropriation was \$2.5 million but there is a supplemental for 0.9M to cover pay raise and another for 4.0 million to expand matching funds; together they make the \$87.4M shown. NOTE THAT, in 1972 dollars, the present appropriation is worth \$63.2M, 12% less than value of 1951 funding. Indeed, past three years have been lowest in history of nuclear age.

For FY 1978, Administration budget figure would set new low in constant dollars. Senate authorization of \$95.5 would leave it like the last three years (\$63.3M in constant dollars), only House authorization breaks the pattern of a new low and equals pre-Kennedy appropriations of FY 1960. There is a "message" here somewhere.

These data may be of interest and use to you in authorization conference and appropriations cycle.

Sincerely,

WALMER E. STROBE.

AMERICA'S ACHILLES HEEL

(By John E. Bex)

There is no chance of defending and protecting America's cities in the event of a serious nuclear attack by the Soviet Union or anyone else.

Any other conclusion is dangerously deluded wishful thinking. The U.S. has concentrated almost entirely on counter-offense rather than defense, the concept of massive retaliation.

Fred C. Ikle, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency director, said: "The truth is that we are basically defenseless in the United States against threats of nuclear attack that could come from a great many different sources rather than from one or two clearly identifiable potential adversaries."

A few years ago, an anti-ballistic missile system might have made a difference by shooting down some or quite a few—no one would claim all—of the attacking enemy missiles, but it was never built.

The only reliable means of saving lives and preserving American industrial and economic strength are dispersal and shelter. They can be effective against the worst that modern weapons can accomplish. A few hundred feet of rock or the equivalent in earth or concrete can defy atomic bombs.

About half of 1%, or only about \$82.5 million is allocated for civil defense out of a defense budget of \$114 billion.

The result is that the United States has never had a civil defense system worthy of the name. It's a token effort.

The Russians are spending annually about 10 times as much as the U.S. and have been for decades and have important advantages in geography and stage of development. The USSR, a much larger country than the United States, is less urbanized. Its economic system is less vulnerable because it is in an earlier stage of economic development.

The degree to which the offense is now favored in warfare because of the deadly combination of atomic bomb and rocket is probably unprecedented in all human history. The opposite state of affairs would have been much more desirable for world peace. History and technology, then, have given mankind a tough problem to cope with.

The absence of an adequate system of civil defense leaves America's entire defense system unbalanced. Modern warfare depends on advanced technology and a strong economic base. The U.S. civilian population and economic base are unprotected by standard means of passive defense because sole reliance is on the threat of massive retaliation.

In 1958, James Tobin, a Yale economics professor and a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors, wrote: "Casualties could be greatly reduced by shelters, but we have not even made a beginning in building them." Nothing essential has changed since then.

Civil defense requires adequate funding and thinking ahead and planning. For example, the Moscow subway and all the other Soviet subways were built with civil defense needs in mind, with deep tunnels and blast doors. No American subway has been built like this, not even the newest ones currently under construction.

In evaluating the total defense of a nation, the trade-off between money spent on offensive weapons and on civil defense should be considered. In the current unbalanced American system every dollar spent on civil defense would be worth about five of 10 for further offensive weapons in terms of the

contribution to overall defense and national strength.

Former Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger, acknowledged the need for adequate civil defense: "The Department of Defense reaffirms the need for a viable and vigorous civil defense program. Over the years, this need has not diminished."

A nuclear attack would threaten the very survival of the United States as a nation, he continued. "Deterrence remains our primary objective, but prudence requires the development and maintenance of a strong national civil defense system should deterrence fail."

Nobel prize winner Eugene P. Wigner, has written: "By not offering the temptation of an unprotected populace, by instituting a vigorous civil defense program, we would be truly serving the interests of a lasting peace."

Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin said "defense systems which prevent attack are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people."

Leon Goure, an expert on Soviet civil defense, summarizes it:

"The Soviet Union has always regarded civil defense as an integral part of its war-fighting capability and its defense posture. It believes civil defense to be a decisive strategic factor which can determine the outcome of a war and the attainment of victory."

Consequently, the Soviets have been spending a great deal of effort over the last 20 years to achieve a major civil defense capability.

In the event of a Soviet attack, the U.S. might lose as many as 100 million people and the greater part of its industry. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, might lose less than it did in World War II—fewer than 20 million people—and assure the survival of most of its industry.

Therefore, the Soviet Union not only has eroded American deterrence posture, but can blackmail the U.S. with nuclear weapons in a crisis situation, survive as a power and win a war with the U.S.

To actually do something about civil defense will require first facing up to the fact that the U.S. is not invulnerable.

History has allowed the Russians no such illusions. In two world wars, they suffered the heaviest losses and learned an important lesson. They have the will to survive and know that it requires effort and foresight.

Other nations and groups, some more fanatical than the Russians, are acquiring atomic capabilities.

The American people are tough and capable of rising to any challenge if the proper information is given to them.

Fortunately, the country is starting to wake up from its long civil defense sleep. The facts and the message of the need for an adequate civil defense system are beginning to get through.

The hard verdict of history has always been that only those with a will to survive, who plan and work for it, deserve to survive.

CIVIL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS IN CURRENT AND CONSTANT (1972) DOLLARS

Fiscal year:	GNP deflator for goods and services, Federal Government (1972=100) ¹	Civil defense appropriations	
		Millions of current dollars	Millions of 1972 dollars ¹
1951	44.3	31.8	71.8
1952	46.7	77.0	164.9
1953	47.3	44.3	93.7
1954	48.0	49.3	102.7
1955	49.6	50.2	101.2
1956	52.0	70.9	136.3

	GNP deflator for goods and services, Federal Government (1972=100) ¹	Civil defense appropriations	
		Millions of current dollars	Millions of 1972 dollars ²
1957	54.5	95.8	175.8
1958	57.0	41.6	77.0
1959	58.8	45.3	83.2
1960	60.0	52.9	100.3
1961	60.9	61.1	100.3
1962	61.3	257.6	420.2
1963	62.1	128.0	206.1
1964	64.0	111.6	174.4
1965	66.2	105.2	158.9
1966	68.2	106.8	156.6
1967	69.9	102.1	146.1
1968	72.2	86.1	119.3
1969	75.9	61.0	80.4
1970	82.6	70.3	85.1
1971	90.2	72.1	79.9
1972	96.6	78.3	81.1
1973	102.9	83.5	81.1
1974	111.4	82.0	73.6
1975	123.6	82.0	66.3
1976	134.0	85.0	63.4
1976 ³	134.4	19.3	14.4
1977	138.2	87.4	63.2
1978A ³	150.7	90.0	59.7
1978B		134.8	89.4

¹ Constant dollar series is expressed in dollars of calendar year 1972 purchasing power but deflators for consecutive calendar years have been averaged to reflect average prices over a fiscal year.

² Deflator used applies to July 1-October 1.

³ Two estimates are shown for fiscal year 1978. The A entry corresponds to the budget figure and the B entry to the House authorization. Deflators for 1977 and 1978 are estimates based on extrapolation from official data, assuming a relevant inflation rate of 6 percent per annum.

DEFENSE CIVIL PREPAREDNESS AGENCY, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1977.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: Representatives of the United States Civil Defense Council (local civil defense), the National Association of State Directors for Disaster Preparedness (State civil defense directors) and the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency met at the Pentagon on May 16 to discuss the present National debate and several pending bills which would affect civil defense.

We discussed the civil defense program and it was recognized (1) preparedness for any type of disaster, peacetime or attack, must necessarily be developed jointly at the local, State and Federal level, (2) total preparedness for natural disasters, such as tornadoes, hurricanes, and floods, and man-made disasters, must exist at the local and State level before there can be effective nationwide attack preparedness, (3) there is a wide variance in the needs, abilities, and resources of the 50 States and the more than 4800 local jurisdictions accomplishing preparedness, and (4) the timing for achieving attack preparedness must necessarily vary from locality to locality, and from State to State.

We noted the difference in State and Federal priorities. Local and State governments concentrate on a broad spectrum of potential disasters, many of which occur yearly if not more frequently. The Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, on the other hand, is charged with focusing on attack preparedness. Working cooperatively, we can agree on a common goal and more effectively use whatever level of Federal funding is available for preparedness.

It was recognized that Public Law 94-361 authorized this Agency to support local and State preparedness against risks of tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, chemical spills and the like, provided that the support enhances attack preparedness. This Agency will follow the course suggested by Public Law 94-361. In return, State governments will give this Agency timetables by which progress in achieving attack preparedness can reasonably be assured.

A statement resulting from the discussion is enclosed for your information. We hope by working cooperatively together to be able to achieve the maximum protection of the Nation's citizens against all risks, and also to make the best use of taxpayers' dollars, whether derived from local, State, or Congressional appropriations.

We would appreciate your letting us know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

BARDYL RIFAT TIRANA,
Director.

STATEMENT ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Representatives for local, State, and Federal civil defense agencies met on May 16, 1977 in Washington to discuss common goals. At least within the Federal Government, there has been a great deal of confusion over civil defense since adoption of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. There has been a conflict of priorities as between local and State governments on the one hand, and the Federal Government on the other. Congressional appropriations could be used more effectively.

Local and State governments have extraordinary needs for total preparedness for the protection of their citizens and property from the consequences of natural and man-made disasters. The Federal Government has an obligation to provide for the common defense of American citizens against the hazards of enemy attack.

Local, State and Federal governments all want to attain the same objective, the protection of people and property within their respective jurisdictions. It was today resolved to work in cooperation toward a common goal. They hope to maximize the benefit from appropriations made by local authorities, State legislatures and the Congress. They agree as follows:

1. Civil defense is government's responsibility for preparedness, response and recovery from any natural or man-made disaster.

2. At the local and State level, civil defense requires protection of people and property against all risks. Local and State governments have established single-agency responsibility for all disaster preparedness. The primary responsibility of the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency is nuclear attack preparedness.

3. Nuclear attack preparedness, as with any other type of preparedness, must exist at local, State and National levels. Thus, one cannot have nuclear attack preparedness unless local and State governments have an adequate base of total preparedness for any risk. The principal difference between the preparedness that must be exercised by local and State governments for major peacetime disasters and nuclear attack is that for the latter, response and recovery operations must take place in a nuclear attack environment.

4. Historically, protection of the lives and property of citizens has been a responsibility of the States and the Federal Government. The Federal Civil Defense Act placed on the Federal Government the obligation of supporting State and local government in protecting lives and property against the consequences of enemy attack. The 1958 amendments to the Act created a joint local, State and Federal partnership. The amendments gave the Federal Government a more direct responsibility to participate with local and State government in attack preparedness and emergency operations, and provided for Federal financial support.

5. DCPA plays a significant role in the overall Federal commitment, and is the primary channel of communications between the Federal Government and local and State preparedness agencies. However, DCPA is only one of more than 30 Federal agencies

presently charged with a preparedness role. DCPA can provide useful assistance in urging other Federal agencies to support local and State preparedness efforts.

6. DCPA acknowledges that it cannot carry out its partnership responsibility to support attack preparedness unless local and State jurisdictions have adequate total disaster preparedness. Local and State governments have the responsibility to provide preparedness for enemy attack as well as peacetime disasters. Therefore, DCPA's financial assistance to local and State governments may in the future be used to achieve total preparedness against any risk. Local government, State government and DCPA will together work out appropriate guidelines so that the citizens of the several States, the President, and the Congress can be assured of progress in achieving attack preparedness on a State-by-State basis.

7. An important role which has been largely overlooked in civil defense planning in recent years has been that of industry and labor. Preparedness cannot be effective at any level of government without their cooperation and assistance. DCPA will undertake a review with industry and labor of the means by which they can effectively participate in total disaster preparedness at the local, State and National level.

8. The effectiveness of taxpayers' funds, whether from local, State, or Federal sources, will be enhanced greatly by a cooperative focus on total preparedness needs at the local and State level. A consistent approach to disaster preparedness for all risks will materially advance the objectives of local and State agencies, and also meet the partnership obligation embodied in the Federal Civil Defense Act to provide for attack preparedness.

Signed at Washington, May 16, 1976.

LEA KUNGLE,
President, U.S. Civil Defense Council.
DAVID L. BRITT,
President-Elect, National Association of
State Directors for Disaster Prepared-
ness.

BARDYL R. TIRANA,
Director, Defense Civil Preparedness
Agency.

MIDDLE-AGED AMERICAN VIEWS UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

MR. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, since the very beginning of the 95th Congress, few issues have concerned the Members of this body more than unemployment. Whether we were considering the CETA extension, the local public works bill, or the youth bill, the bottom line of our discussions has been to take action quickly to get people working.

Throughout all of our deliberations we have dealt primarily with figures to portray the unemployment picture; when we were not considering the rate of unemployment in the Nation or in a particular State, we needed to know the number of unemployed persons or vice versa. While I do not dispute the value of data—without question it is necessary to know where the unemployment situation is most aggravated and whom it most affects—it is also helpful for the Members of the House to have insight from unemployed persons, themselves, as to their opinions of their condition

as well as their suggestions for legislative remedies. It was for this reason, the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee of the Educational and Labor Committee began its deliberations on youth employment legislation with field hearings in New York at which young people were principal witnesses. The members learned a great deal from the young men and women who appeared before the subcommittee; the young people articulately expressed their view that "make work" jobs were wasteful and that their real needs centered on learning work habits and job skills which will help them in their future development.

We have not heard, as of yet in this session, the views of middle-aged Americans who are unemployed. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the May 31, 1977 edition of the New York Times in which an anonymous author tells us of his unemployment experience. The author, a 46-year-old white male with a graduate degree, writes of the despair of his unemployment; he tells us how unemployment has affected his wife and his three children as well as his feelings about himself; he admits that he conceals his lack of employment prospects from his mother, brother, and sister and that because he has told his stories of optimism many times before he now has little to say to his family.

This article does not deal with the impressions of someone who needs to develop positive work attitudes, good work habits, or saleable job skills but rather it is written by someone who by any measure which we could propose could not be denied the opportunity for success.

Mr. Speaker, the time which the Congress has devoted to employment legislation has been well spent, yet, we still have a long way to go. We cannot afford to waste either future talent or talent which must still be developed. Full employment is the most desirable goal. Perhaps this article will help to make this message clear.

The article follows:

[From The New York Times, May 31, 1977]
DARKEN YOUR GRAYING HAIR, AND HIDE YOUR FRIGHT

(This article was written during the 10 months that the author, formerly an executive at an Upstate New York college, was looking for work. He was subsequently employed—"through sheer dumb luck"—at another institution.)

I am male, white, 46. I have undergraduate and graduate degrees from two reasonably well-known Eastern institutions. My first job lasted for four years, my second for ten, my third for seven. I have a wife, three daughters, a mortgaged home and a 1972 "Beetle" for which I paid cash.

Whereas I once earned over \$400 a week, New York State now provides me with \$95 a week in unemployment benefits.

I am smoking almost two packs a day. I try not to drink before 5 o'clock.

The other day I encountered the man who fired me. He is an affable, bright man, and on the eve of retirement. Many months ago he told me I had outlived my usefulness, and he wished me well. The other day he said he knew what I had been going through. When I said he didn't, he looked just a little startled. He does not, never did, like to be

contradicted. But I knew he had never been without work. I told him that physically, fiscally and spiritually I and all members of my family had been wiped out. Then he asked why I was having such trouble finding a new job.

The easiest, possibly even the only truthful answer would have been this: "No one wants me." That is the way I feel, of course. (Paranoia. Depression. I used to think these were modern conveniences that only others could afford.) But I told him what I know: My age, sex, and salary needs work against me. So, of course, does the shortage of jobs. Then he turned to talk with another passer-by; he meant well, though.

I have discovered there is an entire literature on the art of job-hunting. One book—I think it was the same one that said if you are over 35 and out of work, you're in great trouble—offered a few how-to's on rejuvenation:

If you have too much gray hair, darken it. If you look younger than you are, revise your birth date in your resumé. Be relaxed during interviews, avoid personnel managers (go right to the top!).

I have been told I look younger than 46, but if I change the year of my birth from 1931 to, say 1934, then I have to change graduate dates, military-service dates, previous-employment dates. Barring a gin-induced stupor, how can anyone be relaxed during an interview. (And why that noun? Why not "interrogation"?) My hair is too gray now. A dye, I think, would be conspicuous.

Unemployment is a leveler. The lines and the people in them—I report to the New York State Employment Service's local office every Thursday between 3 and 3:30 P.M.—remind me of my basic training at Fort Dix. Then and now there was, and is, little in common except shared misfortune. Just why the lines move so slowly, I don't know. It should be a fairly mechanical, effortless process.

I went to Washington for an interview in early April. It was raining, and Newark, Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore looked uglier than ever. The interview lasted only 15 minutes because the salary was \$10,000 less than what I had been making. In Washington, that salary would translate into about \$95 a week.

The snack car on the Metroliner on the way back to New York was crowded with men in double-knit suits, carefully cut hair. Some held computer sheets. There was talk about budgets and personnel. I hated them.

I used to ridicule lesser beings who drank martinis with their dinners. No longer. In fact, I usually continue after dinner. Vodka martinis. I know what I'm inviting (or may already have), but they do help me sleep. I should say get to sleep. Because it seldom lasts. I have nightmares, and I scream and I awaken others. Usually, I seem to be in pursuit of an object of one kind or another; just as I'm within reach it moves beyond my touch. Then I scream.

Among our neighbors is a young psychiatrist. My wife has suggested that I talk to him, friend-to-friend (we are friends) about my problems, paranoia, depression, nightmares. Perhaps he would know of a pill that would dilute my anxieties, my problems. But I know the bare root of all of them, and unless he can provide me with a job, why bother with a pill? So I drink in lieu of a pill.

One interviewer eventually turned me down because, he said, I lack eyeball contact. When I called him to say I didn't understand, he told me that because of my courage in asking such a question, he would reopen "the discussions." We had dinner at the Yale Club, in New York (he had one beer, I had nothing), and he said we had misread each other's "signals." We would start afresh, and he would be back in touch

with me. A month later, he wrote to tell me that he had decided not to fill the position after all. (I heard shortly afterward that he had lost his job.)

The help-wanted ads are the first things I look at in Sunday's paper. But they're strange. Box numbers and employment agencies. My résumés go out on Monday, but there's seldom an acknowledgment.

The corporate display ads are a little different. Most of the time an answer is forthcoming. The final sentence, often enough, is, "I wish you well in your future endeavors." Earlier in the form letter are references to the numbers of applicants, all good, but a few better suited for "our needs" than others. But the résumés of the rejects, of course, will remain in "our active files."

A vice president of an organization asked me to meet him for breakfast at a Park Avenue hotel. Two days later, I received a note from him saying he was impressed by my credentials, liked my answers to his questions and would probably invite me to his base for additional interviews. I was skeptical—he wasn't the first vice president with whom I had had breakfast in New York—but two days later his assistant ushered me from one vice president to another, and finally to the president.

A week later, I was told that everything had gone well and that I could expect a decision within two weeks. I received the decision—from the assistant—three months later. It was formal, brief and negative. The job went to a young woman. The organization is the defendant in a number of affirmative-action cases in the courts.

A friend of mine, a president, once told me that whenever he advertises a vacancy, it's an easy matter to skim off the four or five most outstanding candidates. After their interviews, he compares not their experience, but their statistics—their total compensation packages, retirement and medical benefits in particular. If you're not young, he said, it sure helps to be single. I, as he knows, am neither.

I'm never sure just how the children are taking it. I think they see it all in very different ways, for they are not at all alike. One is a sphinx, one seems almost (though not intentionally) removed, and one sees it all. But they all know my countenance and can interpret it. They know I spend most of the week in my chair. Only one of them has said that I no longer talk, and I frown when others are talking.

There are times when I wonder not whether I will ever have a job again, but whether if I do, I will be able to function. For almost a year, I have not done what I was trained to do. I have, as they say, vegetated.

The invitations for interviews never come by mail, always by telephone. So I stay home and wait for the phone to ring. It's not that I have nothing else to do, but it is a matter of how I spend that waiting time. After the newspaper there is coffee, and junk mail, and boredom. I eat too much for lunch because there's nothing else to do. Lately a friend has supplied me with Irish novels and short stories, all new and none published in this country. I am Irish and know something of earlier Irish literature, but my friend's books offer little release, less escape.

At dusk, in those unearthly hours between sleep and wakefulness, I have visions. I see pictures of small-bore pistols. Lethal, but, I hope, quick and comparatively painless. Not heroic, certainly, but not cowardly either. But, then, there's my wife and our daughters. Because I love—and I do—all four, I have to ask whether my death is preferable to my (mere) despair. I do not know. Would they be better off without me? I do not know. When I first lost my job, the real pain derived from the (eventual) realization that I had failed not only myself but four others.

I recently read about a White House deputy press secretary. I think he was not quite 30,

whose new salary is \$39,500. No, maybe it was \$49,500. I had never heard of him before, but I hate the son of a b-----.

I knew that life isn't fair long before J.F.K. went on television to tell us as much. But fair isn't the right word. It's not fairness that's lacking; it's balance. Proportion maybe.

When the phone does ring, it's usually someone asking for one of our daughters to babysit. "We have to go out tonight, and I was just wondering if..."

We never go anymore. It's not just the money—our hearts aren't in it. We are obsessed and can talk only to each other. But only about our obsession.

I weep when I write my mother, my brother, my sister. I tell them that we're all well, that the family fabric is intact, that I have a half-dozen irons in the fire. But they've heard all that too many times now, so I seldom write. I have nothing to say.

CHALLENGE IS TO PRESERVE PEACE, CONGRESSMAN EILBERG SAYS

HON. MICHAEL O. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MICHAEL O. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, my colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia, JOSHUA EILBERG, was honored by being asked to serve as keynote speaker at the commemorative service of Rhawnhurst-Castor Memorial Post 754 of the American Legion.

His comments, I believe, were eloquent, timely, and thoughtful. They expressed the hope that we in America can meet the challenge of holding high the memory of those who gave their lives for our country, and that we can restore domestic tranquility as we set about to preserve peace. Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. EILBERG's remarks in the RECORD, and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOSHUA EILBERG, MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

This is Memorial Day—a solemn and moving occasion in the life of our country, and in the cause of the freedom which we hold so dear.

Once again—as we have for one hundred and nine years—we pause to honor the memories of those fine young Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of their country.

These are those Americans who, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "gave their lives that this nation might live."

Memorial Day has its roots in that terrible and tragic national upheaval of our Civil War.

But without regard to the origin of Memorial Day, it can truly be said that on this day we honor all of those who have fallen in all of the wars that have tested our national spirit in the two hundred years that this republic has endured.

From Lexington and Concord—to Laos and Cambodia—the graves of American servicemen circle the globe—silent reminders of their sacrifice, and our enduring indebtedness to them.

I intentionally include the sacrifices of those who fell in Southeast Asia—because in our intense and continuing national debate over this most recent and tragic war, the cause of those who struggle there has been too quickly overlooked.

We have endured a great national trauma over the war in Vietnam—and the wounds of that public debate are far more visible than the graves of the young Americans who died in that war.

I do not want to reopen the wounds of Vietnam—it would serve no useful purpose to do so.

But there is one point I want to make—one point that has been overlooked.

Vietnam, we are told, was not a popular war—and I guess that's right.

Vietnam, after all, divided America.

But so did our own Civil War—which set region against region, brother against brother.

And our own Revolutionary War divided this country too.

It was not a popular war with significant numbers of our countrymen.

There were many in the American colonies who thought it was wrong to wage a war of independence against England—many in the American colonies who simply did not want to obtain their freedom by force of arms.

The national debate two hundred years ago was every bit as strident—every bit as divisive—as was the national debate over Vietnam.

And, like the Vietnam debate, it lasted long after the armed hostilities had drawn to a close.

Over a period of time, we have come to revere those gallant men of the Continental Army who purchased our freedom with their blood.

I trust that the time will come—and I pray that it will come soon—when we will revere the memories of those who died in Vietnam, convinced that they were guardians of the same legacy of American freedom.

America has bled through many a war—here on our own soil and in far away lands—and when each war was over, we set about the task of binding up the wounds of those who bore the battle—the veteran and his loved ones.

We face that task again today, in the aftermath of Vietnam—and I feel confident that we will succeed.

We owe it to these, our honored dead, to restore domestic tranquility.

There is sorrow on each Memorial Day—many of us still weep for our fallen.

But Memorial Day comes in the springtime of the year—in the season of hope—the greening season after the dead hand of winter has been loosed from the land.

It is our challenge to keep—forever green—the memory of those whose sacrifices we honor.

And it is our challenge, too, to preserve the peace which they struggled so valiantly to attain.

America, I believe, is capable of meeting that challenge.

THIRD WORLD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the nationally syndicated columnist, Patrick Buchanan, is known for his penetrating stories and sharp commentary on domestic and international events.

His column, appearing in the Chicago Tribune of May 31, is devoted to the Law of the Sea Conference which is currently meeting at the United Nations. I found his comments to be quite pertinent, and

insert the article for the attention of the Members:

SOAK YOUR HEAD, THIRD WORLD

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

WASHINGTON.—If Lady Luck is with us, the Law of the Sea Conference, the fifth session of which has opened at the United Nations will, like its predecessors, collapse in acrimonious name calling.

For last September, Herr Kissinger left tabled a proposal so unnecessary, foolish, and damaging as to make success of the conference an economic disaster for the United States.

Central to the discussion at Turtle Bay is the question: Who has the right to exploit the billions of dollars in nickel, cobalt, copper, and manganese lying on the ocean floor outside the territorial limits of any country?

The Japanese and the Germans, but especially the Americans, have the organization, technology, and capital ready to scoop up these minerals lying about in potato-shaped nodules. Last fall, however, Henry the K offered the Third World the following:

A. The United States will agree to creation of a Third World-dominated International Seabed Authority (ISA), which would be supreme regulator of who mines the oceans, when, and where.

B. Every time a U.S. company discovers and develops a bed of ore, another comparable seabed will be found for the ISA to exploit.

C. The ISA would get a rakeoff of the profits of the American operations.

D. Uncle Sam will help finance an outfit the ISA deep-mining arm to be known as Enterprise.

What the United States was to receive in return for these gratuities has yet to be disclosed.

Instead of leaping at the deal, however, the Third Worlders dismissed it as insufficiently generous. They want the whole hog. Their demand is that Enterprise be given exclusive monopoly rights to mine the seabeds; and the American companies should keep their grubby capitalist hands off.

Kissinger's offer should be withdrawn as the first order of business at the conference. It is a betrayal of the national interest. Chad, Sri Lanka, and Mozambique have no more claim to minerals we pick off the ocean floor than we do to the hauls of fish the Russian trawlers scoop up on the high seas.

What is it in the composition of the American diplomat that he is forever dreaming of ways to ingratiate himself with Third World thugs who do not disguise their contempt for us, our system, our success, our values?

In a thousand attempts we have sought these last 20 years—with soft loans, trade concessions, aid grants—to purchase their friendship and respect. Yet everywhere, the hostility and hatred mount round about us.

American policy will begin to command respect when it is viewed by friend and foe alike as furthering our national interests. Elliott Richardson, U.S. Ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference, would do well to deliver to the gathering a single valedictory address along the following lines:

"Gentlemen, the U.S. no longer buys the argument that your poverty is our fault. Our wealth was not created by stealing yours, but by the hard work of our own people. If you wish to be friends of the United States, you will find us generous in both counsel and assistance."

"However, as to the minerals on the floor of the ocean, they belong in our judgment to the nations with the ingenuity to recover them. American enterprises are going prospecting for those nodules; you, of course, are free to do the same. But no international authority is going to dictate to the United

States what it may and may not do on the world's oceans. And if there should be physical interference with our mining operations, you will find yourselves arguing the matter not with me, but with the Sixth and Seventh fleets. Have a good conference, and good day."

STIMULATION PACKAGE: A CONSERVATIVE ALTERNATIVE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to balance the budget and restore a sound economy by reducing Government spending. This legislation was based, in large part, upon a statement by the distinguished economist, Hans Sennholz, outlining a conservative alternative to liberal economic policies.

Professor Sennholz argues that it is the enormous increase in Government transfer payments that has depleted the economy of the capital necessary to expand production and brought us inflation and recession. Consequently, the stimulus necessary to restore a sound economy is a reduction in Government spending, not a continuation of the inflationary spending policies that produced recession and high unemployment.

Professor Sennholz' statement follows:

STIMULATION PACKAGES: A CONSERVATIVE ALTERNATIVE

American income and wealth are not produced in Washington; they are merely redistributed there by political force. The steady growth of this redistribution process in recent decades explains the growth of the Federal government. During the last decade Federal spending has increased some 10 percent per year. Over the last three decades, Federal, State, and local government spending has soared from 20 percent of national income to more than 40 percent.

We must view this trend with great alarm. After all, the growth of government in our lives signifies the growth of political coercion and simultaneous loss of individual freedom. As politics is becoming a popular redistribution method, it is gradually gaining in importance until every sphere of economic life is politicized, and political action is more important than economic effort. Economic stagnation must inevitably follow. But, above all, the political redistribution process is breeding antagonism and conflict not only between the beneficiaries, who are profiting from the redistribution, and the victims, from whom the benefits are forcibly taken, but also among the beneficiaries themselves who are at odds about their fair and proper shares. The redistributive society is a conflict society that jeopardizes its individual freedoms and economic well-being.

When the quest for redistribution outpaces the means that are available in tax revenues, budgetary deficits are suffered. Small deficits may be covered by government borrowing of the people's savings. But the huge deficits of recent years can only be financed through some creation of money, which is inflation. Deficit financing thus appropriates the people's monetary savings for government spending, and gradually impoverishes the American middle class. Its impoverishment is aggravating the social conflict.

In the footsteps of his New Deal and New

Republican predecessors President Carter is promoting more redistributive spending. In order to stimulate economic growth and alleviate the high rates of unemployment, he is proposing a stimulation package of \$31 billion over two years. President Ford's Budget Message of January 17, 1977 foresaw a 1977 deficit of \$57.2 billion; President Carter's first year deficit must be expected to exceed this amount.

In the name of social peace and economic prosperity we must reverse this ominous trend. The growth of social strife must be halted, and the economic stagnation with its awful waste of capital and labor must be overcome. This is why the Federal budget must be balanced and, above all, government spending be cut.

In a democratic society, such as ours, a trend in policy can be reversed only with the full support of the majority of the populace. To seek this support is an educational task of gigantic proportion. An open and thorough discussion of government spending in general, and the U.S. budget in particular, is well suited to serve this educational task.

A conservative reform administration would seek to stem the transfer tide and reverse the trend. It knows what has to be done. But it is also aware that every attempt at curbing the redistribution demands will meet with the bluster and rage of many beneficiaries and their spokesmen. Their arguments and doctrines must be thoroughly defeated in the arena of debate and discussion before the reform can be conducted with any degree of success. Only when the objectives of redistribution are completely discredited and its consequences are finally understood by the American public, can a true reversal be effected.

Specific proposals must be defended successfully on the battlefield of ideas. In particular, we are proposing, and are ready to defend, the following first-year program of reform:

1. All redistributive spending by the Federal government will be reduced by 5 percent. That is, in the 1978 Budget of the United States, total outlays are estimated at \$440 billion, of which \$277.1 are transfer payments of one kind or another. A 5 percent reduction of this amount would save \$13.9 billion.

2. To show the way and set an example the expenditures on Federal employees engaged in the redistribution process, including all members and employees of the legislature, will be reduced by 10 percent. We estimate the number of such employees at 840,000. If their compensation averages \$15,000 per year, their expenses amount to \$12.6 billion. A 10 percent reduction would save \$1.2 billion. Of course, the 5 percent curtailment of redistributive function should permit operation with 5 percent fewer civilian employees, or 42,000 less, which would save \$0.6 billion. This reduction could be quickly achieved by a temporary ban on Federal hiring.

3. All Federal agencies and commissions that in any way disrupt economic production, raise consumer prices, cause shortages or surpluses, weaken competition through restrictions and prohibitions of entry, or create cartels and monopolies through franchises and licenses, will be abolished summarily. The budgetary savings of such a measure, which we estimate at some two billion dollars, are insignificant when compared with the release of creative energy and productive effort that would follow. Although some present beneficiaries of the control system, together with the Federal agents and commissioners, could be expected to oppose this economic release, every consumer would benefit greatly from the expansion in production, the surge in supplies, and lower goods prices.

4. As the Federal government reduces its

spending and relaxes its grip on the national economy its demand for resources in general and for loan funds in particular, would fall. Interest would decline immediately. The stabilization of the U.S. dollar would have the same effect. A two percent decline, which would be a realistic expectation, would reduce the interest burden on the Federal debt of almost \$700 billion by \$14 billion.

Altogether, this reform program would save the American taxpayer nearly \$32 billion. It would unshackle the American economy, stabilize the U.S. dollar, and halt the drift toward government omnipotence and social strife. Misled by the apostles of redistribution and spending many Americans may not yet be ready for such a reform. But the growing afflictions of the redistributive society may cause them to re-examine their conduct and give thought to the only alternative.—Hans F. Sennholz.

A COMMONSENSE LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues a letter written to President Carter by one of my constituents, Mr. Stephen M. Moser of River Forest, Ill.

Mr. Moser's succinct letter covers a variety of subjects and his thoughts are certainly representative of much of what I have been reading in my mail. No doubt many of my colleagues will recognize his opinions as being very reflective of their own correspondence.

If President Carter intends to stay "close to the people" as he has so often declared, certainly one of the best ways of doing so would be by reading a daily sampling of his mail. I am sure he will find that many Americans concur with the views expressed by Mr. Moser:

MAY 24, 1977.

DEAR PRESIDENT CARTER: The following are some of my views and ideas which I would like to share with you.

ENERGY

Let's cut down on Domestic Airline Flights, flying empty, or with a partial load on duplicated flights by more than one airline.

School Busing is used for integrating schools but it is costing enormous amounts of money and gas. Let's have the kids go or continue to go to local neighborhood schools.

Our Government regulates the Trucking Industry which forces one way loaded and return trips empty—a complete waste of fuel.

A lot of Commercial Business's are open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This is also a drain on the use of energy.

Enforce the 55 m.p.h. speed limit. It will save gas and lives.

If you have to go to rationing, it must be done fairly or it won't work.

CRIME

What about the victim's rights? Let's get the habitual and mentally insane criminal off the streets so they don't commit additional crimes.

WELFARE

It is a rip off. Let's have reform. Also the Food Stamp Program is mis-used.

MILITARY

Let's have a strong but lean Military and eliminate duplication and waste.

CIA AND FBI

They must have some degree of secrecy but safeguards must be there so they are not mis-used or compromised.

FOREIGN POLICY

Beware of the Russians and Cubans. I don't trust them.

If we are going to sell wheat to foreign countries, let them pay as we have for oil. Has our wheat price gone up like oil and coffee?

Most aid is needed abroad, but I'm sure we don't get credit from the people for giving it or they don't appreciate it.

Let's take a hard look at all aid. Can we really afford it with a deficit at home?

We must support and continue the support of Israel.

Finally, there are so many Government Agencies to help, but they are given so much power that they are going to destroy what they started to help. With regulations and policies and no control, these agencies are going to undermine our country. Let's have some "Zero" base evaluations.

Our Government must stop spending more money than it takes in. Increase productivity and efficiency and eliminate the "Bureaucracy".

Thanks Sincerely,

STEPHEN MOSER,
River Forest, Ill.

MEDICAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the May 25 edition of Medical Tribune included an article entitled "Bill To Curb FDA Power Gains in Congress." The article deals with the medical freedom of choice bill, H.R. 54, that my colleague from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) has introduced and which I, along with 105 other Members of Congress, have cosponsored.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues to review it:

BILL TO CURB FDA POWER GAINS IN CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The criticism of medical leaders and researchers and the concern of physicians and, more recently, patients with regard to FDA regulatory overkill has given momentum to a House of Representatives bill to restrict FDA powers in respect to drug efficacy, returning it to the practicing physician. The increasing frequency of reports, carried by MEDICAL TRIBUNE, of what scientists and medical leaders consider abuses of regulatory discretion has recently been reinforced by growing sentiment aroused by FDA actions in respect to anticancer therapy and noncaloric sweeteners. The new Symms bill is a terse 300-word amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act which will reduce FDA hegemony in the area of drug effectiveness even as it retains FDA powers in respect to drug safety.

As described in MEDICAL TRIBUNE by its author, Rep. Steven Symms (R.-Idaho), the bill is based on the proposition that FDA overregulation has unnecessarily cost American lives, has stifled drug research and development and denied the American consumer vital drugs at an estimated cost of \$250-\$300 million a year, mostly in extended hospital stays.

The bill, express purpose of which is "to expand the medical freedom of choice of

CXXIII—1094—Part 14

consumers," has received its strongest impetus from medical leaders' continuing, outspoken criticism of what they consider to be a virtual blockade on potentially lifesaving drugs.

In a recent address to Congress, Rep. Symms cited, as a prime example "of the urgent need to pass this legislation" an exclusive report by MEDICAL TRIBUNE (April 13) in which, he said, "two of the most prominent physicians in America, Drs. Michael E. DeBakey and Raymond P. Ahlquist, describe the problems that the FDA has created [with respect to] beta blocker drugs." Inserting the article in the Congressional Record, Rep. Symms urged his colleagues to read it "and ask themselves why the United States has chosen to follow the disastrous path of regulatory overkill."

The Idaho Congressman was particularly impressed by Dr. DeBakey's declaration to MEDICAL TRIBUNE that "The prosthetic artery, aneurysmal patches and other prostheses would not be here today if we'd had to comply 25 years ago with current FDA regulations." Said Rep. Symms pointedly during an interview with MEDICAL TRIBUNE: "FDA people tell me that the fact is that if penicillin, or digitalis, or aspirin, were developed today they'd never make it to the market."

"RIGHT THING TO DO"

Dr. Ahlquist became one of the first prominent medical scientists to offer unequivocal support for the bill, saying: "I'm in favor of any action that will speed up the process of releasing safe new drugs to the medical profession. The history of the FDA since 1962 makes this [the Symms measure] the right thing to do. The general effect of the 1962 legislation has been to slow down accessibility to new drugs. I am sure this was not the intent of Congress, but this has been the unforeseen effect of those regulations."

Encouraged by the scientific support, Rep. Symms noted that "We have already drawn wide bipartisan support in the House, since the bill's introduction January 4, and we have indications that many prominent Senators from both parties are willing to support it. The bill was to be introduced soon in the Senate by Sen. Jesse Helms, a North Carolina Republican and former newspaper editor who has been prominent in environmental and price stabilization affairs."

"Our 92 co-sponsors in the House include 32 Democrats," Rep. Symms emphasized, including such liberals as Rep. Shirley Chisholm of Brooklyn and Rep. Charles Rangel of Manhattan in New York City. Other influential backers are Rep. Bob Wilson (R.-Calif.), a ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. Joe D. Waggoner (D.-La.), a leader in the Ways and Means Committee, and Rep. James G. Martin (R.-N.C.), of the Science and Astronautics Committee, who has introduced a bill to reform the Delaney amendment.

Rep. Rangel, who represents a predominantly black constituency in Manhattan's Harlem and Upper West Side, told MEDICAL TRIBUNE he is supporting the bill because it would make more proved antihypertensive drugs available to black patients.

ANTIHYPERTENSIVES CITED

"Hypertension is one of the commonest medical problems that blacks encounter," he said. "Effective antihypertensive compounds are available in Europe, but not available in the United States because of the FDA regulations. The bill would speed passage of these drugs to the medical consumer. Our position is that if a drug is shown to be safe it should be made available. It is my view that the individual physician who treats the patient is best qualified to determine whether or not a drug is beneficial to that patient."

Rep. Chisholm, in supporting the bill, said, "Naturally everyone would like to see that all drugs on the marketplace are effective. But 15 years of experience and bills of dollars have

shown very clearly that the 1962 Amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act have not helped achieve that goal. In fact, they have considerably harmed the American consumer."

"There is overwhelming economic and medical evidence that the American people are being denied access to many drugs now in wide use in other countries for the treatment of serious disease, because of the controversy over the efficacy of the drugs alone. It is our belief that so long as a drug is proven safe and properly labelled as to all possible efficacy, it should be made available to patients and physicians who wish to use it. In addition to the basic question of the right of individuals to exercise freedom of choice of safe medical treatment, there is considerable evidence that internal problems at the FDA and overly stringent proof requirements under the law have made it virtually impossible to meet efficacy standards in timely fashion. Hence, this country suffers from a 'drug lag' as compared to other developed nations."

As rationale for the bill, Rep. Symms cited an evaluative study in which Prof. Sam Peltzman, of the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business, "has documented the loss of new drugs to medicine and the consumer as a result of FDA holdups for reasons of so-called effectiveness. The drug flow since passage of the Kefauver amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act in 1962 has been cut by 60%." (Regulation of Pharmaceutical Innovation, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1974.)

"In his econometric model based on historical pre-1962 cost and benefit averages, Prof. Peltzman estimates that in terms of missed benefits, or lives lost and illnesses lengthened, the cost is between \$300 and \$400 million a year; he pegs the tab for higher prices created by the lack of competition in drug production at another \$50 million a year, and he deducts an estimated \$100 million a year for the projected savings that have accrued to the consumer because ineffective drugs [as well as effective drugs] have been blocked from the market. Hence the final estimated cost to the consumer of \$250 to \$300 million annually."

"But I would emphasize that a 1975 'Economic Report of the President' has concluded that it is not clear whether drugs introduced under the tremendously difficult circumstances that have existed since 1962 are any more effective than those introduced before the Kefauver amendments."

NO TIME CONSTRAINT NOW

Noting that the thalidomide episode sparked passage of the 1962 amendments, he stressed that "under the original law, a new drug application or NDA received automatic approval if it had not been rejected by the FDA within 180 days; the 1972 amendments removed this time constraint."

Rep. Symms, who has become a consumer relations expert in his four years in Congress, pointed out that only 16 new chemical entities have been introduced annually since 1962, as compared to 43 prior to that time. "The FDA should be encouraged to make greater use of data generated by reputable foreign scientists to reduce duplicative research and avoid the questionable ethics of conducting clinical trials for regulatory purposes only."

"And safety and efficacy are relative, not absolute terms. Consideration should be given to developing an effective post-marketing surveillance (or Phase IV) system to expedite the marketing of new drugs with significant therapeutic potential, while some [other] governmental agency works with clinical pharmacologists and other scientists in industry, government and in the private sector to foster the development of new drugs."

The fate of the Symms bill now lies in the

House Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Senate Health Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. And there could be some tough sledding ahead, Rep. Symms concedes. Rep. Paul Rogers (D.-Fla.), chairman of the House health panel, voted for the Kefauver amendments, and Sen. Edward Kennedy (D.-Mass.), who heads the Senate health group, is not thought to be favorably inclined toward the bill. But both are consumer advocates, and success or failure of the Symms bill may rest on its appeal to the nation's patients, doctors and their Congressmen.

STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL'S REACTION TO VOTER REGISTRATION PROPOSAL

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1977, I brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House a letter which I had received from the Board of Elections of Burlington County, N.J. That letter discussed in some detail the objections to the voter registration proposal on the part of the local officials who ultimately will have to bear the responsibility for administering any new programs.

Today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues another letter on this subject, this one from the New Jersey State Association of Election Officials. The letter encloses a resolution passed during the State convention expressing the opposition of the organization to H.R. 5400, the Universal Voting Registration Act. Note that the association is composed of all election officials from every county of the State of New Jersey and adopted the resolution without dissent. Such a statement coming from such a group, I think, says much more about the true potential for disaster inherent in this voter registration proposal than all of the rhetoric on the floor of the House will be able to say of its potential for good.

I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, my statement of April 4 that we have an obligation as responsible legislators to provide laws which reflect the realities of the world in which we must function. I think this resolution of the Association of Election Officials reflects the reality of the world with which these officials must deal every day.

The material follows:

NEW JERSEY STATE
ASSOCIATION OF ELECTION OFFICIALS,
Jersey City, N.J., May 13, 1977.

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE,
Moorestown, N.J.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This Association, composed of all election officials from every county of New Jersey, sitting in convention recently at Atlantic City, N.J., went on record as being strongly opposed to the adoption of H.R. 5400, commonly known as the Universal Voting Registration Act of 1977.

The undersigned, President of the Association, was directed to forward to each member of the New Jersey delegation, a copy of the attached resolution, adopted without dissent, so that our Washington Representatives may

be made aware of the sentiments of the election officials who would have to implement this law if it became a reality.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH T. BRADY,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is presently pending, in the United States House of Representatives, an Act designated as H.R. 5400; and

Whereas the stated purpose of said legislation is to provide the manner in which citizens of the various States may register to vote and vote in any federal election, on the day of said election; and

Whereas the said legislation provides for the establishment and administration of said registration program through a Federal Election Commission; and

Whereas the members of this association recognize the inherent privilege of each qualified citizen to vote in the most convenient manner possible; and

Whereas it is also recognized that election day registration will cast the burden and responsibility of determining voter qualification upon the individual district or precinct workers and that undue hardship and reasonable burdens will also be placed upon them if they are required to register voters in addition to fulfilling their usual election day duties; and

Whereas H.R. 5400 provides totally inadequate safeguards in determining constitutional requirements regarding age, residency or citizenship, thus opening wide the door to notorious acts of fraud and misrepresentation; and

Whereas H.R. 5400 will require and compel Election Officials to initiate, maintain and service voter separate registration records for State and Federal Election; and

Whereas such duplication of records imposes severe financial obligation upon the tax payer of the various counties of the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas statistics released by the United States Government indicate less than 2% of persons responding to a post election survey cited voter registration inconvenience as a reason for not registering;

Whereas, H.R. 5400 provides for a large expenditure of federal funds which is a gross injustice to the taxpayers, and

Whereas we believe that a responsible electorate wants, and has a right to expect, proper safeguards in the right to vote.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved by the New Jersey State Association of Election Officials in convention assembled in Atlantic City, New Jersey on this 16th day of April 1977, that the said Association is opposed to the adoption of H.R. 5400 by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

BAD FOR HEALTH

HON. KENNETH L. HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, May 18, and I would like to take this opportunity to share it with the Members of the House.

The article follows:

BAD FOR OUR HEALTH

President Carter's proposals for controlling hospital costs probably aren't going far in Congress and that is just as well; they're the wrong medicine.

The President proposes to put an 8.3% limit, of sorts, on the annual rise in revenues of acute care hospitals and also limit capital outlays above \$100,000. In that way he would hope to bring government's sharply rising Medicare and Medicaid costs under better control.

At the present rate of growth, these two programs will cost the federal government \$30 billion in fiscal 1978, a rise of 13% from the current year. Hospital costs, rising at 15% a year, are a major reason. About 45% of all hospital bills are paid by government.

But the Carter proposals fail to address the underlying cause of rising hospital costs—they are rising so rapidly largely because there is insufficient restraint on demand. About 92% of all hospital bills are paid by some third party, either the government or private insurers. The incentive for the patient and his doctor is not to economize on hospital usage but to make the most of the fact that insurance will pick up most of his bill.

No one in particular is to blame for this, although it is not overly harsh to say that past administrations and Congresses should have given more thought to designing health care policies that would have been less inflationary. Not only did the sharp rises in demand under Medicaid and Medicare raise prices but the government also has encouraged, through its tax policies, the present broad coverage of private insurance. Economist Martin Feldstein of Harvard estimates that tax deductions for health insurance premiums lower the cost of such insurance some 30% from what it otherwise would be.

The answer to the cost inflation problem is not as complicated as many people would like to make it sound. Hospitalization is different from other services in that treatment is often a matter of life and death. But it is not radically different in economic terms. Mr. Feldstein, one of the most persuasive experts on the subject, makes a convincing case that with patients paying a substantial portion of their bills out of pocket—up to, say 10% of their annual income—and insurance picking up only the rest, medical costs would soon come under the rigorous control of supply and demand.

Any politician, however, can see political liabilities in this. Politicians have been promising the nation "free" medical care for so long that there is a pervasive belief that such a thing exists—that doctors and nurses presumably can be made to work for nothing and that X-ray machines can be had for a song. Rather than control costs by resort to co-insurance by the patient, government is willing to try almost anything else.

Unfortunately, innovative attempts to avoid reality have come a cropper. President Nixon established federal subsidies to promote Health Maintenance Organizations, which he hoped would hold down health costs by competing with existing forms of health care delivery. But liberals in Congress loaded the HMOs up with so many federal requirements that they have had difficulties achieving their supposedly inherent efficiencies. Congress established Professional Standards Review Organizations, which were supposed to enlist doctors to review the performance of their peers in spending federal money. But doctors don't much like that line of work, so that only about half the proposed number of PSROs have been formed. It is doubtful whether even those exert much effective control on hospital utilization by doctors.

Now Mr. Carter is falling back on that last resort of failing government policies, direct controls. But there are all sorts of flaws, real and potential, in the ceilings. For one thing, they would permit non-supervisory wage increases to be passed through. The idea of controlling capital expenditures already is

being employed by federally sponsored Health Systems Agencies in a number of states; the main effect seems to be to embroil the HSAs in litigation and controversy with hospitals and doctors. And in some states, where the main focus has been to try to control Medicaid costs, arbitrary controls and ceilings have contributed to nursing home bankruptcies, a dubious contribution to the efficacy of American health care.

Direct controls simply will not work. And since they won't work, neither will "national health" in the sense that it has been envisioned by Senator Kennedy and others, as a blank check for unlimited care—that is, unless Congress is willing to face up to a federal budget deficit of \$150 billion or so.

So the choice is open. Congress can go along with something like the Feldstein proposal and bring costs under realistic control at some political price. It can adopt the Carter proposal and plunge deeper into the morass. Or it can continue to let matters drift. We suspect it will choose the latter. It should be obvious that it could do a lot worse.

ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE ON MENACHEM BEGIN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have read and seen much in the news media about the victor in Israel's recent election, Menachem Begin. Because his election has created so much discussion, I have noted in the May 25 issue of the Jewish Times of the Greater Northeast, published in my home district, the following excerpts of an interpretive article on Mr. Begin.

This article was written by Albert Liss, executive director of Brith Shalom. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, because I think it is an interesting and perhaps different analysis of the man and the issues, which are of critical importance:

MENACHEM BEGIN—A PROFILE (By Albert Liss)

Now that Menachem Begin, a member of the Knesset since Israel's reestablishment 29 years ago, and former Commander of the underground liberation forces, the Irgun Zvai Leumi, has emerged as fresh copy for today's newspapers, American reporters of the Middle East scene must accept a special responsibility to correct the misconceptions about Mr. Begin which were nurtured in the bitter partisan days of Israel's beginning.

The description of "right-wing" to Mr. Begin, in a political spectrum that includes Communist parties and the Marxist Mapam, may be useful, but it regrettably conjures up a distorted vision to Americans who generally apply the term to anti-Democratic elements who oppose a free Democratic society.

Mr. Begin believes passionately in the free society that can provide social justice for the individual and is one of the staunchest adherents of the parliamentary system which he served not only as a member of the Knesset but also as a former member of Golda Meir's cabinet.

Although a champion of the free enterprise system, Mr. Begin has advanced ideas for the socialization of Israeli society far more radical than any proposed by the Labor Party which, incidentally, also has encouraged a free enterprise economy, despite the

anomalous Histadruth. Mr. Begin, for example, urged the nationalization of all public utilities and has called for public referendum on vital issues facing the Israeli electorate. He was one of the first who argued for the termination of military rule over Arab civilians in Israel proper and advocated full political, social and economic equality for all citizens of Israel, Jew and Arab. He has even espoused the right of loyal Israeli Arab citizens to serve in Israel's military forces, and opposes the death penalty.

Mr. Begin may with accuracy be described as a radical only in his territorial views. Jewish traditionalist, he sanctions the concept of Eretz Israel, a view shared by many in Israel. It would not be surprising, however, that given evidence of Arab reconciliation, he would find a way to take the necessary reciprocal steps to secure their friendship and attain a durable peace.

Besides the deep influence of Hebrew traditions and Jewish history, the French Revolution and European revolutionary nationalists, such as Mazzini and Garibaldi, seem to have exerted profound influence on Mr. Begin's political outlook.

His vision of Israeli society was eloquently stated in the first public address he made in Tel Aviv on May 15, 1948 after emerging from the underground:

"Let the government be the guardian of the right of man and citizens, without discrimination and without (special) privileges.

"Within our house justice will reign supreme. Justice will rule even its rulers. Those in high office will be the people's servants, and not its rulers. There will be no parasitism. There will be no exploitation. In our house, there will not be a man—citizen or alien—hungry for bread, without a roof over his head, without clothes or without an opportunity for education."

Attention has been focused by Mr. Begin's adversaries on his alleged preoccupation with Israel's military posture. Mr. Begin's reliance on strong military defense forces to protect Israel is a result of his knowledge of the Jewish people's historic vulnerability as unarmed, defenseless victims, and his pragmatic conviction that at this juncture in history, the Arab nations have not yet demonstrated their willingness to accept Israel's legal right to exist as a permanent sovereign Jewish nation-state in the Middle East.

Finally, a word about the man who unfurled the banner of revolt against the foreign occupiers of the Jewish homeland. An appreciation for truth calls for a more edifying description of Mr. Begin and his underground activities than the inflammable ad hominem "terrorist."

Mr. Begin's underground exploits were carried out against powerful foreign military forces which were brutally engaged not only in preventing the establishment of the Jewish state on land held in trust for the Jewish people, but which callously were thwarting the rescue and repatriation of survivors of the holocaust who had no other place to go.

Any comparison of the acts committed by the Irgun (even those in which, unhappily, innocent persons by error and not by design may have been victims) with the cold-blooded murders perpetrated by Arab fanatics at Munich, at Maalot, or at the former Lod Airport, against civilians having no connection with the Middle East conflict, is a palpable absurdity.

No other people in history have succeeded in reconstituting themselves as a nation against greater odds than the people who made the ascent to Zion. There are countless heroes among them, not the least Menachem Begin, the leader of the first successful rebellion for Jewish freedom since the Maccabees.

(NOTE.—The author who is Brith Shalom's National Executive Director, served as Regional

Director of the American League for Free Palestine, an American organization composed of Jews and non-Jews, which supported the fight for the liberation of Palestine waged by the underground forces of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, led by Mr. Begin.)

THE C-130 AIRCRAFT AND ARMS POLICY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in the apparent frantic rush of the present administration to control and further restrict arms sales abroad, there is a clear-cut danger of not only further erosion of our industrial base that used to be called the "arsenal of democracy," but also a further worsening of our balance of payments due to our reduced arms sales, to say nothing of our allies having nowhere to turn for equipment with which to defend themselves. A case in point is the C-130 aircraft which has been accorded the status of a major weapon at the Department of State. Some of us feel this policy is wrong for the reasons set forth in the letter below which was sent to Secretary of State Vance.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1977.

HON. CYRUS VANCE,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A number of us here in the Congress are becoming increasingly concerned over the problem of maintaining our position as the "arsenal of democracy". In this day and age, a key foundation of this arsenal has to be the aerospace industry of the United States. Our aerospace industry, as you are aware, is also a leading factor in our exports. Given the fact that both defense spending and our space program have declined in recent years, this matter has become more urgent. Therefore, we are writing to take up the case of one of the giants of the aerospace industry—Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, and specifically the case of the C-130 cargo plane manufactured by that corporation.

It is our feeling that the sale of such planes should be encouraged to all non-Communist countries and not discouraged. Since this is not a strategic weapon, and even in many parts of the world has come to be associated with American humanitarian and rescue efforts, it would appear that it is erroneously classified as a major item of defense equipment and, therefore, cannot be commercially sold in amounts in excess of \$25 million in accordance with the Arms Control Export Act of 1976.

Our allies around the world continue to need to be able to buy needed equipment from us. We can ill afford to have countries traditionally friendly with the United States turning to the Soviet Union for equipment and becoming dependent upon it for supplies, spare parts, and the necessary training. The spectacle of Kuwait buying Soviet SAM missiles is particularly instructive in this regard, we feel.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, we respectfully suggest you reconsider your policy on the C-130 aircraft and recommend that it be reclassified as a defense article.

Your prompt consideration of this matter

will be greatly appreciated by the undersigned.

John J. Flynt, Jr., Ga., Doug Barnard, Jr., Ga., Bo Ginn, Ga., Billy L. Evans, Ga., Ed Jenkins, Ga., Elliott Levitas, Ga., Trent Lott, Miss., Jim Lloyd, Calif., Gene Taylor, Mo., Goodloe E. Byron, Md., Larry P. McDonald, Ga., Mendel Davis, S.C., Wyche Fowler, Ga., Dan Daniel, Va., Floyd Spence, S.C., John H. Rousselot, Calif., G. V. Montgomery, Miss., Richard A. Ichord, Mo., Marilyn Lloyd, Tenn., Bob Stump, Ariz.

Bill Ketchum, Calif., Steve Symms, Idaho, Philip M. Crane, Ill., George O'Brien, Ill., John M. Ashbrook, Ohio, Jack Brinkley, Ga., Robert Badham, Calif., Dawson Mathis, Ga., Carlos Moorhead, Pa., George Hansen, Idaho, Chuck Grassley, Iowa, Dave Treen, La., Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., La., Robert K. Dornan, Calif., Richard Kelly, Fla., James M. Collins, Texas, W. Henson Moore, La., Eldon Rudd, Ariz., Jack Kemp, N.Y., James R. Mann, S.C.

Edward Derwinski, Ill., Robert J. Lagomarsino, Calif., Tennyson Guyer, Ohio, Bill Chappell, Fla., Mickey Edwards, Okla., Shirley Pettis, Calif., Bill Goodling, Pa., Bob Bauman, Md., Barry Goldwater, Jr., Calif., G. William Whitehurst, Va., Bob Sikes, Fla., John Buchanan, Ala., Larry Winn, Jr., Kans., Marjorie S. Holt, Md., Samuel S. Stratton, N.Y., Bill Nichols, Ala., Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Va., Bill Wampler, Va., Sam Devine, Ohio, Richard C. White, Tex.

SAVE THE HATCH ACT

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, this body has before it controversial legislation to, in effect, repeal the Hatch Act.

I disagree with the proponents who argue that Hatch Act reform is needed to grant full political participation to the Nation's civil servants and that such reform can be accomplished without the potential danger of turning the civil service into a political pawn.

I feel that there are very real dangers associated with Hatch Act "reform" and was naturally very pleased to see a most perceptive editorial on this matter appear in the Goleta Today newspaper. I would like to share the wisdom contained in this editorial with my colleagues and insert it in the Record at this point:

SAVE THE HATCH ACT

Since 1939, federal civil servants have been "Hatched" and it's a system which has worked well.

The Hatch Act forbids federal and postal employees to take active roles in partisan politics; they can't be hassled for political contributions; they can't be press-ganged as doorknockers, literature distributors, campaign office "volunteers", money-raisers.

They may not serve as officers of a political party, solicit contributions, serve as convention delegates, circulate partisan petitions, or run as partisan candidates for public office.

They may, of course, make campaign contributions if they choose and be members of a political party. They may even engage in non-partisan campaigns.

The Hatch Act is under attack. There's a bill in the House of Representatives which would "revise" the act. Revisionists claim the present law disenfranchises federal workers and restricts rights of free speech and association. That's the claim, although the Supreme Court has held otherwise.

Proponents of Hatch Act revision include

the American Postal Workers Union (AFL-CIO) and the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO) plus the National Federation of Federal Employees. The suspicion arises that these groups are not so much interested in First Amendment rights of the rank and file membership as they are in the increased political clout they can acquire if Hatch Act protection from arm-twisting is removed.

The rank and file should be aware of what is going on.

Will political loyalty and activity become the basis for promotion within the Civil Service system, a system which was developed to erase that evil?

Will campaign contributions be the price of a better job, perhaps even keeping a job at all?

Will the federal bureaucracy be used to build a political machine?

Should the friendly letter carrier be hired on the whim of a political boss rather than by competitive exam? Should he be promoted the same way?

Common Cause President David Cohen, in a letter to the House Post Office and Civil Service committee, said the nation "cannot afford a politicized civil service. Our civil service must be respected, and that requires that federal personnel be impartial in the administration of our federal laws and policies."

This isn't the first time revision of the Hatch Act has been tried. In fact, Congress passed such a bill in 1976 but President Ford wisely vetoed it and the veto was upheld.

The new attempt (H.R. 10) would remove existing restrictions on partisan political activities for most federal employees. They would be permitted to run as partisan candidates for elected office, campaign for partisan candidates, raise funds for candidates and parties and serve as officers of political parties.

The spoils system is not dead.

The federal employees better know what is in store for them. And we better know what is in store for us.

ELIMINATE CAUSES OF POVERTY

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, this Nation made a major commitment to eliminate the causes of poverty in the United States. The Economic Opportunity Act represented a concerted effort by thousands of concerned individuals to openly confront a national disgrace which this country had ignored for decades. That landmark legislation established the Office of Economic Opportunity to assist programs at the local level to address the problems of the poor and the causes of poverty.

While this commitment initially produced remarkable results, the fact is that large-scale poverty still exists in the United States. The Bureau of Labor statistics reports that its latest figures show a total of 26 million poor people in this country, an increase of 3 million over the 23 million reported in 1973, and an increase of nearly 2.5 million from 1974. This represents the largest single-year increase since 1959, the first year for which poverty data were available.

This Nation's commitment to eliminate the causes of poverty must be con-

tinued and strengthened. Toward this goal, I am today introducing the Economic Opportunity and Community Services Amendments of 1977. Basically, this bill extends the major provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended by the Community Partnership Act of 1974, through fiscal year 1981.

This legislation would increase to 75 percent the Federal share requirement and relieve the financial burden faced by many local communities which have been unable to provide the funds necessary to compensate for the reduction of Federal funding imposed by Congress in 1974. For the first time, specific funding is authorized for research and evaluation so that the coordination of Federal efforts to alleviate poverty can be strengthened. This bill recommends a reduction in the amount of time nonpublic members of community action boards may serve to help generate greater community participation.

The organization of the Community Services Administration is streamlined by abolishing the nonfunctional Inter-governmental Advisory Council on Community Services, by deleting the section of the act which authorizes a transfer of CSA to HEW, and by extending for 1 year the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity. Furthermore, this bill encourages the Director of CSA to revise and update regulations which have become burdensome and dated. The Director is authorized to promulgate regulations on the issue of employee compensation, and is directed to consult with community action agencies and regional offices prior to proposing regulations. Finally, this bill places new responsibility in regional offices by providing them with authority to process and finalize grants and to provide technical assistance to local community action agencies.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so that this country's commitment to reduce poverty can be continued with speed and enthusiasm.

THE HELSINKI WATCH IN MOSCOW

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, a year ago a small group of people who dare "to think differently"—the literal translation of the Russian word we usually render as "dissenter" or "dissident"—formed a remarkable organization in Moscow. It was called the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R., and its constituted the first signal to the West that the Helsinki Accords instead of being a triumph for Soviet diplomacy, were becoming an embarrassment to the Kremlin. The evidence of that embarrassment is now painfully obvious to the courageous men and women who formed the Public Group. Three of its Moscow leaders—Prof. Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginsburg, and Anatoly Shcharansky—and two of the founders of a similar group in the Ukraine—Mikola Rudenko and

Oleksy Tykhy—were arrested and imprisoned last February and March, because they dared to try to hold Soviet authorities to the pledges given at Helsinki.

Despite such harassment and repression, however, the Soviet Helsinki watchers have continued the task they set themselves: Monitoring Soviet compliance with the accords, pinpointing the people and the issues involved in the long and agonizing effort to establish, in the U.S.S.R. standards of conduct which would make the Soviet reliable participants in the world's search for peace and stability. Already, the Public Group has issued 20 detailed and documented reports on compliance with the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki Agreements. They make grim reading. Most are case studies of the ways in which an authoritarian state denies its citizens the rights Helsinki was meant to reinforce: The rights of free movement, free expression and conscience.

But the Public Group has not despaired of change, and neither should we. After the arrest of Professor Orlov, a new activist, Yuri Mnyukh, appeared as spokesman for the Helsinki watchers. And a document the group issued at the end of February—only recently received by the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe of which I am a member—echoes the stubborn faith of the unofficial monitors that their work of reporting is not in vain.

They write in assessing the human rights situation 3 months before the 35 signatories were to begin their own review of Helsinki implementation:

In the world today, one can never be certain that facts on the unending suppression of elementary liberties in the USSR will not become public.

It is thanks to their efforts that those facts are known and that they will be a part of the diplomatic assessment this year of the progress that has been made and must be made in giving the Helsinki Agreements life and meaning. The Public Group Professor Orlov has founded has done and is doing a great service. Its assessment of the situation in the Soviet Union, "Three Months before Belgrade," is depressing but important reading.

A translation of that report, prepared by the Khronika Press in New York, follows:

THREE MONTHS BEFORE BELGRADE

1. A GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The course of events since August 1976 when the Helsinki Watch group published its review "A Year After Helsinki" has shown the justice of our appraisal of the human rights problem in the USSR. Our statement that "the Soviet Government does not intend to fulfill its international human rights obligations" has been confirmed as well as our August 1976 prediction that the Final Act of the European Conference would be accepted by more and more people as a juridical basis for the fight for human rights.

Citing provisions of the Final Act, participants in the human rights movement in the USSR and other East European countries have spoken out energetically, demanding that the agreements signed at Helsinki be observed. In Poland, human rights advocates are championing, with apparent success, the rights of the workers who protested against increased food prices. In the German Demo-

cratic Republic, a protest citing provisions of the Final Act has been mounted against the deprivation of citizenship of balladeer and poet Wolf Biermann. In Czechoslovakia, human rights advocates have used the same juridical basis in drafting that exceptionally valuable document, Charter 77. And the number of signatures on Charter 77 continues to grow despite the regime's reprisals. In Romania, eight persons have issued a statement on human rights violations in their country. The distinguished Yugoslav author and public figure, Milovan Djilas, has spoken out against the violation of civil rights mentioned in the Final Act. Every day witnesses new examples of the importance attached by the public of the East European countries to the obligations assumed by the governments of the states participating in the Helsinki Conference.

In the USSR individuals and groups basing their struggle for civil rights on the Final Act have also stepped up their activity. Soviet citizens are addressing a swelling stream of letters to different Soviet organs, to the Helsinki Watch Group, and to the international organizations about the situation of prisoners, about psychiatric persecution, and about violations involving freedom of conscience, religious liberty, the free exchange of information, and the right to emigrate.

More and more prisoners of conscience are declaring that their sentences constitute a gross violation of the Helsinki agreements as do the brutal, inhuman conditions in penal institutions: punishment by hunger and cold, forced labor, insurmountable obstacles to correspondence, confiscation of complaints and statements, etc. Letters and statements have also been received from political exiles and former prisoners of conscience who are suffering from serious discrimination with respect to their choice of domicile, their freedom of movement, and their choice of jobs.

Participants in the Jewish movement for emigration have significantly expanded their activity. More attempts have been made to secure a revival of Jewish national culture in the USSR. Germans seeking the right to leave for the Federal Republic of Germany form a growing movement.

An increasing number of people are demanding implementation of their right to emigrate for religious, socio-economic or other reasons. The attempt of large groups to emigrate without receiving individual invitations from abroad is a distinctive, new phenomenon. (One example is the recent application made by more than 500 Pentalists.)

The Helsinki Watch Group has passed on to the court of world opinion and to the states signing the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference a series of documents with facts on many violations of fundamental human rights in the USSR. The events of recent months have demonstrated once again the Soviet government's extreme intolerance toward any information which reveals the true situation with respect to human rights and which is not subject to the control of official Soviet organs.

2. THE REGIME'S BATTLE AGAINST THE DISCLOSURE OF UNDESIRABLE INFORMATION

Since late 1976 the Soviet authorities have engaged in a new offensive against those persons who collect news and inform world public opinion about human rights violations in the USSR.

The USSR Procurator's Office delivered an official warning to Academician Andrei Sakharov, Nobel Peace Laureate. Soon thereafter the organs of state security arrested four members of the Helsinki Watch Group: Alexander Ginzburg, representative of the Fund to Assist Political Prisoners in the USSR; physicist Yuri Orlov, founder and leader of the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group and a corresponding member of the American Academy of Sciences; writer Mikola Rudenko, leader of the Ukrainian Helsinki Watch

Group; and teacher Oleksy Tikhy, another member of the Ukrainian Group. Before and after these arrests, searches were conducted at the homes of several Group members, and in some instances, evidence of crimes was planted in their homes and "discovered" during the searches.

The arrests and searches were accompanied by an unpardonable campaign of slander against Soviet human rights activists in *Pravda*, in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, in *Golos roding*, in TASS bulletins for Western consumption, in special lectures and conversations and in other media.

No doubt, the slander disseminated through the mass media has one aim only—to prepare public opinion inside our country for political trials of human rights advocates in the Soviet Union. They will all be charged, to judge from the propaganda, with slandering the USSR or with non-political crimes such as illegal currency operations or keeping weapons (which KGB agents planted themselves during the searches). The true reason for the arrest of four Helsinki Watch Group members and for the threat against other Soviet human rights advocates—for example, the warning addressed to Valentin Turchin, chairman of the Amnesty International Soviet group—is the authorities' desire to intimidate all the civil rights activists inside the country and to cut off the daily increasing stream of information about violations of the Helsinki agreements.

The pressure and repressions directed against the human rights advocates by the authorities will apparently be intensified. But another aspect of the current campaign of repressions should be kept in mind: the Soviet government intends to make evident to the whole world its disdain for the voices raised in the West criticizing its actions, to demonstrate its toughness, and to discourage world public opinion from responding to appeals for support issued in the USSR. Such actions are, however, incompatible with that climate of trust which was, one would think, a goal of the states participating in the Helsinki Conference.

We are convinced that only one course of action can in fact establish confidence in the Soviet government: putting an end to the systematic and ruthless suppression of civil liberties and fundamental human rights in the USSR. Nothing else—neither repressions directed against Helsinki Group members, nor diplomatic evasions, nor the concentrated campaign slandering the dissidents—can help the Soviet authorities conceal the truth about their violations of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Final Act of the European Conference. In the world today, one can never be certain that facts on the unending suppression of elementary liberties in the USSR will not become public.

3. FUTURE ACTIVITY OF THE HELSINKI WATCH GROUP

The members of the Moscow Group, in spite of the repressions, will continue to inform world public opinion of all violations of international human rights obligations entered into by the Soviet government. Many events, including the organization of similar groups in the Ukraine, in Lithuania and in Georgia have confirmed the significance of Yuri Orlov's initiative in creating the Moscow Helsinki Watch Group. In reply to the authorities' pressure and their arrest of two of the Group's key workers, we announce the election of two new members: Yuri Mnyukh, a Candidate of physical and mathematical sciences, and Prof. Naum Meiman, a Director of physical and mathematical sciences. Ludmilla Alexeyeva, a Group member who has left the USSR, will act as the Group's representative abroad. The Group will in this fashion continue its work despite the repressions of recent months.

The Group believes that one reason for the repressions directed against its members is the Soviet leadership's fear that people in the USSR and other East European countries who are concerned about fulfillment of the human rights obligations assumed by their governments are linking up on the basis of the Helsinki Conference's Third Basket. The desire to disrupt the developing unity among human rights activists is transparent in the mass media's propaganda on this topic. The support received from several West European Communist parties for the struggle on behalf of human rights has served to sharpen the authorities' fear of the burgeoning human rights movement in the USSR. The Soviet government has taken the risk of losing the trust of their ideological confederates and of their partners in the Helsinki Conference just for the sake of preserving its freedom of action to persecute Soviet citizens for any attempts to assert cultural or social values unpalatable to the authorities.

With respect to the danger now threatening the arrested members of our Group and the mass media's campaign of slander, the Helsinki Watch Group has asked Ludmilla Alexeyeva, Andreo Amalrik, Vladimir Bukovsky, Valery Chalidze, Lev Kvashevsky, and Leonid Plyushch to explain the true aims and character of our Group's work when they meet with official representatives of the countries signatory to the Final Act, with leaders of Western public opinion and with representatives of political parties.

Serious disagreements between the leaders of the Western and the Eastern countries have now become apparent on the issue of the proper criteria to be used in monitoring the provisions on human rights. (This is evident, for example, from President Carter's letter to Academician Sakharov and Ambassador Dobrynin's statement made in response to that letter.) In the present circumstances, discussion and elaboration of such criteria by representatives of public opinion in countries of the West and of the East are particularly important and could play a major role in the preparation and conduct of the Belgrade Conference.

HOW SOON WE FORGET

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because Vietnam was a dirty, unpopular war there are many people who feel that we should not talk about it except to make martyrs of those who dodged the draft, deserted, or were discharged other than honorably. But we cannot hide the fact that our involvement in Vietnam spanned almost 10 years and that 55,000 American lives were lost in that war. In addition, the peacetime expectations of young men, their wives, their parents, and those of their children were interrupted by their service in the service of their country in the Vietnam war. For those who do not like to think, or talk about our involvement in Vietnam, and who want to forget, let me remind them that there are scars that never can be healed. There are lives that will never be mended. There were too many sacrifices, not only by the young men who fought the battles but by their families and friends. It is strange that most of the media stories today are devoted to draft dodgers, the dishonorably discharged,

and the deserters at the expense of the more than 55,000 dead, and the many other Americans who bravely served in Vietnam.

And what about the other casualties, those who suffered wounds from which they will never recover? For those whose heart goes out to the deserter and draft dodger, which mine does not, although I do feel for the parents and families, let me state that the obvious difference is that the families of the war dead have a vacuum in their lives, while the families of the deserters, draft dodgers, and dishonorably discharged still have a son. Death is very final.

I was touched by the article which appeared in the Washington Post on the day after Memorial Day entitled "Family Shares 9 Years of Grief, Memories of War Victim."

We should be ashamed if we forget the fine young men who lost their lives, or those who served honorably in the Vietnam war. For those who did not have the chance to read the article which appeared in the May 31, 1977, issue of the Washington Post, I offer the same to you with the hope that we will never forget Peter Jason Angle—a man—and a true American, may God bless him and all his comrades.

The article follows:

FAMILY SHARES 9 YEARS OF GRIEF, MEMORIES OF WAR VICTIM

(By B. D. Colen)

The words and abbreviations on marker 55-327 in Arlington National Cemetery are at once terse and all inclusive, summing up everything the United States Army needed to know or say about: Peter Jason Angle, Virginia, Cpl., Co. B, 2Bn, 1 Air Cav Div, Vietnam, Jan 20, 1949, July 1, 1968, BSM, AM, PH.

Peter Jason Angle, resident of Virginia, corporal in Company B of the Second Battalion of the 1st Air Cavalry, died in Vietnam on the 163d day of his 20th year. He was the recipient of the Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal and Purple Heart.

He was also the first born and only son of Luther E. and Louise Angle. And they have suffered his loss these past nine years.

When the chaplain and the sergeant first visited the Angles' neat clapboard Dutch Colonial in Arlington they found the house empty. Luther and Louise Angle were out to dinner.

But at 8 the next morning, July 2, 1968, "I heard them. Louise was still asleep," Peter's father recalled yesterday, just before a holiday visit to the grave.

Angle said the sergeant asked, "Are you Luther Angle?"

"Yes."

"Is your son Peter Angle?"

"I said 'yes' and gave him the serial number," Angle continued. "I knew what it was as soon as I saw them. I remembered from World War II."

Peter Angle lies dead in Arlington Cemetery, but he is still very much alive inside the house in which he grew up.

The sheet music to "The Little Drummer Boy" still sits on the piano in the living room, just as it did that last Christmas before Peter shipped out for Southeast Asia.

The yellow 1st Air Cavalry patch hangs framed on the living room wall. Beneath it, in Latin, the words: "Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori"—How sweet and becoming it is to die for your country.

There are pictures of Peter. Peter in uniform with a girl friend. Peter as a crew-cut child. Peter with his sister.

And in the basement there is the collection of Peter's effects and letters, many

items still sitting on the desk drawers where he left them before shipping out.

"I still can't bring myself to touch his things," his mother said yesterday. "It would be like invading his privacy." It was only last year that Louise Angle stopped visiting the white stone marker several times a week, taking fresh flowers to Peter and watering the flowers on nearby graves.

Louise Angle said it "made me feel better to go" to the cemetery. "When your child dies, a part of you dies with him."

To the Army, Peter Jason Angle was a soldier. To his mother, he will always be a child.

"It's lonely without him," she said. "Couples today should have three or more children. Then if one dies it's not so hard."

It took the Angles all these years to accept the finality of Peter's death.

An insurance check arrived an unseemly two days after the notification of his death, and Louise Angle "just stuck it away. I kept thinking they must have made a mistake. I couldn't believe it. I couldn't believe he wasn't coming home. We didn't have the casket open or anything."

"At first I didn't touch it (the check) because it (his death) wasn't true. But then I didn't because..." Her voice thickened, but didn't crack. "It's sort of a nest egg."

Peter Angle was not a victim of the draft. He was a volunteer from a family of volunteers whose roots go back on both sides to the American Revolution.

"He enjoyed the Army, as such," his father recalled. "He was really gung ho."

"He was upset because he hadn't done well in college," she said of her son. "He said, 'This time you're going to be proud of me, Ma.' It is hard to believe Louise Angle was ever not proud of Peter."

His parents remember the little things, the happy moments that make a collection of biologically connected individuals a family. The week Peter spent in New York with his sister during the 1968 Christmas season. "He had a wonderful, wonderful time."

Or the evening after his graduation from basic training at Ft. Jackson, S.C., when Peter "was so proud he insisted on paying for the meal. He insisted that the treat had to be on him," his father recalled yesterday.

And the afternoon when his mother found him out taking photographs of the neighborhood. "He wanted to take them with him" to Vietnam, she said.

Then there were the letters home. "He was always so happy, so up. He was a happy boy. It was a terrific shock because I had no idea" of the danger Peter was in every day in Quang Tri Province.

The first hint of that danger came one week before the visit of the sergeant and chaplain. "The last letter we got he said his best friend had been killed. He sent us a picture. They have a little service and put the rifle in the ground and put his hat on top of it," said Louise.

"Helmet," corrected Luther, who saw action in the Pacific as a staff sergeant during World War II.

There was one final letter. It arrived a week after Peter's death. "He was going on R&R and he was going to Hawaii. It was his turn because he was the oldest in his platoon. He wanted us to meet him there and he signed the letter, Aloha."

Yesterday, at the graveside, Louise Angle looked at the two roses, picked beside the white clapboard house and brought to Peter, and at plastic flowers on a nearby grave.

"That's not right," she said. "A young person shouldn't have anything artificial. He was so young. He was just coming into his own."

"You think about him being so young," said Luther Angle, "but there's nothing you can do..."

THE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES OF
NEW YORK'S PUERTO RICAN AND
HISPANIC COMMUNITY: VII

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to insert in the RECORD the recommendations of the panel on criminal justice of the first Conference on the Problems of the Puerto Rican and Hispanic Community in the Metropolitan New York area. As you will read, the panel concludes that the problems for Hispanics in the criminal justice system begin with the lack of Puerto Rican professionals in decisionmaking positions within that system, and go all the way to building more community-based correctional facilities in large urban areas. I hope that all my colleagues concerned with improving the criminal justice system will carefully read these proposals:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESOLUTIONS

(1) That Puerto Rican professionals be considered for top decision making positions with all the principal Federal Agencies in the Criminal Justice field, namely:

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Federal Board of Parole.

The Federal Judiciary.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of the U.S. Attorney General.

And . . . the subdivisions of Federal agencies, Departments and Commissions with a policing or law enforcement component.

(2) That the Federal Civil Rights Commission more actively pursue cases in which Puerto Ricans are being deprived of Due Process in Criminal Justice proceedings, incarceration or denial of probation and parole.

(3) That the Federal District Courts accelerate the handling of Civil Rights (class suits) in which Puerto Ricans are alleged to be victimized by the inadequacies of the Criminal Justice system at the local or state level.

(4) That the Federal government appropriate more money for juvenile and youth programs with special emphasis on:

(a) Anti-Crime prevention programs—youth clubs, houses, etc.

(b) Programs to humanize the process by which juvenile or youthful offenders are prosecuted or sentenced by the Family Court.

(5) That LEAA should enforce Federal Equal Employment Opportunity statutes in state, city or private agencies receiving Federal funds for crime prevention, crime control, corrections and law enforcement programs.

(6) That the LEAA review carefully all programs which receive Federal funds to insure that the interest of the Puerto Rican community is taken into account.

(7) That the LEAA review all funds drawn from block grants to insure that Puerto Rican organizations get their fair share.

(8) That the Federal government must insist that State Crime Planning Agencies, or similar boards at the municipal level, are adequately represented by Puerto Ricans especially if there is a high Puerto Rican population density in the state or municipality concerned.

(9) That the Federal courts and U.S. Attorney General's offices, and regional offices,

have more Spanish-speaking, and preferably Hispanic or Puerto Rican personnel, who can service the needs of the large number of Hispanics now being prosecuted in Federal courts.

(10) That the Federal Government must provide funds to train Hispanic criminal justice professionals—either by setting up its own school—or through grants to private institutions. These Hispanic employees will help provide a more equitable handling of the cases involving Hispanic defendants (or Hispanic victims) in all courts.

(11) That the LEAA should carefully monitor programs to insure that anti-crime community based programs which serve to protect the interests of the Puerto Rican community are not prematurely cut off when their effectiveness is still being evaluated.

(12) That the President—along with all Federal agencies and their department heads—should stop going to Puerto Rico for program input or prospective candidates for posts with Federal agencies when a valid resource of information and qualified professionals who can meet these requirements is now available on the mainland.

(13) That the Federal Government must remove its own prejudices against ex-offenders by eliminating whatever present Federal restrictions now exist (either in the law or in the operational philosophy of its agencies) which restricts the licensing or hiring of qualified ex-offenders.

(14) That the Federal Government pass legislation protecting the rights of ex-offenders, which would supersede state laws if it is proven that the civil rights and constitutional rights of ex-offenders are being denied by government.

(15) That the Federal Government remove restrictions in Civil Service regulations (at the Federal level) which tend to restrict Puerto Ricans from working in Criminal Justice agencies in specific job categories. This is especially true in cases where arbitrary and non-relevant job specifications now exist which have no relation to the actual performance of the job itself.

(16) That the Federal judiciary implement a viable bilingual court program which can be used as a model for other state supreme and criminal courts.

(17) That the Federal Courts speed up the handling of its own criminal case backlog affecting Puerto Rican and other Hispanic defendants throughout the country.

(18) That the Federal Government relocate Puerto Rican inmates to facilities closer to their homes, and that consideration be made regarding the construction of more community-based correctional facilities in large urban areas where Hispanics constitute a large population factor.

(19) That the LEAA insure that funds given to cities for crime prevention or law enforcement programs, or programs dealing with ex-offender rehabilitation, be not used if such programs would normally be financed by local tax levied funds.

**JUNE 2, 1946, A GREAT DAY IN
ITALIAN HISTORY**

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, June 2 marks a stirring event in the rich history of Italy. For on that day in 1946, the great Italian people gave a resound-

ing vote of confidence for political democracy.

The beautiful land of Italy, washed by the blue waves of the Mediterranean and cradled within the Alps, has boasted of an advanced civilization for thousands upon thousands of years. It may be truly said that Italy constitutes a mosaic of human history. She is a major source of Western culture—her legal system is a model for the West, her language is the tongue of music, and her Renaissance stands as one of man's greatest achievements. Yet throughout her glorious history, few more stirring events have occurred than the day, 31 years ago, when the Italian people chose a republican form of government.

Let us recall those early postwar years. In the devastation and destruction of World War II, Italy had suffered more heavily than most other Western nations. During the war, her civilian population had endured privations and suffering even more severe than the German citizens, and in addition, they had suffered more than two decades of oppressive Fascist rule.

In the immediate aftermath of war, the most urgent political problem facing Italy was the need to establish a framework for effective democratic government. The task was a difficult one because of the multiplicity of political parties and because of disagreement over whether the monarchy would be abandoned or retained.

In a nationwide referendum, held on June 2, 1946, the Italian people elected delegates to a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution. In the same referendum the Italians were called upon to decide whether to keep the monarchy or turn to a republic with a president. By a margin of 2 million votes the Italian people voted for a republican form of government, which was an outstanding victory for political democracy.

Eleven days after the referendum, King Umberto II left Italy. With the aid of the Marshall plan, the determined and ingenious Italian people launched upon a great period of economic, political, and social progress. In addition to outstanding postwar achievements on the domestic scene, Italy also placed herself in the vanguard of European integration. Moreover, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been and continues to be a stalwart and loyal Western ally.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we commemorate June 2, 1946, a proud day in Italian history, and, indeed, in the entire history of man's eternal striving for freedom. On this glad occasion, may I extend warmest best wishes to the people of that great Republic, and to our many friends of Italian descent in my own 11th District of Illinois, throughout the United States, and all over the world. May the people of Italy continue their important contributions to the culture of the West, to the vitality of democracy, and to democracy's precious ideals.

AMBASSADOR YOUNG AND THE WESTERN POSITION IN AFRICA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing amount of queasiness being expressed in the media about the performance of our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Andrew Young. Today, Washington Post editorialists attribute President Carter's unflinching support for Mr. Young to a presumed guilt complex.

Earlier this year, I presented to the Senate confirmation committee a network news clip in which Mr. Young was seen to state that he would probably favor the destruction of Western civilization, if he thought it would help the Third World. Since then, Mr. Young's behavior has made it clear that the attitude expressed then was highly relevant as a key to his motivations. However, the Young statement was totally ignored by the Senate committee and the media. Mr. Young was confirmed by a lopsided vote which does it little credit as a deliberative body.

The consequences of this particular folly are just beginning to descend upon us. I commend for consideration the columns of Patrick Buchanan of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 1, and Evans and Novak of the Washington Post, June 2, as they demonstrate the devastation wrought upon the Western position in Africa by the Communists and Ambassador Young.

"STABILITY AND ORDER" COMING TO ETHIOPIA (By Patrick J. Buchanan)

WASHINGTON.—At Notre Dame University on Sunday, May 22, President Carter outlined a "new American foreign policy" to fit the "new world" in which we live.

"... [W]e are now free of that inordinate fear of communism which once led us to embrace any dictator who joined in our fear," the President declared. The applause was thunderous.

On Wednesday of that same week, State Department spokesman Hodding Carter III warned that if the 50 Cuban advisers arriving in Ethiopia were the vanguard of several hundred troops, this could be a "serious development." Further, the U.S. was prepared to give "careful consideration" to the request of Sudanese dictator Gaafar al-Nimri for military assistance.

The "new American foreign policy" thus lasted about 72 hours. Our "fear of communism" had convinced State that we had to snuggle closer to a Sudanese dictator who "joined in our fear."

U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young, of course, quickly exercised his perennial option to contradict publicly stated U.S. policy. In London, where he had just insulted the British for their "colonial mentality," the Russians for being "the worst racists in the world" and the Swedes as "terrible racists" who treat blacks almost as badly as the folks in Queens County, N.Y., Andy was asked if he shared State's "grave concern." No, he said, "I really don't because they're killing people right and left [in Ethiopia] and ... maybe the Cubans might be a little more rational than Ethiopians at this point."

The long-suffering Hodding Carter de-

clared, for the 32nd time, that he saw no difference between what he said and what Young had said.

Well, at least Andy is consistent. Repeatedly, he has cautioned us not to get "paranoid" like, say, Kerensky did, over a "few thousand Communists." So why should he be worried about a few dozen or a few hundred Cuban Communists in Ethiopia? Perhaps the Cuban troops can bring to that embattled country some of the same "stability and order" Andy says they brought to Angola.

Seriously, the arrival of Cuban military advisers in Ethiopia—to train the locals in the use of their new Russian armor—is a refreshing, healthy development. Like a summer breeze, it has swept away much of the rhetorical smog hovering over this capital city about the moderation of the middle-aged "new Fidel."

The royalty of U.S. journalism and the big-name politicians, wine and dined in Havana, who came home with the inside scoop about Castro's impending withdrawal from Africa, have been snookered and humiliated. The congressmen pushing for trade concessions to wean that lifelong Yankee-hater away from his alliance with the Soviets are now left with large deposits of egg on their faces. Among the happiest of moments in politics is the sound of chickens coming home to roost.

The real danger to peace and security, however, does not come from a few hundred Cubans in Addis Ababa—or the asinities of Andy Young. It is, candidly, that Brezhnev will reread President Carter's Notre Dame speech and come to the not altogether illogical conclusion that Jimmy Carter is as woolly headed on world affairs as his vice president and U.N. ambassador. That could be as dangerous as Nikita Khrushchev's assessment—based on JFK's vacillating performance during the Bay of Pigs, the Vienna summit and the Berlin crisis—that the time has arrived for a direct challenge to the United States to show the world the wave of the future.

The drivel the President uttered at Notre Dame notwithstanding, we do not live in any "new world," but the same old world of the postwar struggle between East and West. That is what Angola and Ethiopia are all about.

Having watched the U.S. abandon, in humiliating fashion, allies in Cambodia and Vietnam, the Soviets put us to the test in Angola, using Cuban proxies. The United States backed away from that challenge.

At that point, even the most timid of Soviet strategists must have argued for the military probe into Zaire, for Soviet support for the guerrillas operating out of Angola and Mozambique, for Soviet-Cuban bolstering of client states on the African continent.

If the United States is indeed careening toward a future collision with the Russians, much of the blame must rest upon President Carter for misleading the Soviets with nonsense such as that uttered at South Bend.

COURTING AFRICA'S BLACKS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

New evidence of how far and quickly U.S. policy in southern Africa has changed came in Vienna last month when Prime Minister John Vorster of South Africa got nowhere in an unpublicized request that Washington discourage black guerrilla activity in white-ruled Rhodesia.

According to authoritative U.S. sources, Vorster asked Vice President Mondale if the United States would "lean toward restraining" Zambia in sponsoring guerrilla raids into Rhodesia. He was turned down. Yet the United States has raised the devil with Rhodesia for launching cross-border raids.

This ought to shatter any illusions remaining in Pretoria or Washington that the Carter administration intends to take an even-handed position on racial conflict in southern Africa. The new position adamantly favors strict black-majority rule everywhere on the continent, by peaceful means if possible but through violence if necessary.

This entails moral support by the U.S. government for black guerrillas in Rhodesia, the most effective of them avowing Marxism and using an increasing supply of Soviet arms. The theory is that pro-Moscow Marxists can be won over to friendship with the United States. So, while Washington is even less color-blind than it used to be, it is now blind to ideology.

All this demolishes talk that the selection of Mondale to conduct the Vienna talks meant defeat for U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young and his policies. In truth, Mondale went to Vienna relying on Young's aides and like-minded National Security Council staffers rather than old-line Foreign Service officers. The State Department's African affairs bureau and Assistant Secretary William E. Schauffele have not really been in the policy-making picture since January.

While the South African government may not have thought Mondale any more friendly than Young, it did envision the Vice President as prepared to negotiate with Vorster. But Mondale did not deviate an inch from prepared positions; he carefully checked with his staff, or back to Washington if necessary, before responding to Vorster.

Consequently, there was never any chance for Vorster's appeal that the U.S. attempt to restrain Zambia's support for Rhodesian guerrillas. Some U.S. officials think Vorster was asking that as a condition for applying South African pressure on Rhodesia. But senior U.S. officials believe the South African was not bargaining and would not pressure the Rhodesians.

In any event, Mondale made no promise of restraint on Zambia. "We can't do it," a U.S. official explained. "It is not U.S. policy to turn off the armed struggle." One policymaker put it this way: "We recognize it is very difficult to tell these people to stop fighting."

But "these people" do not include the white Rhodesians. Although Washington does not maintain diplomatic relations with Salisbury, it has issued vigorous protests to Rhodesian officials in South Africa about raids aimed at black guerrilla bases across the border.

While clearly taking sides in Rhodesia, the United States keeps hand off the continuing civil war in Angola between the Marxist government (not even recognized by Washington) and anti-government guerrillas. The fact that Congress prevented significant U.S. help for the government in neighboring Zaire against insurgents invading from Angola is now considered providential by the administration.

The new policy thus becomes clear: support for black armed efforts to dislodge the last white minority footholds in southern Africa, and non-involvement in battles between blacks anywhere on the continent. This results in U.S. support for black Communists against white non-Communists (as in Rhodesia) instead of insistence on peaceful settlement, and neutrality in struggles between black Communists and black non-Communists (as in Angola).

The doctrinal authority cited for this policy is President Carter's declaration at Notre Dame May 23 that "we are now free of that inordinate fear of communism which once led us to embrace any dictator who joined us in our fear." Therefore, in the case of Angola, this means the enemy of our enemy is no longer our friend. But this also entails

hope that victorious armed Marxists in Africa can be induced to turn away from Moscow, as revisionists have always claimed that Ho Chi Minh and Fidel Castro would have done had they been given half a chance.

This portentous shift in policy deserves more public debate than it has been given. Certainly Young is not a loose cannon, as was widely thought a few weeks ago. Rather, his January statement over television that he feared racism much more than communism has been elevated into U.S. strategy.

NO SINGLE MEASURE CAN MEET ALL REQUIREMENTS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been concerned with the inaccuracies of the unemployment statistics announced each month.

Recent studies have shown that these unemployment statistics are not fully accurate, and may have caused many communities with chronic high unemployment and underemployment to be shortchanged of the greater than \$30 billion in Federal formulas allocated each year on the basis of unemployment statistics.

I would like to insert an article which appeared in the Washington Star on May 25, by Lee M. Cohn, which does an excellent job of discussing these problems with Bureau of Labor Statistics Commissioner, Julius Shiskin. I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to read this illuminating piece.

The text of the article follows:

COUNTING THE JOBLESS: EVERYBODY'S GOT A SYSTEM

(By Lee M. Cohn)

People expect Julius Shiskin, commissioner of labor statistics, to tell them how many Americans are employed and how many are unemployed. When he tries his best to respond, they argue with him.

There are no simple answers, and no formula can precisely fit everyone's ideas about how to define and measure employment and unemployment, Shiskin says in self-defense. Consider these cases:

Bill Jones works 40 hours a week and earns \$240. Jack Smith averages only five hours weekly at odd jobs paying about \$2 an hour, and his family barely scrapes by on welfare.

The computers at Shiskin's Bureau of Labor Statistics see no difference. Jones and Smith count equally in the official estimate of 90 million employed Americans in April.

Mary Jackson, a widow supporting three children, was laid off three months ago and still is job hunting. Susan Whitaker, wife of a \$50,000-a-year executive, is bored with civic committees and wants to feel independent, so she is looking for paid work. Her son, Tim, has registered with his college employment bureau for a Saturday job to earn money to buy gas for his car.

BLS includes all three among the 6.7 million unemployed, without distinction.

Jim Dawson, a bachelor with simple needs, applied for an assembly-line job at a local factory four weeks ago and was offered a job as janitor, which he turned down. He has been taking life easy since then. Joe Jenkins

looked for work unsuccessfully for more than two months and still would like a job, but he is so discouraged that he has quit looking.

Dawson is listed as unemployed. Jenkins, by dropping out, has reduced total unemployment by one. He is classified as neither employed nor unemployed.

No one is satisfied with these results, which in some cases seem to defy common sense. Policy-makers depend on BLS figures for guidance, and fluctuations of the statistics can decide elections. If the numbers are wrong, economic policies can go astray and voters can be misled.

Conservatives object that the official statistics exaggerate the severity of joblessness and lead the government to spend too much money to boost the economy, while liberals contend that unemployment is even worse than the figures show, so the government should do more to create jobs.

Grilling Shiskin at a House Budget Committee hearing, Rep. Delbert L. Latta, R-Ohio, demanded that BLS shine a stronger spotlight on rising employment than on unemployment. "Emphasize the positive," Latta urged. "I mean in the first part, have that catch the reporter's eye. They don't like to read more than that first paragraph sometimes, they are in such a hurry."

Latta also objected to counting auto workers who receive generous unemployment benefits as jobless. Some of them in Ohio "were getting about — percent of their pay for going to Florida and they weren't in too much of a hurry to get back in the winter time to go to work," he said.

Congress has ordered the establishment of a National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics to conduct an 18-month study of how to improve the data. Shiskin pushed for creation of the commission, but he wonders whether it will recommend big changes after considering the complications and pitfalls.

A similar blue-ribbon committee in 1962 ratified the basic ground rules in use then and now. Indeed, the fundamental concepts have not changed much since systematic measurement of employment and unemployment was started by the Works Progress Administration in 1940, near the end of the Great Depression.

"The subject is so complex that no single measure can meet all requirements," Shiskin says. "Maybe we need three to provide a reasonably complete picture. But try putting that in a headline. Everybody wants a single number to represent the unemployment rate."

BLS monthly and quarterly reports provide considerable detail in addition to the aggregate figures. The tables break out data according to sex, age, race, occupation and marital status, for example. There also are breakdowns between full-time and part-time employment. But the single figure on the national unemployment rate still attracts most of the attention and criticism.

Offering the critics a wide selection to satisfy their divergent needs, Shiskin now regularly publishes seven distinct unemployment rates reflecting different concepts of joblessness. He calls them U1 through U7.

In April, the official unemployment rate (U3) was 7 percent. U1 was only 1.9 percent, and the other rates ranged up to 8.6 percent for U6. U7 is available only quarterly. It was 9.9 percent in the January-March quarter, when the official rate averaged 7.4 percent.

U5 is designed to measure the tightness or looseness of the labor market as objectively as possible. It classifies all civilians outside institutions who are 16 or older in one of three slots—employed, unemployed or outside the labor force.

The Census Bureau, under contract to the BLS, obtains the data through a monthly survey of a 55,000-household sample. The

survey is conducted during the week including the 19th of the month, and the questions pertain to what members of the households were doing during the week including the 12th.

Any civilian who worked for pay, even for one hour in the week, or who was self-employed, is counted as employed. Also counted as employed are those who worked 15 hours or more in the week without pay in a business or on a farm operated by family members. Those who have jobs but are temporarily absent because of illness, vacations, bad weather or strikes also are considered employed.

Housework, painting and repair work around one's own home do not count as employment, and neither does unpaid volunteer work for religious and charitable organizations.

Persons without jobs during the survey week may or may not count as unemployed. They are officially unemployed only if they are available for work and have engaged in specific job-seeking activity some time during the preceding four weeks. Qualifying kinds of activity include registering at employment offices, placing or answering advertisements, meeting with prospective employers, sending application letters and checking with friends or relatives.

Even without job-hunting activity, a person is considered unemployed while waiting to start a new job within 30 days, or while waiting to be recalled from temporary layoff.

The civilian labor force is the total of employed and unemployed workers. The unemployment rate is the percentage of the labor force classified as unemployed.

Everyone else 16 or older is outside the labor force. That includes those who do not want jobs, and those who say they would like to work but are not looking for personal reasons or because they do not believe they could get jobs.

These definitions are attacked from the right and the left.

Many conservatives contend that it makes no sense to count among the unemployed those who quit jobs, refuse job offers, never worked before, attend school full-time, or have spouses who earn good wages. They also demand more than a perfunctory job-seeking effort once in four weeks as evidence of a real desire to work.

Whether they realize it or not, those who make this argument want to measure unemployment in terms of hardship. Shiskin offers them U1, the unemployment rate as the percentage of the labor force that has been jobless 15 weeks or longer, which is hardship by any standard. U1 was 1.9 percent last month.

U2, a somewhat broader measure of hardship, is the percentage of the labor force that has lost jobs through layoffs, firings or plant closings. It excludes those who quit jobs voluntarily, and those who are looking for jobs for the first time or are returning to the labor force after dropping out. U2 was 3.1 percent in April.

U3, which registered 4.4 percent last month, is the percentage of heads of households who are unemployed. The presumption is that unemployment is most serious when it hits breadwinners, and less of a hardship for dependents of workers who have jobs.

U4, at 6.5 percent in April, is the unemployment rate of those who want full-time jobs. Full-time workers are the core of the labor force and lose the most income when unemployed, while part-time workers usually are marginal, according to this reasoning.

The conservative emphasis on hardship aims at reducing the size of the unemployment problem. By contrast, labor leaders and many liberals contend that the official figures understate joblessness. They argue that part-time jobs should not count as much as full-time jobs in the employment

figures, and that workers who want jobs but quit looking because they believe no work is available should count as unemployed.

U6 makes adjustments for part-time work, producing an 8.6 percent unemployment rate in April, U7, which takes account of both part-time jobs and "discouraged" workers, is calculated only quarterly by BLS. It registered 9.9 percent in the January-March quarter.

The AFL-CIO issues its adaptation of U7 every month, within hours after BLS announces the official figures, and contends it is the "true" measure of unemployment. It was 9.6 percent in April.

Shisken and other experts see legitimate uses for all these unemployment barometers, if users are aware of what they are measuring.

U5 gives the clearest reading of the labor market, indicating how easy or difficult it is for workers to find jobs and for employers to hire workers. This information is essential in assessing potential inflationary pressures and judging the need for broad fiscal and monetary actions to stimulate or restrain the economy.

It is relatively objective, minimizing value judgments on hardships and relying on what people do to find jobs instead of trying to probe their attitudes.

U1 through U4 attempt to measure hardship, which is an important element of unemployment. But hardship does not necessarily indicate whether credit should be eased or tightened, or whether federal budget policy should aim for a deficit or a surplus.

If a lot of jobs are available, workers will apply for them and production will increase whether or not the workers are needy. If a worker is laid off, production will drop, even if the worker has ample savings and his wife continues to bring home pay checks.

U6 and U7 look beyond existing conditions in the labor market and try to measure the potential labor supply—how many additional workers could be hired if demand grew strongly. This can help measure the gap between actual and potential production.

But it is difficult to measure a jobless worker's desire for a job if he does not take overt action to find one. He may be willing to work only in a glamorous job, or at double the wage employers think he is worth.

Informed sources report that President Carter soon will nominate Sar A. Levitan, a leading manpower and welfare expert, as chairman of the new commission to study employment and unemployment statistics. Among other expected nominees for membership are Rudy Oswald, research director of the AFL-CIO, Jack Carlson, chief economist of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Michael H. Moskow, undersecretary of labor in the Ford administration.

Levitan, director of the Center for Social Policy Studies at George Washington University, can be counted on to stir up controversy in pushing for changes in the statistics.

He says the current formulas were adequate in the depression, "when you worked or you starved," so the unemployment rate was a good measure of hardship. But now, he says, much more "sophisticated" barometers are needed to measure hardship and "underemployment."

For example, he says, an unemployed wife whose husband still has a job is a lot better off than a full-time laborer struggling to support his family on earnings below the poverty line.

Despite the highest unemployment rates since the depression in the 1974-75 recession, "there was surprisingly little public clamor over this slump—no riots, no large-scale marches on Washington, not even much rhetoric," Levitan observes.

One explanation is that unemployment compensation benefits and other government programs helped to cushion the loss of in-

come, and many laid-off workers were secondary earners in families with breadwinners who continued working, he says.

"While headlines focused on the rise in unemployment, the increase in deprivation due to low earnings was much less and this may explain the limited social unrest generated by the economic downturn," he says. "The corollary, of course, is that when unemployment recedes it should not be assumed that the real problems have been eliminated."

Since the conventional unemployment statistics "are no longer valid measures of economic and social health," Levitan has devised an experimental "Employment and Earning Inadequacy" index. This EEI index comes closer to measuring the real effects of unemployment because it takes account of family earnings and income as well as jobs, he says.

Levitan's complex formula adds "discouraged" workers and workers with earnings below the poverty level to the official total of unemployed, and subtracts full time students between the ages of 16 and 21 and persons over the age of 65. * * *

INDIANA SADDENED BY DEATH OF "ELDY" LUNDQUIST

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, the residents of the State of Indiana, particularly those of Elkhart County, have been personally saddened by the untimely passing of Eldon F. "Eldy" Lundquist, one of our State's most selfless, effective, and personable civic and public servants for the past four decades.

His long list of achievements, dedication to his fellowman, and concern for the betterment and improvement of mankind and community will long be remembered by the Hoosiers of Indiana and his many friends across the breadth of this Nation.

Eldon F. Lundquist was born on July 16, 1915, in Elkhart County where he remained a life resident. A basketball stalwart at Elkhart High School, he later graduated from Goshen College.

In spite of his many accomplishments and talents, Eldon was best known in Elkhart County for his football and basketball play-by-play coverage on radio station WTRC from 1939 to 1968. He became the personal friend and voice for the young athletes and their parents.

In addition to broadcasting, Eldon pursued careers in the fields of banking, advertising, and health care.

Eldon was noted for his dedication to the field of education where his achievements were innumerable. In 1955, he was elected to the Elkhart School board. Following his election to the Indiana House of Representatives in 1961, he was appointed chairman of its Education Committee. In 1961, he was also appointed secretary of the Post Secondary School Education Study Committee. In 1963, Gov. Matthew E. Welsh appointed Eldon to the board of trustees of the Indiana Vocational Technical College where he later was offered the opportunity to become that institution's first president. He

refused that opportunity, as he did many later opportunities to become the president of various educational institutions, in order that he could remain with his first love beyond his family—Elkhart County. Education was obviously a close second—but always second.

After his election to the Indiana State Senate in 1964, Eldon was appointed chairman of the Senate Education Committee. He was also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Vocational Education. In 1975, he steered landmark vocational education legislation through the Indiana General Assembly.

A complete legislator in all fields, Eldon was appointed chairman of the Constitutional Revision Committee in 1968. In addition, his fellow legislators elected him to the position of assistant majority floor leader in 1969.

Eldon Lundquist's career as a State legislator covered 16 years. In February 1976, to the disappointment of his constituents and all of Indiana, Eldon announced his retirement from public office. He announced that:

The people of Elkhart County have been wonderful in their support of me over the years. I realize I cannot totally repay their generous acceptance of me, but I hope that in some small way, my efforts to serve them have indicated my great regard for them and my gratitude to them.

Yes, Eldon F. Lundquist was a civic-minded Elkhart citizen and a no-nonsense legislator. His honesty and integrity were beyond reproach. Eldon was respected by Democrats and Republicans alike. Eldon did not like long, pompous speeches, but he loved people and people loved him.

Besides his illustrious career as a broadcaster, State legislator and educator, Eldon was a member of the Elkhart Park and Recreation Board, Chamber of Commerce, Industrial Development Commission, Elks Club, Moose Club, Rotary Club, Elcona Club, and the Trinity United Methodist Church.

The late Eldon F. Lundquist, who lived to be 61 years of age, is survived by Helen, his wife of 38 years, who resides at 227 Marine Avenue in Elkhart; his mother, Nellie; his son, John; and his daughter, Jean.

Mr. Speaker, while Eldon and I were not of the same political persuasion, I deeply respected and admired his rational, acute, and sensitive approach to the solution of problems of our times. While Eldon dissuaded long and tedious oratory, he was undoubtedly the most effective and articulate speaker I have ever known. He was a "healer," and a "doer," and a man of great charm, love, and wit. More important to me, he was my friend.

I, like all Hoosiers, regret the untimely loss of Eldon who was serving as assistant president of Indiana University at the time of his passing. Eldon was an inspiration, a fighter, and a man who many of us attempted to emulate but could never equal.

It was my honor to share many legislative battles with him, as supporter at times, opponent on occasions. Besides his many legislative accomplishments in education and government reform, he will also be remembered for his

outstanding contribution to the adoption of the first omnibus medical malpractice act in the Nation. While we now mourn his passing, he passed through this life leaving all of us better persons for having been able to share some of his life. I know that our mutual friend, Congressman JOHN BRADENAS, and all of our colleagues join together to extend our sympathies to Eldon's family and the State of Indiana on their loss of a truly remarkable and great American who gave much more to the dynamics of civilization than he ever received in distinction or achievement in spite of his numerous honors. Eldon F. Lundquist will never be forgotten and his deeds will live on to improve and ameliorate the conditions of future generations as they have for this one.

PROPOSED AGENCY NOT NEEDED

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, a column in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, May 26, calls attention to what might be termed the perpetuation of compounded failure of government which would occur if Congress approves the proposed Consumer Protection Agency. The author's logic speaks for itself and therefore the column by Mr. James G. Reynolds is inserted at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 26, 1977]

PROPOSED AGENCY NOT NEEDED TO PROTECT CONSUMERS

(By James G. Reynolds)

Arguments against a Consumer Protection Agency have largely centered on the practical problems of implementation, i.e., how the agency would determine who is the consumer and how is he to be protected. These arguments are all well and good, but they miss the larger and more fundamental reason why Americans should oppose creation of this agency.

The express purpose of the proposed law, as announced by its sponsors, is to establish a federal agency to represent the interests of the consumer in federal agency proceedings. If the purpose is sound (it rings bells of Catch-22 to me), then the malaise is the failure of federal agencies to perform their legal and constitutional mandates.

In general, each federal agency was created for the express purpose of assuring that transactions which were to be the subject of such agency's power be conducted in the public interest to promote the greatest public justice in an area that might otherwise be subject to abuse if left in unfettered private hands.

This purpose is necessary to justify the birth of a government agency and to support its continued existence at the taxpayers' expense.

Taxpayers and consumers are identical. Tax-paying citizens are the same people who buy goods from businesses regulated by the FTC. What purchaser of securities is not already supposed to be represented by the mandate of the SEC? Is there a consumer of foods and drugs who is not now paying taxes to support a huge FDA staff whose legal duty is to regulate foods and drugs in his interest?

The FPC and the FCC are there to assure that utilities and broadcasters provide full, fair and efficient service under monopolistic conditions. For whose benefit? Consumers. Taxpayers. You and me.

From a tactical point of view it may seem logical to establish a federal agency to represent the consumer in federal agency proceedings. But philosophically, it's wrong. Maybe the agencies aren't doing their jobs. Perhaps they are influenced too much by special interests, and another system is required to channel the special interest of the consumer.

But why are taxpayers being told they need to pay for another agency just because the ones they are already paying for are not fulfilling their legal mandates, their constitutional purposes?

I suggest the people be told that another layer of government is required because the bureaucratic layer is out of control. The people should be told that our administration and our Congress do not know how to solve this problem from within the agencies. We don't know how to constitute our agencies so that they will perform their legal mandates.

The people should be advised that the purpose of this proposed agency is conceptually different from the normal management control functions of auditing and review necessary to assure continued performance by people we believe to be doing a good job right along. The purpose of the new agency is to cause (force) the responsible agency officials to do the job they are already supposed to be doing. The bill approved by the House Government Operations Committee would permit this proposed agency to sue other federal agencies.

It is inconceivable that a private organization would seek to solve a problem in one department by hiring a separate staff to force that department's employees to do their jobs properly. If a breakdown in performance were perceived to be complex or widespread, management might commission an outside group to study the situation.

And suppose this hypothetical outside group were to report that the purchasing department was overly influenced by suppliers bearing Super Bowl tickets, that the finance department was being swayed by bankers bearing low-interest personal loans, that production and engineering staffs were beset by equipment dealers offering free color TVs on the side?

No organization in possession of even half its senses would conceive of solving such a problem by hiring another permanent staff with authority to advocate the interests of the organization and force the responsible employees to do their jobs properly.

The responsible employees in purchasing, for example, know their job is to obtain high quality goods and services at the lowest cost, and to ignore suppliers bearing gifts. If a private organization were to pay people for not performing their jobs and also pay another group to force them to do their jobs, the inevitable result would be the deterioration and eventual ruin of the organization. Maintaining the organization would become too costly, and maintaining employee attitudes and spirit so necessary to continuing vitality would be impossible in light of management's acquiescence to large-scale non-performance.

Federal agencies are no different. Responsible agency employees know their jobs and their duties. The administration and the Congress, through existing offices and monitoring committees, should force the agencies to perform their duties in the first instance through proper budgeting, auditing, performance standards review and by firing people who are not doing their jobs properly.

Or have the federal agencies become so large, cumbersome and otherwise entrenched that we have several very expensive, uncontrollable monsters on our hands? Are matters so irreversible that what we really need for

effective control is a regulatory advocacy agency to regulate the regulators? And in due time, who regulates the regulatory advocacy agency?

The Consumer Protection Agency is wrong, not so much for what it would try to do, but because it admits to an incurable state of affairs within our government. We cannot as a nation afford to support a government that cannot control itself.

"INSTANT" VOTER REGISTRATION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal for "instant" voter registration is now working its way through the House and, I understand, is scheduled to come to the floor sometime later in June. I strongly oppose this ill-conceived and politically motivated legislation, as you well know.

At this point I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article which appeared in the Ventura County Star Free Press, which expresses the apprehension of the Ventura County Clerk-Recorder Robert L. Hamm concerning the "instant" voter registration bill and its probable impact on the county. I insert the article at this point:

[From the Ventura County (Calif.) Star Free Press, May 22, 1977]

HAMM WARNS OF HIGH COST OF CARTER REGISTRATION PLAN

By Carol Bidwell

President Jimmy Carter's proposal to let voters register through election day may increase the turnout 10 to 20 per cent, but it would be sure to cost local government a lot of extra money, says Ventura County Clerk-Recorder Robert L. Hamm.

He is clearly skeptical that the extra turnout would be worth the trouble.

These days Hamm is trying to estimate exactly how much the proposed change in voter registration could cost the county so county supervisors and budgeters will know how much to set aside for future elections if Congress approves Carter's proposal.

Hamm said he will go before supervisors with a detailed report within two weeks. That report, he said, will include "a recommendation that the board take some strong action" to press Congress to finance 100 per cent of the costs of the new system, rather than shoving the costs off onto local agencies.

The future of the election-day registration proposal is somewhat in doubt, with different versions slowly progressing through the Senate and the House of Representatives, but Democrats—who claim a historical advantage when more people go to the polls—seem bent on pushing some form of the legislation through in the current session of Congress, say political observers.

Thursday, however, the House postponed action on Carter's bill until June. Some Democratic congressmen told Carter the measure faces stiff opposition.

How well such a new system would work—and how much it would cost—would depend largely not on voters or election officials, but on lawyers and state and federal government officials who would interpret the new law and set up guidelines for local agencies and election officials to follow.

Hamm and some congressional leaders have forecast "a great potential for fraud" unless strict controls were laid down for election-

day registrants to identify themselves, making sure a person didn't vote more than once simply by visiting another polling place and giving a name and address different from his own.

Carter's proposal doesn't specify what sort of identification would be required at the polls, but Hamm said two forms of identification should be required: Personal identification with a physical description and a photo on it, such as a driver's license, and residence identification, such as a recent rent or utility bill receipt.

Hamm wants it made clear that the proposed new system would not do away with pre-registration, which would still be encouraged. And, he said, special care would have to be taken so a long line of people waiting at the polls to register on election day didn't discourage a pre-registered voter who didn't want to wait in line behind "a lot of jugheads" who waited until the last minute.

On election day, Hamm said, election workers would have to provide two lines, one for pre-registered voters and one for election-day registrants, for whom the process would take longer.

"The purpose of this legislation is to turn people on to voting," Hamm said. "We don't want to do anything on election day to turn them off."

There's a potential for local agencies to receive as much as 60 cents from the federal government or each voter who casts ballots at the last state, local and federal elections to go toward defraying the cost of the new system.

By its voting history, Ventura County could receive as much as \$102,000 to help pay for the changeover. But Hamm said that's only a drop in the bucket compared to what he expects it to cost the county.

What would boost those costs?

Provisions in the two versions of the new legislation and in proposed follow-up legislation, he said, would require that sample ballot materials, candidates' statements and other voter information be mailed to every home in the county. Later, each resident would receive a notice of the location of his polling place—in case the person decided to vote.

Each polling place would have to be provided with not only its own precinct list, but with the lists of voters in five surrounding precincts so election workers could tell somebody who showed up at the wrong place where the right place is for them to vote, Hamm said.

Carter's proposal does not apply to party primaries, but a law bringing primaries under the same election-day registration blanket has already been proposed. If that happens, Hamm predicted it would be nearly impossible to know how many ballots the county would have to print for Democrats, Republicans, Peace and Freedom and American Independent parties' voters.

He predicted that besides being expensive, the change would be "bad for the parties," who rely on knowing well in advance how many voters they can count on on election day.

There are many more questions and problems involving who's qualified to vote and who's not, so more "roving" elections inspectors would have to be hired to smooth out these situations, he said.

"We're talking about nothing but money," Hamm said.

Does he think the aim of the new system—to bring many more indifferent voters out of their homes on election day—would be met?

"It's not likely"

Few voters bother to cast ballots now—only 53.3 per cent of those registered in the county voted in the 1976 presidential election—"because those of us in government

have made them mad. It's my sincere belief that government has lost rapport with the taxpaying voters," Hamm says.

He blamed increasing government costs, increasing taxes and generally unresponsive government for the turnout.

"When was the last time we asked the electorate what we could do for them?" Hamm asked. "We say, 'The public is demanding more service.' I don't see the public demanding anything, except lower taxes . . . Some have said this (change in voter registration) is because the public is demanding it. The public didn't demand it. It's Jimmy Carter's idea."

How many more voters are likely to show up at the polls on election day, knowing that they can register and vote at the same time?

"At best, a 20 per cent increase . . . probably closer to 10 per cent," Hamm said. "It appears to me that we will pay half as much again per voter for a 10 to 20 per cent increase in voters on election day . . . We have to ask, how much is this going to cost us and how much are we going to get from it—and is it worth it?"

PROPOSED NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION QUESTIONED

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1977

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, President Carter's proposed energy plan appropriately takes full cognizance of the need to make a major reappraisal of our Nation's energy needs. The President correctly says Americans waste too much fuel and must conserve.

There are, however, serious questions which should be raised about several provisions in the proposed legislation, especially those related to natural gas pricing. A very astute analysis of those pricing measures were recently provided in testimony from the director of the Energy Action Committee before the House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, chaired by my friend and colleague, JOHN D. DINGELL.

I believe the comments of Mr. James F. Flug deserve the close attention of all my colleagues in Congress. Therefore the testimony about the natural gas pricing measures follow:

TESTIMONY OF JAMES F. FLUG, DIRECTOR AND COUNSEL, ENERGY ACTION COMMITTEE, ON THE NATURAL GAS PRICING PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL ENERGY ACT

Mr. Chairman: Deregulation by any other name smells just as bad, and I submit that the natural gas pricing provisions of the "National Energy Act" are the moral equivalent of deregulation.

From his January, 1976 statement in support of "legal restrictions to allow a 'reasonable profit' on oil and natural gas", to his January, 1977 assurance of a "prohibition against excessive or windfall profits from energy costs at the expense of the consumer", to his April 18 promise that "no one will gain an unfair advantage" or "profiteer" from his Energy Plan, and right up to his April 20 admission that fuel price decontrol "would be disastrous for our economy and for working Americans, and would not solve long range problems of dwindling supplies", Jimmy Carter gave the American people hope that whatever he did on natural gas prices,

the result would be fair and equitable, spreading burdens and sacrifices evenly throughout society.

Unfortunately the reality has not matched the rhetoric. The proposal to set the price of natural gas at the "equivalent energy value" of U.S. crude oil, beginning at \$1.75 per thousand cubic feet, is a betrayal of the public interest and a multi-billion dollar boon to the oil and gas industry. It is precisely what President Carter's "Energy Plan" said he wanted to avoid: "an inequitable transfer of income from the American people to the producers, whose profits would be excessive and would bear little relation to actual economic conditions".

Perhaps we have become so numb that \$1.75 for a thousand or anything doesn't sound like much. But \$1.75 for a thousand cubic feet of gas is a huge amount. It is:

Ten times what producers were getting for gas a decade ago; 6½ times the 26¢ price agreed to by producers in 1970 as an "incentive" price to bring forth "additional supplies" and "meet the demands" of consumers; almost 3½ times the last court-approved "just and reasonable" rate of 52¢; almost 3 times the 60¢ range which the FPC staff has said would produce ample returns and incentives; well above the levels in recent years of the uncontrolled (President Carter properly called them "exorbitant") intrastate gas prices; and about 25% over the \$1.42 price through which the Nixon-Ford FPC attempted to deregulate administratively, a price which the courts are likely to overturn as unsupported under the "just and reasonable" standard.

Let me focus for a minute on the \$1.42 price, because the "Energy Plan," and most of the media, treats it as some sort of credible base case against which future developments can be measured. In fact, however, that price merely represents the personal opinion of three men:

Appointed by Presidents committed to giving the industry unlimited profits;

Themselves opposed to the process of price controls they were responsible for enforcing; and

With backgrounds and political sponsorship reflective of the oil and gas producers' viewpoint.

For policy purposes, you and we are just as entitled to accept as a base case, the opinion of the experts in the FPC Office of Economics which recommended a 56¢ price, or the 61¢ price found adequate by the FPC Bureau of Natural Gas, or the view of the dissenting Commissioner, who found the \$1.42 price "excessive" and unsupported:

We are certainly entitled to exclude from our own calculations the 40¢ of income tax, calculated at the highest rates which the FPC assumed—without evidence and despite history to the contrary—that the producers would pay.

We are certainly entitled not to accept calculations based on industry production, cost, and reserves figures that have repeatedly proved unreliable and that appear on their face to reflect political and legal circumstances rather than physical facts.

And we are certainly entitled to look at cost figures developed by other impartial observers, like the recent Oklahoma study which spoke of actual costs of producing gas in 1976 in the range of 35¢, 44½¢, and 60¢ (the latter allegedly up from 17¢ in 1973).

The fact is that the nation has been operating under an irrational regulatory scheme for natural gas, with two fatal flaws:

1. The combination of an uncontrolled intrastate market and a controlled national market for the same product has unavoidably led to minimal production for the controlled market and maximum production for the uncontrolled market. This factor alone is responsible for a major portion of the sup-

ply problems in non-producing states, as this committee is well aware;

2. The expectation—and fact—of continued sharp rises in regulated price, and the expectation—and hope—of eventual deregulation, has made withholding gas more profitable than selling gas.

To remedy the first flaw we have to bring the interstate and intrastate prices together. We can do so either by bringing the national prices up to the uncontrolled levels of the intrastate market, giving all production the benefit of the fantastic windfalls which intrastate producers have been receiving for the past few years, or we can bring the "exorbitant" intrastate price down to a "just and reasonable" national level.

The proposal before you clearly reflects the industry's approach of raising the regulated interstate price to the unregulated intrastate levels, something this Committee and this House have protected the American people from in the past. Anyone who has any doubt that this proposal takes the deregulation route need only look at the FPC's own statistics on intrastate prices. The weighted average of new intrastate contract sales of producers reporting to the FPC has never reached the \$1.75 level until the crisis winter of '76-'77, and even then many sales and contract renegotiations, in many places, were at much lower prices, including prices under \$1.

The fact that the highest price for intrastate gas sales in Oklahoma as of January was \$1.68, and the fact that New Mexico recently set \$1.44 as the state-imposed cap on its local sales of local gas gives additional evidence that the \$1.75 price is truly a deregulated price.

Moreover, as this Committee well knows, the reported intrastate prices are themselves artificially inflated not only by the aberrational spot-type emergency sales, but also by what the FPC euphemistically calls "sales between affiliated companies," or what most of us would call phony pricing or price fixing. You have had evidence of this phenomenon in the past, and now there is a brand new, startling set of disclosures in the Oklahoma legislative investigation of gas pricing in that state. I hope each of you will read it so that you can judge for yourself its objectivity and dispassionate approach. But I will say that if a \$1.68 price can only be reached by that kind of self-dealing, connivance, and flim-flam, then the nation has no business whatsoever one-upping the price fixers by imposing a national price level of \$1.75.

It's hard to think of anything worse than the \$1.75 price itself, but the means of calculating that price, and determining its future course is worse. Tying the gas price to the price of U.S. crude oil immediately, of course, builds into the gas price a heavy dose of the OPEC oil windfall which is already well reflected in the price of U.S. crude. But if the oil pricing system suggested by President Carter is adopted, then the oil price on which the gas is based must move upward much faster than inflation, and thus so will the price of natural gas. That is, while each of the three tiers of oil will ultimately be limited to price rises equal to the annual inflation rate, in the next three years "new" oil will move up faster than that as it rises to world price levels, and the proportion of "new" oil in the U.S. mix will also rise each year, so that the overall U.S. crude price, and

with it the gas price, will keep rising sharply, and much faster than the general inflation rate.

Thus instead of removing the second major flaw in the current system, the incentive to withhold in anticipation of rapidly rising future prices, the current proposal would build in that expectation and thus assure future withholding and continuing supply problems. In other words, while the price level in any one year would be wildly beyond the most generous notions of "incentive" prices, the predictability of even higher prices in coming years would provide a disincentive to current production and a strong economic justification for placing available reserves in inventory.

Of course the whole notion that the oil and gas industry needs additional "incentives" to produce is a joke. We know that we don't know the whole story about oil and gas costs and profits, because the industry has been notoriously unwilling to share its data with either the government or the public, despite its continuous pleas for every kind of help based on assertions about that data. But we know enough to know that the industry has done very well under the recent pricing arrangements.

The top oil and gas companies increased their profits by over 100% from 1972, the last pre-embargo year to 1975.

Mobil alone increased its profits on U.S. energy operations from \$171 million in 1975, to \$430 million in 1976, and after spending about a billion dollars on Montgomery Ward and Container Corp., is now offering a third of a billion for the Irvine Ranch.

Standard Oil of California increased U.S. earnings from \$240 million in 1975 to \$461 million in 1976.

Exxon admits to a 25% return on capital in 1975 and a 20% return in 1976 for U.S. exploration and production operations, and showed an increase in U.S. oil and gas earnings of \$38 million despite a decrease in production of both gas and oil.

Similarly, Phillips Petroleum showed a \$350 million increase in revenues, and a \$60 million rise in earnings on U.S. oil and gas operations despite a reduction in U.S. oil and gas production.

And I submit for your enjoyment and the record the cover of this year's Tenneco Offshore Company Inc. Annual Report which can only be described as an open celebration of the FPC's recent gift to the industry.

In fact what Mobil's Annual Report describes modestly as "some improvement in natural gas prices", has already produced such a windfall to the companies that it is entirely likely that their cutbacks in production reflect a fear that level or rising production rates at the rapidly increasing prices of the last 10 years would have shown such a gross excess of profits, even by oil industry standards, as to bring not only horizontal and vertical divestiture, but also a sharp rise in the already strong public sentiment in favor of still more severe government action.

Because we know that we do not know all the facts, we cannot accept industry claims about "hardships", "insufficient capital", and "inadequate incentives", especially when the known facts are to the contrary. President Carter has called for a detailed Petroleum Industry Reporting System, and once we see the detailed facts which that system will presumably generate, then

we can decide whether the "just and reasonable" rate system is really inadequate—or perhaps over-adequate—to produce the cash flow legitimately required for continued investment in gas production. In the meanwhile we should consider the revenue and profit implications of the plan which the White House has put forth.

Any projections are necessarily speculative, but the attached computations are a first attempt at calculating the windfall inherent in the \$1.75 "new gas" price, the allowances of interstate rollovers at \$1.42 and intrastate rollovers at a \$1.75, and the locking in of the FPC Opinion 770 rates on the last two biennia. The projection is extremely conservative in that it calculates the rollover windfalls from the respective average prices rather than the actual prices of the rollover production, which would be a significantly lower base. It also assumes that the windfall factor would be constant over time, when in fact the windfall will accelerate as the gas price moves upward ahead of the inflation rate because of the oil equivalency factor discussed above. The two assumptions for "new gas" volumes are based (I) on President Carter's past assertions of a 5% rate, and (II) on projections based on the AGA estimate to Mr. Schlesinger of 5.5 trillion cubic feet of new gas by 1980. Obviously the assumptions of these figures differ substantially from those of the proposed system, but since there is no limit on the amount of "new gas," and since the aim of the program is to stimulate as much "new gas" production as possible, these figures, too, are likely to be conservative. The detailed bases of the calculations as well as further revisions as we refine the projections will be submitted to the committee.

Based on these preliminary calculations, however, it appears that the windfall factor, that is, excess profits generated by the pricing system, without any basis in increased cost or risk, will amount to:

Preliminary estimate of total producer windfalls under natural gas provisions of energy plan

[In billions of dollars]			
	Low	High	
1978	\$4.5	\$4.9	
1979	7.5	8.3	
1980	10.2	11.4	
1981	12.6	14.1	
1982	14.7	16.5	
1983	16.5	18.6	
1984	18.0	20.4	
1985	19.2	21.9	
1986	20.2	23.2	
1987	21.1	24.4	
Total	144.5	163.7	

I want to emphasize that these are very rough estimates. I welcome and encourage the committee, the industry, and especially the administration to set forth different assumptions and derive different totals. But I assure you of one fact: As long as the base case is some realistic notion of actual current and prospective cost plus a reasonable return, the windfalls under the proposed pricing system will be in the tens of billions of dollars over the period of the plan.

The American people cannot be asked to sacrifice when the oil and gas industry is going to be given that kind of unearned bonus.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 3, 1977

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Reverend Mr. Charles A. Mallon, permanent deacon, St. Matthias Church, Lanham, Md., offered the following prayer:

And if My people, upon whom My name has been pronounced, humble themselves and pray, and seek My presence and turn from their evil ways, I will hear them from heaven and pardon

their sins and revive their land.—II Chronicles 7: 14.

Father, we Your people, come before You with proud hearts yet seeking Your presence. Give us the grace to humble