

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

James J. Gillespie, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Dean C. Smith, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to

file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, July 18, 1977, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MRS. JEANETTE WILLIAMS, WIFE OF SENATOR WILLIAMS, GIVES EXCELLENT COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Human Resources, Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, planned to deliver the commencement address at the Marie H. Katzenbach School for the Deaf in West Trenton, N.Y., on June 10.

Senator WILLIAMS' presence was required here during our deliberation of the Clean Air Act. The Senator's gracious wife, Jeanette, came to the rescue and delivered the speech. Mrs. Williams also delivered a message in sign language from Senator WILLIAMS in opening and closing remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that the address, as delivered by Mrs. Williams, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., DELIVERED BY JEANETTE WILLIAMS AT THE MARIE H. KATZENBACH SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, WEST TRENTON, N.J., FRIDAY, JUNE 10, 1977

Senator Williams regrets so much that votes on the Clean Air Bill in the Senate keeps him from being with you.

It is my pleasure to join you this afternoon to salute the graduating class of 1977 and to share with you Senator Williams' thoughts about the future.

The Senator's favorite quote from Walden's Thoreau is:

"If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer.

"Let me step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

For many of the past 10 years, this Nation has virtually ignored those who listen to the sound of different drummers.

During the long period of unrest and pain of the Vietnam war, those who sounded the call against our military involvement were for a long time ignored and later, harshly criticized for their dissenting views.

In the period leading up to the Watergate investigation a similar attitude prevailed.

And, too many of us have chosen to ignore the lifestyles and needs of those around us who have different abilities.

We have, as a Nation, all too often ignored the uniqueness and great potential of persons with various physical differences.

You might say that their questions and wishes have fallen upon our "deaf" ears.

But times are changing.

The last several years have brought an incredible awakening throughout our Nation.

This awakening has been brought about

by the drumbeat of a new civil rights movement of disabled people who have come to Washington and to the State capitols to petition the government for their long-overdue basic rights.

It has brought people forward to speak out and educate society as to what must be done.

And today, the civil rights of those who live with disabilities—with deafness, with blindness, and with other physical disabilities—have been recognized and will be protected.

We have accomplished much at the Federal level.

In 1971 Senator Williams created the Subcommittee on the Handicapped: the first one in the Senate history to focus attention solely on the legislative needs of the handicapped. Senator Williams is proud of his authorship of legislation which was enacted into law in 1973 prohibiting discrimination against people on the basis of their handicap.

These provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ban discrimination in all programs receiving Federal financial assistance.

And if you think about it, that includes most health, housing, education, transportation, and other social service and jobs programs.

Federal contractors are required to take affirmative action to employ and promote persons with disabilities.

And discrimination is prohibited in Federal employment, and each Federal agency must have an affirmative action plan to promote employment for persons with disabilities.

These programs reaffirm what many of us have been saying for a long time: it is not the disability that counts, but the abilities of the person.

Disability should have no bearing on job performance and potential.

They will also assure that persons with disabilities will not be treated differently than other persons—in fringe benefits, in insurance coverage, and in wages and benefits.

The Congress has also enacted legislation which reinforces the right of each child to an education based on his needs.

This law—the Education for All Handicapped Children Act which Senator Williams authored—requires that each State makes available the teachers, interpreters, and financial assistance necessary to assure every deaf child and every other child with a disability an appropriate and adequate education.

On another front, through pressure from the deaf community, their friends and the Congress, the Federal Communications Commission has ordered all TV broadcasters to make emergency broadcasting available both orally and visually so that the deaf and hearing impaired community will have access to vital information.

And finally, the FCC was persuaded to reserve line 21 on the TV screen for captioning of television so that the communications and entertainment media will be available to deaf persons.

It is striking to think that for the cost of a little more than \$25,000 any station can

make programing which is fully accessible to deaf persons available.

The responses of commercial and public television stations has been encouraging in putting on interpreted news or captioned news.

And in 1976, for the first time in history, the Presidential debates were given this type of treatment.

I do not think our advances will stop here.

Additional legislation has already been introduced to meet the needs of the deaf—legislation to lower the cost of long-distance phone calls by TTY—and to equip all Federal agencies and Congressional offices with TTY's so that the deaf will have quick access to their elected officials.

Recognition is coming in other ways as well.

Just last Sunday night, the National Theatre of the Deaf won a National TONY award for drama—an important recognition of that troupe's talent and also of its artistic value.

Last year's Academy Award to Louise Fletcher for her magnificent performance in "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest", which was accepted in sign language for her deaf parents was incredibly important for our National awareness.

A National Center for Law and the Deaf has been established to work on the unique legal problems which deaf people face.

Based on the Gallaudet College campus, this Center has already represented the interests of the deaf in two major cases—protecting the confidentiality of an interpreter in a criminal action and in a pending case to vitiate a prohibition of the U.S. Department of Transportation against deaf persons driving trucks in interstate commerce.

All of these events mark the emerging recognition of deafness and other physical differences throughout our communities and the recognition of the unique abilities and potentials inherent in this segment of our population.

They mark the beginning of a full understanding of what it means to be deaf or disabled in the United States today.

This recognition comes none too soon—from your perspective and from mine.

Over the years as Vietnam and Watergate froze our consciousness, it was difficult for us to focus on or take up healthy new approaches for dealing with the needs of our people.

Senator Williams as Chairman of the Senate Human Resources Committee, watched as our programs to put an end to poverty, to educate our children, to provide decent health care and adequate support for our workers were diverted and undercut.

Fight as we did to keep these programs going—and they are still operating—we accomplished little more than survival.

As a result, the very same National problems we faced years ago are no closer to solution now than they were then.

We see a Nation in which 7 million workers—325,000 of them in New Jersey—are without jobs while another 3 million more work only part-time.

We have come through a winter in which a record cold caused tremendous hardships because of energy shortages, and yet, we still do not have an energy policy which will ensure that these hardships will not occur again.

Our urban centers continue to deteriorate and have become centers of crime and poverty—conditions which go hand-in-hand.

Millions of Americans cannot afford adequate health care or live in areas where it is available.

Countless Americans do not even have a family physician.

I could go on, but you know many of the problems as well as I do.

I would not underestimate the magnitude of the problems which we face.

But I also would not underestimate our ability to deal with these problems.

I remain confident that we have the talent, the ingenuity, and the sense of National purpose to fashion the solutions which are demanded.

But, if we are to succeed, we cannot afford any policy which discriminates or fails to use the potential of every individual in this Nation.

We need your help!

We need your energies; we need your talents; we need your determination.

A new day is dawning for the handicapped.

But, countless other Americans still only face the dark nights of despair.

Every time we fail to give a child an appropriate education; every time we fail to provide a job for an able-bodied man or woman; every time we cast someone into the life-style cycle of poverty, we inflict upon them a handicap that is every bit as real as the physical handicaps which other people face.

We cannot tolerate these conditions and we will not tolerate them.

I see here today the spirit that is needed in this Nation if we are to progress.

So, I ask your assistance—you, who have striven so mightily and so successfully, in your own behalf.

I ask you to share your priceless talents with all Americans so that together, we can fashion an America that fulfills the promise of our National dream for all people.

Goodbye, I love you.

#### NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MINOR DISPUTES

**HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 3816, amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act. One of the provisions of this legislation would create a private right of action for violations of FTC trade regulation rules and cease and desist orders. These suits could be brought as class action lawsuits but under more relaxed procedural rules than those governing other class actions as set out in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This authority would, of course, be in addition to the authority which we gave the FTC, just 2 short years ago, to bring suits on behalf of consumers injured by an unfair or deceptive trade practice.

Proponents of this provision argue that class actions are needed in order to protect consumers. I have some doubts, however, whether this is really an effective consumer protection device or merely a "get-rich-quick" scheme for plaintiff lawyers. When the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance and later the full Commerce Committee considered this legislation, there was absolutely no discussion of whether the

class action device was an effective consumer remedy compared to small claims courts, consumer arbitration panels, and other consumer redress mechanisms which operate essentially at the local level.

Because of my concerns in this area, I was interested in a recent speech made by Chief Justice Warren Burger at the National Conference on Minor Disputes Resolution given at the Columbia University Law School in New York City and sponsored by the American Bar Association. Chief Justice Burger points out that many consumer disputes just do not belong within the formalistic bounds of our judicial system. As the Chief Justice points out—

The consumer with \$300 in controversy for car repairs or a dispute on a defective roofing job or a malfunctioning home appliance prefers a reasonably satisfactory resolution to the protracted legal proceedings that are characteristic of courts.

Frankly, I believe we do consumers a cruel injustice by passing this legislation which will return to them only a fraction of what they have lost and this after several years of litigation.

I believe that a number of my colleagues will find of interest the Chief Justice's remarks with respect to the appropriateness of the legal system in resolving minor consumer disputes. The Chief Justice's speech follows:

REMARKS OF WARREN E. BURGER, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

As the discussions at this conference have shown, lawyers and judges, and social scientists and philosophers, have pondered for generations the problems arising from what we call minor, but vexing, disputes between private parties and those between citizens and government—usually local government. One year ago we sought again to probe unresolved problems in this area, on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of Roscoe Pound's classical analysis of popular dissatisfaction with the administration of justice.

This conference is a very important follow-up of the 1976 Pound Conference. President Justin Stanley and the American Bar Association deserve the thanks of multitudes of Americans who are involved in these minor but often painful disputes with their fellow human beings or with government, for which few adequate, cost-effective remedies are now available. I use the phrase "minor disputes" as you have in a sense as a term of art. Because we described some problems and disputes as minor for statistical purposes does not mean they are unimportant to the individuals involved, or easy to resolve. In fact, thanks are due to dedicated judges in small claims courts, and to arbitration systems, which recognize that "minor disputes," if not disposed of in some reasonably acceptable manner, can create festering social sores and undermine confidence in society. From what I have been told of your deliberations of yesterday and this morning, I gather that some of our preconceptions may be shaken. That, of course is the purpose of this gathering of a select group of thoughtful professionals, who are interested in "people problems." My criticism of legal education beginning when I tried to teach law long, long ago was that it was good on principles and not good about people. The law in its broadest sense is not an end in itself—it is a tool—a means to an end. And that end is justice as nearly as fallible humans can achieve it—for people and their problems. And we must not exalt the means at the expense of the ends. We in the law have been too much like the pathologists

who can often tell more about what caused death than what would preserve life.

In common with most of you, I have participated in discussions of this kind for a long time. We are well aware that large lawsuits are not the major problem of American justice. They tend to take care of themselves—at great expense of course, especially in this day of high legal costs—and the litigants, whether satisfied or not, can at least vent their hostilities on each other. I do not minimize the potential contribution of some kinds of "large law suits" to improve the quality of life in our society, although I confess that the longer I live, the more I sense the futility of much of the gargantuan-sized litigation that is carried on. The thought will not go away, that there must be a better way to do some of these things. Apart from all other factors, judges are just not all that wise.

Perhaps some may disagree, but certainly there ought to be a clear consensus on the proposition that the complex procedures, refined and developed for certain types of more complex cases, are inappropriate and even counter-productive when applied to the resolution of the kinds of disputes which are the focus of our attention today.

What is beginning to emerge, through the fog, is that we lawyers and judges—aided and abetted by the inherently litigious nature of Americans—have created many of these problems.

It may be that even if we disciples of the law do not invent new problems, we have done far too little to solve them or channel them into simpler mechanisms that will produce tolerable results.

If we are completely honest, we must at least consider whether we are not in reality, somewhat like Pogo, the brainchild of that philosopher-humanist, Walt Kelly, who proclaimed "We have met the enemy, and he is us."

I do not suggest in fact the "enemy" we have met is the legal profession. But the "enemy" may be our willingness to assume that the more complex the process, the more refined and deliberate the procedure, the better the quality of justice which results. But this is not necessarily so. My submission is that we continue to engage in some ruthless self-examination and inquire whether our fascination with procedure, with legal tests—now often evolving three or four tiers deep—has not led to a smug assumption that conflicts can be solved only by law-trained people. It is possible that—because of our training—we have tended to cast all disputes into a legal framework that only legally trained professionals can cope with, and in traditional legal ways. If that is so—and I put it as a question—we are in a vicious cycle.

I do not suggest this has been the purpose or objective in the minds of lawyers, judges, and law professors, as we have developed and refined legal theory and procedures, but it may be the effect of our preoccupation with legal theory, orderliness and formalism.

As I pondered these matters in recent years, two experiences came into focus, one recent and one long past—one almost flip-pant and one serious.

One of my mother's many grandchildren at about age four suffered outbreaks of painful body rash. The family physician finally gave up and sent the patient to a renowned specialist in dermatology. For weeks the child was examined, treated, given injections and X-rayed. All clothing and bedclothing was burned and replaced, as multiple medicines were employed. One day, the parents being occupied, the child was taken to the dermatologist by Grandmother. As usual, the child was disrobed, placed on the examining table where the first time she saw the condition. With some hesitation she said, "Doctor, if you will excuse me for saying so, this child isn't sick; he just should not eat eggs—he's

allergic to them." The astonished specialist, having made no progress for weeks, was sensible enough to agree to act on Grandmother's diagnosis. The result of a no-egg diet was a complete recovery in a matter of days!

That experience, now more than thirty years past, came to my mind when the Chief of State of a developing but by no means poverty-stricken country visited the United States and I had occasion for some extended conversations with him about the problems of his country. He told me he had read that I had been working to make improvements in our system of justice and wanted to discuss what his country should do to modernize its judicial processes.

I hastened to tell him our progress was very slow and that at best some of our programs had begun to turn the tide somewhat. He asked me to explain what I meant and I responded that our system as a whole was a bit like a country that was trying to double its production of coal and iron while continuing to use 19th century methods and equipment. Not realizing the truth of what I said, he put my appraisal of progress to modesty and he went on to describe what he called the primitive system of justice in his country, especially dealing with small disputes in the rural areas. He said in his country, as in so many underdeveloped countries, each village had an informal body of respected elders to whom the villagers took their disputes. Their claims were resolved under something resembling our process of final arbitration—with no appeals and no review—and of course no lawyers, for they had none in rural areas. He said that their studies showed most disputes were disposed of with rough justice but that he wanted to modernize the system to make sure that true justice was done for the people of his country.

It had been suggested to him that a team of American legal experts might be enlisted to survey their problems and recommend a plan or system of courts and improved legal education, and he asked what I thought of the idea. I told him the story of the Grandmother and the dermatologist and said my honest answer to him—at least for the present—was to let well enough alone. I did not say, for fear he would think it foolish flattery, but I confess it occurred to me that a team of American legal experts, combined with social and political scientists, might well tour the towns and villages of his country. They might well, as social scientists have in studying primitive countries, learn lessons that would be useful in such conferences as this dealing with minor dispute resolution.

I do not want to be understood as endorsing Shakespeare's observation that to improve things, the first step is to "kill all the lawyers"—indeed I categorically reject that Shakespearean slander—but I must also reject the idea that we lawyers have all the answers. We do not. It is often pointed out that the United States has more practicing lawyers per 100,000 population than any society in the world—14 times the ratio of modern Japan, which is also a highly complex, highly developed society. Sometimes this is said to make a point favorable to our profession and sometimes to disparage it.

What some critics overlook is that we have a very complex social and economic system and, happily, we afford individuals more rights and provide more remedies than most other societies. To maintain that standard will always require a great many people—many of them lawyers, some of the new breed of para-legals, numerous decisionmakers, and then some others as yet unidentified.

I cannot escape a feeling that people with the kind of problems we are concerned about are more likely to go to a local neighborhood tribunal including not more than one lawyer surrounded by two non-lawyers, than a blackrobed judge. Such people—the deci-

sion-makers must be trained or natural—and practical—psychologists, with an abundance of the milk of human kindness and patience.

There is a notion abroad in our times—especially since the 60's and early 70's which I hope will pass—that traditional litigation—because it has been successful in some public areas—is the cure-all for every problem that besets us or annoys us. Litigation is indeed the cure for many problems and conflicts and is inescapable when new rights are evolving and new remedies being sought. And our profession can take pride in the role of the law in improving the quality of life for the disadvantaged, in righting historic wrongs suffered by minorities, in assuring true freedom in fact to those for whom freedom was once only a promise. But the role of law, in terms of formal litigation, with the full panoply of time-consuming and expensive procedural niceties, can be overdone.

The consumer with \$300 in controversy for car repairs, or a dispute on a defective roofing job, or a malfunctioning home appliance, prefers a reasonably satisfactory resolution to the protracted legal proceedings that are characteristic of courts. I suggest that most people will prefer an effective, common sense tribunal of non-lawyers, or a mix of two non-lawyers and one lawyer, rather than the traditional court system to resolve his modest but irritating claim.

The small claims courts which began early in the century have served a very useful function and many continue to do so. But you, who have taken the time from busy lives to attend this conference, need not be told that changing conditions have made some of those courts less than adequate as problem solvers.

My early reference to the informal, neighborhood-type mechanisms long used—and still used by both underdeveloped and some very advanced societies—points to what I am sure you have been considering. By whatever name we call it—arbitration, or mediation, or conciliation—or a combination of all three—centuries of human experience undergirds these informal kinds of procedures.

The labor movement, beginning in Europe more than a century ago, developed informal dispute resolution which today settles a vast array of difficult, tension-producing conflicts in industry and which helped make this country the great producer that it is. Great credit is due to the practical working men who devised the early grievance procedures employed by labor unions. The American Arbitration Association and the International Chamber of Commerce have demonstrated, on another level and on a larger scale, the value of arbitration methods, less formal and less rigid than traditional litigation. Countless variations and permutations have evolved to deal with lesser disputes than those great organizations are concerned with, the well-known Philadelphia plan being a prime example.

The complexities of our social structure today are placing unacceptable tension-producing burdens in two areas: first, the economics of law practice, with hourly rates beginning at \$35 or more, make it unrealistic to have lawyers involved in minor disputes, unless they are subsidized by government. That, of course, is an increasing reality, but even with budgets running into the millions, it is doubtful that lawyers can be supplied to everyone. Even government-financed neighborhood law offices find it difficult to deliver legal services at much less than \$15 to \$20 an hour. More important, fully trained litigation lawyers are not needed to resolve some kinds of conflicts and, except for part of the decision-making process, they may be a handicap.

The second factor is that there are many conflicts that fall into today's classification as minor disputes, which no one is solving and which ought to be resolved if we are to

avoid the frustrations, tensions, and hostilities that often flow from unresolved conflicts. We do not need to call on psychiatrists or clinical psychologists to tell us that a sense of injustice rankles and festers in the human breast and the dollar value of the conflict is not always the measure of tension and irritation produced. A landlord who delays unduly in repairing a defective radiator or refrigerator can produce unhappy chain reactions on children and adults. A defective roofing or siding job on the home, defective work on the family car or the television set sometimes can produce serious consequences comparable to those of a major illness.

Only the most effective small claims courts are dealing effectively with such claims. The volume of claims has gone beyond the capacity of many of those courts—as is true of all courts today. And when the injured party must make more than one trip to the court because he or she was not advised of the kind of evidence or witnesses needed, or when the injured party learns there is no way to enforce his legal victory, the tensions multiply and insult is added to the injury. Traditional courts or even specialized small claims courts cannot always cope realistically with such problems.

The recent experience with no-fault insurance is encouraging, even though those systems needed time to develop. We must remember how long it has taken traditional legal systems to evolve—and how far they fall short, after generations or even centuries of experience.

Innovations toward solving the problems you are considering at this conference will take time, but the patterns of centuries of experience with informal and formal arbitration strongly suggest that this is one key area to explore. Whether we look to the history of great institutions like the American Arbitration Association or the International Chamber of Commerce, or that of labor unions with grievances in an industrial plant, we can see their procedures, which are simple and informal when compared with traditional litigation, have made incalculable contributions to commerce and trade and labor peace—to society as a whole.

The 45 years of experience with the Jewish Conciliation Board, an extra-legal community court, here in New York, suggest that potential litigants are willing to submit disputes to laymen they trust, and that such informal tribunals can reduce conflicts and tensions in a community. Indeed, the past ten years proves there can be successful resolution of disputes without even resort to arbitration. The success of the Action Line and Hot-Lines throughout the country confirms this. I am told that an Action Line in Los Angeles has been receiving over 1,500 complaints each week. Not only do they assist in resolving specific disputes but they are also attempting to educate consumers to prevent many such disputes. Indeed, the sponsoring radio station (KNBC) trains consumers how best to initiate complaints. That station has been responsible for compelling manufacturers to change labels on nationally sold products and has helped draft new consumer statutes.<sup>1</sup>

The notion that most people want black-robed judges, well-dressed lawyers, and fine paneled courtrooms as the setting to resolve their disputes is not correct. People with problems, like people with pains, want relief, and they want it as quickly and inexpensively as possible. Even those who do not grasp the meaning of cost-effectiveness know the difference between total frustration and tolerable satisfaction. Overwhelmingly they will settle for a tolerable solution. Interdisciplinary-comparative research is bearing this out.

<sup>1</sup> Earl Johnson, Valerie Kantor & Elizabeth Schwartz, *Outside the Courts*, page 73.

If there are any here who came looking for a perfect solution, I fear they are doomed to disappointment. There are few, if any, perfect solutions to human problems and conflicts and none I know of in the kinds of conflicts you are considering. I do not know what Judge Learned Hand said about arbitration and other informal means of resolving disputes, but I recall what he said about traditional litigation:

"I must say that as a litigant I should dread a lawsuit beyond almost anything else short of sickness and death."<sup>2</sup>

I do not know what Judge Hand would think about those who seem to regard litigation as one of the essences of life, and who scorn any solution short of the traditional, but the harsh truth is that unless we devise substitutes for the courtroom processes—and do so quickly—we may be well on our way to a society overrun by hordes of lawyers, hungry as locusts, and brigades of judges in numbers never before contemplated.

Lawyers and judges have made and are making great contributions to achieving a fair and humane society. Properly employed, with their experience and talents channeled, they can be the healers. Unrestrained, they can aggravate the problem. As with most experts and specialists, they are splendid servants but terrible masters. Their place in the resolution of minor disputes is more likely as fact-finders and decision-makers than as advocates.

James Marshall, a thoughtful student of legal systems, touched on what it is we are trying to grapple with in the closing quarter of the 20th century—and what you have come to this conference to study. He wrote:

"Because law has not developed its own experimental discipline, it has the responsibility to test its own 'make believe' doctrine by whatever scientific methods are available and then adjust those doctrines—insofar as it can—to reality. If the law cannot achieve this within the traditions of the courtroom, then it would seem that substitute legal institutions should be provided that are better suited to reality. What is required, is social invention in the law based on findings of the social sciences."

I agree.

I commend the American Bar Association and this conference for being venturesome and imaginative in seeking new ways to reduce social irritations and tensions with minimum delay, complexity, and prohibitive expense to those who can least afford it. I hope we will see concrete experiments and accomplishments as your work proceeds.

#### RISE OF MR. JUSTICE POWELL

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Virginians are proud of the excellent record being made on the Supreme Court of the United States by Mr. Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr.

Yes, Virginians are proud of Mr. Justice Powell but those of us who have known him through the years are not at all surprised by the splendid record he is making.

One who has known him long and well is the able national syndicated columnist, James J. Kilpatrick.

<sup>2</sup> "Deficiencies of Trials to Reach the Heart of the Matter", November 17, 1921, published in Lectures on Legal Topics, page 105, line 3, by Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Last week, Mr. Kilpatrick did an excellent piece on the Supreme Court and Lewis Powell and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

#### RISE OF MR. JUSTICE POWELL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—The Supreme Court wound up its October term on June 29, after nine months of labor that produced no remarkable surprises. Among the developments that came came as no surprise at all is the rise of Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr. At 69, after only six years on the bench, he has emerged as the intellectual strong man of the Burger Court.

This expanding reputation surely will not startle those who have followed Mr. Justice Powell's career both in the law and in public service. I freely confess my own personal affection for the Virginia jurist—the first Virginian to serve on the Court, incidentally, since Peter V. Daniel more than a century ago.

A court reporter described Mr. Justice Powell the other day as "the Virginia aristocrat." Certainly the Virginia part is true enough. Born in Suffolk, Va., in 1907, he received his first law degree from Washington and Lee (his second came from Harvard), and settled down to the practice of corporate law in Richmond in 1932. But we knew him in Richmond as much more than a top lawyer in the state's most prestigious law firm. We knew him as chairman of the city school board, then as member and president of the State Board of Education, and as a tireless worker in every civic enterprise that came along.

When I first met the gentleman in 1946, he was Colonel Powell, just returned from the war with the Legion of Merit, a Bronze Star and the French Croix de Guerra with Palm. His continuing interest in military affairs was manifested many years later in his service on Nixon's Blue Ribbon Panel to study the Department of Defense.

Most of his reputation, of course, results not from education or defense, but from the law. He served in 1964-65 as president of the American Bar Association; he pioneered in the study of legal services to the poor; and in October 1971, Nixon nominated him to succeed Hugo Black on the Court.

It has proved a remarkably happy appointment. A few Nixon-haters, knowing nothing of Powell's integrity, leaped to an immediate conclusion that the nominee would function as a rubber-stamp, doctrinaire conservative. They were swiftly disabused. In his six terms on the Court, Mr. Justice Powell has indeed sided most frequently with Burger, Rehnquist and Blackman, but his growing eminence derives not from ideology, but from scholarship and reason.

In the term just ended, Mr. Justice Powell wrote 5 of the Court's 142 signed opinions, matching Rehnquist and White in majority output. He caught some of the toughest cases of the year. In the Arlington Heights case, involving charges of racial discrimination in zoning law, he cleared new ground in the Court's emerging emphasis upon the intentions of public officials. In the Miami pupil paddling case, he braved a liberal firestorm to assert that the Eighth Amendment does not apply to disciplinary measures in the public schools. In the abortion cases on June 20, he reasoned cogently that the Constitution secures no automatic right of abortion.

In other cases, Mr. Justice Powell dealt with wiretapping, with obscenity, with labor law, and with illegitimate children, illegal aliens, voting rights, double jeopardy, the taxation of insurance companies, a major antitrust case, and a stubborn grandmother in Ohio. He dissented only 14 times, the least

of any member of the Court, but he wrote 10 full-blown dissenting opinions to support his objections.

The pattern that emerges is essentially a pattern of order. Mr. Justice Powell is an orderly man. His sense of personal reserve constantly is reflected in his view of the judicial function. Judges holding life tenure, he insists, have no business imposing their own social or moral views upon either Congress or the States. Even to prohibit the brutal paddling of a disruptive pupil, the Eighth Amendment must not be twisted out of context. He is not much for reading between the lines of a statute; his task, as he construes it, is to figure out what the lines actually say.

It is too early to say if Mr. Justice Powell ultimately will rank among the great justices of the Court. He is no phrase-maker. His opinions tend to lose cruising speed because of their footnote ballast. There is some truth in the observation that he stands out so conspicuously because he sits as a Virginia cardinal among a Court of wrens and sparrows. In any event, let us forgive Richard Nixon at least some of his sins by thanking him for this much: He put Lewis Powell on the Court.

#### BIASED REPORTING OF NEWS

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper industry in this country is a fascinating business. Their professed dedication to the unbiased reporting of news is sometimes open to question. The protection of the printed page by our Constitution is one of our great assets. However, newspapers are expected to show some sense of social responsibility and devotion to the ideals of this Nation under whose flag they are allowed to operate.

I would not permit any newspaper to be denied its right to formulate its own editorial policy. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat and the Post-Dispatch are the two most widely distributed St. Louis newspapers. Because they are so much at variance on major issues, I want to share with my colleagues the separate editorial treatment of the same subject by these paper giants. I think you will agree that the Globe-Democrat has a value system that appears to go beyond the boundaries of what is considered fair and prudent. These two reprints appeared in the St. Louis Journalism Review and is one of the more outstanding examples of the consistency with which the Globe-Democrat distorts and colors the news events of the day:

[From the St. Louis Journalism Review]

EDITORIALS—IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

NOTE.—The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat may have a joint publishing agreement, which in the words of the late Senator Phillip Hart is akin to "profit-sharing," but there are innumerable examples that editorial diversity remains, witness these two editorials.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, April 16-17, 1977]

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE FBI

The spectacle of 300 FBI agents gathered on the steps of the federal courthouse in New York in support of a former colleague facing prosecution should cause serious soul-searching by an Administration professes deep commitment to human rights around the globe.

Who cares about the human rights of John J. Kearney, a retired FBI supervisor who has been indicted of charges of illegal mail openings, wire tapping and conspiracy for trying to cope with the menace of the radical Weatherman Underground from 1970 to 1972?

With a heart-warming show of strength the 300 FBI agents who came from as far away as Baltimore and Buffalo to cheer Kearney showed that they care.

FBI Director Clarence M. Kelley showed that he cares by seeking a review of Kearney's case by Attorney General Griffin B. Bell. Kelley, conscious of the serious effect on FBI morale, and aware that CIA agents were not prosecuted for similar violations, has promised to use every means open to him for a fair resolution of Kearney's predicament.

Sensible Americans who appreciate that the FBI has conscientiously endeavored to protect them from terrorist bombers should join Director Kelley and the agents in defending Kearney. At the worst it appears he may have committed technical violations of the law while on the trail of the Weatherman radicals.

Kearney is charged with directing a squad of New York City FBI agents to rob mailboxes, steam open and copy personal letters and eavesdrop on telephone calls. The alleged offenses were against individuals suspected of being in contact with the fugitives.

In order to have a solid case against Kearney the government should have to prove that someone suffered serious harm as a result of the FBI tactics. Otherwise Kearney is being made a sacrificial victim for doing his duty in a manner that was intended to protect Americans in general from untold violence.

Attorney General Bell would do well to intervene in the Kearney case and drop prosecution. Americans are not in the mood to see an FBI hero made a martyr. In his concern for human rights, President Carter should be mindful that he has an obligation to protect the FBI from unreasoned abuse.

The dignified appearance of the 300 FBI agents who gathered in behalf of Kearney speaks volumes. These were not dirty, foul-mouthed radicals shouting obscenities or disturbing the peace. They were quiet, resolute, patriotic, fearless, dedicated public servants who put their lives on the line every day to protect their fellow Americans against external and internal dangers. And they were exercising their fundamental right to assemble peaceably to seek redress for a grievance.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 17, 1977]

#### LESSON FOR THE FBI

Passersby at the federal courthouse in New York City a few days ago were presented with the unusual spectacle of more than 300 FBI agents congregated on the steps and applauding one of their former colleagues who was about to be arraigned on charges of illegal mail-opening, wire-tapping and conspiracy. The demonstration was ironic for two reasons: first, the FBI has been known to conduct surveillance operations against citizens who engaged in demonstrations, and, second, the law enforcement agents seemed to be saying that the law should not be enforced against one of their own.

A further sign of FBI support for a double standard of law enforcement was provided by a statement from FBI Director Clarence Kelley asking Attorney General Griffin Bell to review the case of former FBI supervisor, John J. Kearney, who had just been indicted in New York, presumably with the objective of having Mr. Bell stop the prosecution. Mr. Kelley said the Kearney indictment, the first ever of an FBI agent, had seriously affected FBI morale, and the director argued further that CIA agents had been let off the hook for similar wrongdoing.

On the latter issue, Mr. Kelley has a point.

But Mr. Bell's answer should not be to stop the prosecution of Mr. Kearney and other FBI agents, against whom there is evidence of law violation, but to order the prosecution of CIA agents against whom there is similar evidence. As for FBI morale, the bureau's esprit de corps should not be boosted by continuing to wink at its violations of the law, as those in authority did for 20 years. Finally, now that the FBI agents' First Amendment right to demonstrate has been respected (as it should have been), perhaps the agency will be a little more understanding of citizens' desires to exercise their First Amendment rights.

#### THE NEUTRON BOMB IN PERSPECTIVE

### HON. HARRISON "JACK" SCHMITT

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, the Senate debate on the so-called neutron bomb highlights the terrible paradox in national and world security. With this paradox, we must continue to be stronger than any other nation, but we must continue to insure our strength is never tested by an enemy.

We must continue to create weapons against which no potential enemy can defend itself so that no weapons will ever be used by anyone.

This paradox must be maintained. It is a product of the invention of weapons of mass destruction and that only minutes are required for those weapons to be used. No longer can free men wait to be attacked before they prepare their defense. This is a fact of survival in our third century of national existence.

The neutron bomb is not some new death ray. It is an extension of the technology of the hydrogen or H-bomb. We can now produce small H-bombs in which radiation in the form of neutrons is enhanced over the effects of blast and heat. We have "dissected" the H-bomb, not created some new weapon. All nuclear weapons are terrible in their effects. All have radiation, blast, and heat. All will kill and destroy. The neutron bomb kills but destroys less than existing nuclear weapons of comparable size.

It is in Europe that we find the greatest political significance of this neutron bomb. There, we have fallen far behind in balancing the conventional forces of troops, tanks, artillery, and planes now deployed against us in Eastern Europe. The bomb offers a means of countering these large concentrations of troops with minimum damage to civilian population and property. In our necessarily defensive situation in Western Europe, this minimizing of damage to civilian life and property is very important to our NATO allies.

The overall deterrent effect of the neutron bomb will be to give the West increased flexibility in limiting our response to large-scale attack by conventional military forces against which we have no other adequate defense. It becomes an equalizer we would be willing to use if attacked, but which would make a nuclear response by the East politically unacceptable short of global war.

With the increased flexibility in response offered by the neutron bomb, we increase the chances of avoiding full-scale nuclear war if attacked in Europe or elsewhere by conventional forces. However, the existence of this weapon does not relieve us of the necessity of vastly improving our conventional military posture. Increased quality and quantity of hardware and increased size and readiness of our Reserve Forces are extremely high-priority national security matters.

The outcome of the Senate debate on the neutron bomb has even deeper and more general significance. Great confusion exists in all parts of the world with the administration's decisions to withdraw troops from Korea, to "normalize" relations with Communist China and Cuba, to cancel production of the B-1 bomber, to give up "bargaining chips" at the SALT talks before the negotiating begins, to get tough with traditional allies such as Israel, to antagonize Latin American, African, and Asian nations, and to back away from long-term solutions to world energy and economic problems. To counter this confusion we must begin to send consistent and positive signals to friend and potential friends and foes, alike.

The production of the neutron bomb, along with the cruise missile, can be the first positive signals that the leader of the free world is back in control of its national security. As the only Nation with both the idealism and the power to protect freedom on this planet, we have no other choice.

#### TOO MUCH MIDDLE EAST TALK

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Carter administration has been in office for 6 months, and I believe the President has received the necessary time to develop firm international and domestic policies. He was entitled to a prolonged honeymoon period, but I believe that time has ended.

The administration's international policy is especially replete with contradictions, and it is difficult for anyone to trace a pattern in the Carter administration foreign policy.

This foot-in-mouth policy is addressed in an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune of June 30, which I wish to insert it at this time:

#### TOO MUCH MIDDLE EAST TALK

If the Carter administration has a single flaw more serious than others, it is the tendency of too many people to say too many things about sensitive matters. The administration aroused a nest of hornets this week by saying that Israel should withdraw from occupied territory on the West Bank of the Jordan River, in the Sinai Desert, the Golan Heights, and the Gaza Strip as a means of achieving peace.

It no doubt took some guts to say this in a country with a powerful and vocal Jewish community, which was stirred to predictable anger. It is equally certain that peace will in fact require a substantial withdrawal. But

neither guts nor accuracy are substitutes for wisdom, and it is hard to understand why the statement was issued even before President Carter and Israel's new Prime Minister Menahem Begin had their first talk. Mr. Begin is to arrive in Washington July 18. As former Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin implied, an American statement would have been more appropriate after the meeting than before.

An indignant Israeli government has in effect denied that there was any basis for the implication that Mr. Begin's hard-line leadership is unwilling to discuss the Gaza Strip and the West Bank at peace negotiations. If such a response was the statement's intent, it appears the Carter administration has created a lot of trouble merely to establish what might have been thought obvious: At peace negotiations, you negotiate.

The statement could in fact hurt negotiations by making both sides more intransigent—the Israelis in order to show that they will not bow to U.S. pressure and the Arabs because they think we are committed to supporting all of their demands.

On one part of the statement, it seems to us, needed to be uttered: "We believe strongly that progress toward a negotiated peace in the Middle East is essential this year if future disaster is to be avoided." Although the Israelis objected to this statement, too, as a form of pressure, there can be little doubt that it is true. It is essential for President Sadat of Egypt, one of the more moderate Arab leaders, to produce a satisfactory peace soon. His economic troubles continue to mount, and he could easily be replaced by someone less kindly disposed toward negotiation.

Former Secretary Kissinger achieved his successes by serving as a middle man, a relay of messages, and, by that effort, a catalyst. We'd be better off—in the Middle East as in Africa—if we were to return to our earlier effective role as a quiet catalyst.

#### FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR ASBESTOS CONTAMINATION IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

### HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to pay not more than \$4.5 million to Montgomery County for the purpose of controlling asbestos contamination of the ambient air.

I have already introduced one bill that would order three Federal agencies to promulgate standards that would protect the public health from asbestos contamination of the ambient air. This is a problem that has first surfaced in Montgomery County, Md. We should all be aware that several recent scientific presentations have indicated that asbestos mineral deposits are located up and down the east coast as well as parts of the country west of the Mississippi.

There is persuasive, but not fully complete information that asbestos contamination in differing quantities and concentrations can lead to mesothelioma a fatal cancer of the chest cavity; or asbestosis, a nonmalignant tumor that can also be fatal. A combination of smoking and asbestos contamination is especially dangerous even though the affliction will not manifest itself for 20 to 30 years.

We are faced in Montgomery County with a unique problem. For over 20 years a reputable and responsible private concern has been selling gravel and other construction materials to the county for road construction and for coverings in playground and park areas. These sales took place with no one really aware of the potential health risk present in the stone. Only recently have county, State, and Federal agencies been active in defining the problem and working on solutions.

Several of the recommendations sent to the county by the EPA called for repaving or removal of the rock in roadways and play areas throughout the county. The county government estimates that the cost for these recommendations will be between \$3 and \$7 million. I am offering this bill because this is a problem that was no one's fault and because the county is trying to meet all of the EPA's recommendations. The major impediment in the way is money. Due to the participation of the Federal Government, I feel it is proper for the Federal Government to provide financial aid.

#### WHISTLE-BLOWERS HALL OF FAME: ROBERT TUCKER AND ROBERT SULLIVAN

### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today's article wraps up my series on whistle-blowers in the RECORD. I hope my colleagues have found the articles informative of what the conscientious whistle-blower is up against.

The following tale of Robert Tucker and Robert Sullivan is from the Project on Official Illegality of the Institute for Policy Studies, 1901 Q Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.:

ROBERT TUCKER AND ROBERT SULLIVAN

Robert Tucker, a General Services Administration electrical engineer, went to the FBI in 1974 because he believed he had uncovered a widespread pattern of contract abuses at his agency. Tucker found that GSA officials in the Boston region were improperly awarding no-bid contracts to firms that had contributed to certain Republican candidates. He requested that the FBI investigate, and he gave the documents to the Boston Globe. The FBI conducted an investigation and issued a report which found no basis for criminal prosecution. They then turned over all documents to GSA officials, disclosing Tucker's identity. (He thought he had gone to the FBI in confidentiality). Shortly thereafter, Robert Tucker was fired for the methods he used in pressing his charges.

The General Services Administration conducted its own investigation of the matter upon receipt of the documents. Their internal audit substantiated Tucker's charges. Robert Sullivan, a GSA investigator, read the audit and felt that Tucker had been treated unfairly. He believed that GSA officials were not going to do anything about the matter, and after consulting his priest and the government's Code of Ethics, he sent a copy of the audit report to the Boston Globe. The Globe printed a series of stories on the contract abuses, and the situation was subsequently cleaned up.

Robert Sullivan was also fired for making

unauthorized public disclosures. In his dismissal notice, he was told that "... his actions have not only compromised the Office of Investigations, but have unjustifiably contributed to the continuation of public doubt concerning the integrity of all GSA employees, and, if condoned, would certainly lead to administrative and management chaos."

Robert Tucker lost his Civil Service appeal and has filed suit against GSA and the Civil Service Commission for reinstatement and \$500,000 damages. Robert Sullivan is still awaiting the decision of CSC's Appeals Review Board.

#### FRANCE AND WEST GERMANY LEAVE THE UNITED STATES BEHIND

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 5, France and West Germany, along with other Western European nations, finalized agreements to work jointly in further development and eventual commercialization of breeder technology.

The French and West Germans have been working on these negotiations for 2 years. The result is an intensive European effort which the French believe will give them 15 operating breeders by the year 2000 and the Germans perhaps one-third that number.

I wish to submit the New York Times, July 6, account of the breeder agreement for my colleagues consideration as we prepare to decide the fate of the Clinch River breeder reactor and the U.S. breeder program. It is obvious to many that the United States is not changing anyone's mind about deferring breeders, but rather that the rest of the world is leaving the United States behind.

The article follows:

#### EUROPEAN NATIONS SIGN ACCORDS ON DEVELOPING BREEDER REACTORS (By Jonathan Kandell)

PARIS, July 5.—France, West Germany and several other Western European nations today signed accords here for further research and development of nuclear breeder reactors and their eventual sale abroad.

Both Western European and United States officials interpreted the agreements as a rejection of President Carter's call for at least a temporary moratorium on breeder development to avoid the spread of nuclear weapons.

The fuel used by the breeder reactor is plutonium, a material that can also be used for the production of nuclear weapons. The breeder theoretically creates more plutonium than it burns, and has thus gathered support among governments worried over the possibility of a shortage of uranium.

Earlier this year, President Carter said he opposed the use of plutonium as fuel in the United States. But lobbying by the nuclear power industry has kept alive the possibility that funding for a demonstration breeder in Clinch River, Tenn., may be approved by Congress.

#### DISPUTE WITH BONN AND PARIS RECALLED

The United States has already clashed with France and West Germany over their plans to export uranium reprocessing equipment.

The French have held back on a deal to supply the technology to Pakistan, and are expected to announce this decision publicly after the military coup today. The West Germans have refused to rescind commitments to supply Brazil with enrichment equipment.

President Carter's objections to these two deals were based on the fact that reprocessing of spent uranium fuel produces plutonium, unusable as a fuel in conventional reactors, but capable of being diverted for use in weapons. The objections to breeders are essentially the same—they produce plutonium.

The accords signed today are of two kinds. The first calls for cooperation between France and West Germany in research and development. The other accords create a company, including French, West German, Dutch, Belgian and Italian interests to market breeders.

A number of prototype breeders are under construction or in operation in Western Europe. France has a 250-megawatt breeder that operated for about 18 months, then closed down for half a year because of technical problems, and recently resumed its operation. The French have decided to move ahead with a commercial 1200-megawatt breeder.

#### SOVIET NOT A PARTY TO ACCORDS

West Germany, together with the Netherlands and Belgium, is constructing a 200-megawatt prototype breeder. The British have two research breeders operating in Scotland. The Soviet Union, which was not a party to today's accords, has a 350-megawatt breeder that is also used for desalting of seawater, and is building a 600-megawatt reactor.

Europeans tend to defend breeders for variety of reasons, including the following:

There are few secure sources of energy for most Western European countries, which must import most of their oil, coal, gas and uranium. The breeder reactor, by producing more fuel than it consumes, thus becomes an attractive source of energy.

A corollary of this argument is that the United States can afford to take a stand against the potential hazards posed by breeders because it has large reserves of coal, uranium, oil and gas, and what Europeans view as a strong relationship with Middle East oil producers, particularly the Saudis.

Another argument made in favor of breeders is that Western Europe holds a technological lead over the United States. Officials say the Americans will probably come around to accepting the inevitability of breeders and Europe should be prepared to meet its needs and seize a share of the export market.

#### EUROPEANS DISCOUNT HAZARDS

Europeans have tended to discount the potential hazards posed by the creation of large amounts of plutonium, and have said that it is possible to create strict safeguards against its use for weapons.

With the Europeans see potential long-range economic benefits in breeders, their construction costs run into the billions of dollars. If the European economies continue to show sluggish growth, an expensive breeder program could be a prime candidate in a budget cut.

Domestic opposition to nuclear energy got started later in most Western European countries than the United States, but it has now burgeoned into an effective movement and breeder reactors are a likely target.

In West Germany, legal victories won by opponents have slowed plans to have 30 nuclear power reactors in operation by 1985. In France, opposition is being mounted against the 1,200 megawatt Superphenix breeder even before the start of construction. In Britain, both economic costs and

domestic protests have led to public debate on breeders. Protest movements have also added uncertainty in the Netherlands, Belgium and Italy.

### MICHAEL DEL MEDICO CAPTIVATES AUDIENCE AT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that Michael A. Del Medico, an Italian-American playwright, actor, and director, recently appeared at the Library of Congress as the Russian author, Maxim Gorky, in the world premier of his play, "This Italy of Yours."

The play, which was most successful and well-received, was brought to Washington by the Italian American Foundation, and a news release by the foundation on the play as well as a copy of the Library's program of the event follows:

#### GORKY IN ITALY MONODRAMA DAZZLES AUDIENCE AT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A remarkable portrayal of the great Russian literary giant, Maxim Gorky in Italy, stunned and dazzled an overflowing crowd at the Library of Congress recently. Michael Del Medico's virtuoso performance as Gorky in "This Italy of Yours" brought cheers and a few tears in this amazing performance by this brilliant young actor.

Del Medico not only starred in the vehicle but also conceived and directed this world premier. The play was sponsored jointly by The Italian American Foundation and the Library of Congress.

The one man show in which Del Medico became the famous author who penned "The Lower Depths" as well as other plays and novels, weaved tales of his stay in Italy between 1906 and 1913. Del Medico, alone on almost a bare stage, dominated the auditorium with his sure presence and with a voice whose range and power communicated an intimate portrait of a truly great writer who loved Italy and brought the Italy of the early 20th Century to life.

A stunning performance.

Italian American Foundation Chairman, Jeno F. Paulucci and Executive Director, Paul J. Asciola brought the play to Washington to emphasize the cultural heritage of Americans of Italian descent. The Italian American Foundation, Inc., is a non-profit, independent agency in Washington, D.C. Its purpose is to promote, publicize, monitor and coordinate programs on the national level with an impact on Italian Americans.

A distinguished audience composed of people from all walks of life included: Congressman and Mrs. Robert Giaino, Congressman Joseph Addabbo, Msgr. Geno Baroni Foundation President and Assistant Secretary of HUD and Al Stern Special Assistant to the White House for the Arts and Humanities.

#### PROGRAM

In 1906, Maxim Gorky was an author in exile from Czarist Russia. After a brief stay in America, the internationally famous and highly controversial Russian writer, humanitarian, and revolutionary went to live in Italy. His next seven years were spent living and writing among his "beloved Italians." In 1913 (Gorky left Italy. But he would return. . . .

"This Italy of Yours," andante from the life and writings of Maxim Gorky.

Conceived and Directed by Michael A. Del Medico.

Production Supervisor and Sound: P. Brandstein.

Production Staff: Joy Lilly, Nancy Ploeger, and Diana Dela Cuesta.

Reception: Immediately following the performance, Whittall Pavilion.

Michael A. Del Medico has appeared in many stage, film, and television productions. On and off-Broadway he has performed in *The Disenchanted*, *Inherit the Wind*, *Burn Me to Ashes*, *Cicero*, *Line*, and *I Dwell in Bloomingdale's*. He appeared in the premiere and subsequent taping for television of *Tombstone* and played a leading role in *Children's Game*, a film shown at the Venice Film Festival. As Director of the Action Theatre Repertory, he wrote and directed *What A Day!*, which was presented at Lincoln Center and *The Cloisters*, and then toured the country under the sponsorship of CBS-TV. Appearing annually as Guest Artist at Lehigh University, he has directed *Gorky's Lower Depths* and played *Prospero* in *The Tempest* and the title role in *Macbeth*. Mr. Del Medico created *M. Gorky: A Portrait*, in which he opened at the Vandam Theatre off-Broadway. He has appeared in *Portrait* on the Soviet cruise ship *T/s Maksim Gorki*, at the New Jersey Shakespeare Festival, and in the Cooperstown Concert Series. Scenes from *Portrait* were televised as part of the Theatre in America series on PBS-TV. Mr. Del Medico has been honored by a special exhibit of memorabilia and photos of his program at the Gorki Museum in Moscow. Last season he repeated *Portrait* at the Vandam Theatre, and has toured widely to great acclaim. Mr. Del Medico now appears at the Library of Congress in the first production of "This Italy of Yours," his new program covering the years 1906-1913 which Gorky spent in Italy.

The Italian American Foundation, with which the Library cooperates in this presentation, is a non-profit, independent agency in Washington, D.C., which coordinates nationwide programs having impact on Italian Americans and affirms the cultural heritage of Italian Americans.

### COMMENDING THE GOLDEN RAIN NEWS

#### HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the special Memorial Day edition of the *Leisure World News*, the official publication for residents of *Leisure World* in Seal Beach, Calif.

The May 26 issue paid high tribute to those who so selflessly made the ultimate sacrifice for their Nation. Members of the *Leisure World* community shared in the production of this fine paper by contributing wartime photographs which brought back to me a flood of memories of comrades who shared my own war experiences. Some of them returned with me, and others did not.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to make available copies of this Memorial Day commemorative for the asking.

I am proud to represent the people of Seal Beach *Leisure World*, and I am proud of their own substantial contribution to American journalism.

THE BREATHLESS COTTON  
WORKERS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, having just concluded hearings on its proposed cotton dust standards for the textile industry, is now reviewing the public's input and preparing a final standard. Byssinosis, or "brown lung disease," afflicts thousands of American textile workers who breathe cotton dust, and the current standard of 1,000 micrograms per cubic meter of air is a shameful indicator of disregard for employee health. The proposed 200-microgram standard, a significant and long overdue reduction, will still induce a serious incidence of lung disorders and hopefully will be lowered even further as technology permits.

An article in the current issue of the *Progressive* provides an interesting background to the cotton dust debate, and I urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with this issue:

THE BREATHLESS COTTON WORKERS

(By Jeanne Schinto)

Bernardino Ramazzini, "Treatise on the Diseases of Tradesmen" (1705): "Tis a sordid profit that's accompanied by the destruction of health.

A textile worker in Ulster once played in a flute band. During the first day of work following a summer vacation he felt "stuffed up," so he skipped band practice that evening, but promised the band leader he would attend the weekly practice the following Monday. During the rest of the week, the worker's health seemed good. Come another Monday, however, he noticed the chest tightness again. He attended practice but had to leave early because playing was such an effort. On Tuesday and for the rest of the week he felt fine, but every Monday he felt breathless. Finally, he had to give up the band entirely, because the band leader wouldn't let him play on weekends if he didn't practice on Mondays.

A worker in another Ulster mill bicycled to and from work. On Mondays, however, he noticed that breathing was difficult. He "soldiered on" during those days rather than quit early, but on Monday evenings, he couldn't pedal uphill. Soon he got into the habit of having his son meet him on those nights, to help him wheel his bike home; and in time, the son met him more and more often. Finally, back at the mill after a vacation, the man was so breathless all the time that he had to give up his job. At rest he was symptom-free, but any exertion started him wheezing and coughing. Once off the job, he gradually recovered. The only setback came one morning when he visited friends at work. After a while, his chest felt tight, and once home, he had another attack of what he described as "the owl trouble."

These medical case histories, recorded by Dr. James A. Smiley in Northern Ireland in the late 1950s, were routinely reported in March 1960 to the British government. They document certain stages of byssinosis or "brown lung disease," which afflicts textile workers who inhale cotton dust just as anthracosis, or "black lung disease," visits coal miners who inhale coal dust.

How did it happen that while the British government had already identified byssinosis and was attempting to control it and com-

pensate its victims, American businessmen and health officials were still insisting that the disease did not exist, at least among cotton mill workers in the United States? And why is it that while the disease has been acknowledged in America for almost a decade now, industry's irresponsible ways have yet to be adequately checked by government?

The symptoms of byssinosis are easily observable and detectable, even in the early stages of the disease. The chest tightness of "Monday fever," which foiled the flute player and bicyclist, signals the onset of trouble; it occurs as a kind of shock reaction on the first day one returns to work after an absence in a relatively dust-free environment. Then, if exposure to cotton dust is not curtailed, the bronchial tubes constrict, and later these airways may permanently narrow. Next a chronic cough, phlegm-filled or otherwise, develops along with increased breathlessness. A paroxysm of coughing often ends with vomiting.

In time, the chest becomes barrel-shaped and fixed in elevation, as though one is stuck in a deep inhalation, and the disease often ushers in bronchitis, asthma, emphysema, and other lung disorders. Finally, there may be total disability and, uncommonly, death, since byssinosis places undue strain on the heart and thus may lead to coronary failure.

Cotton dust, on the other hand, is not so easily characterized. It ranges in size from particles resembling ashes or gray snowflakes, large enough to see with the naked eye, to those so small they cannot be seen even under an optical microscope. Never homogeneous, cotton dust may contain soil, fungi, bacteria, pesticides, ground-up plant matter (called "trash"), and other contaminants grown or harvested along with the cotton.

The finer aspects of the cause-effect relationship between the dust and the disease have baffled some scientists. The confusion has been used by both industry and government—first to deny the existence of byssinosis and later to delay its prevention. Long after the prevalence of byssinosis here had been confirmed, American cotton company scientists were chasing enzymes, tracking histamines, and testing the relationship between smoking and dust diseases, claiming all the while that they could not begin to solve the problem until they properly scrutinized it for at least another few years. Similarly, government contended that it could not expect industry needlessly to overprotect its workers—in its scheme of things, that would be wasteful; so it, too, bided its time in the labs.

In a society in which profits did not take precedence over people, however, the finer points of byssinosis would have been considered tangential long ago and the road to its prevention would now be clear. Better air filtration systems would have been installed and other capital expenditures made. But in the United States, where society is tuned to a different chord, the present delay over preventive measures, like the oblivion which preceded it, is rooted not in science and technology but in economics and politics—in the callous traditions of the cotton industry and in government's compromising ways.

Though the cotton industry began in New England when water supplied the power and boatloads of immigrants constituted the work force, it began moving south in the 1880s, when water's industrial role was waning and immigrants began organizing. Soon after, it spread westward to take advantage of sources of cheap labor in Texas and California. By 1925, most of the spindles in the country were bobbing and whizzing in the cotton-growing states.

Inside the coast-to-coast girdle of the industrial Cotton Belt, life was defined by

cotton and the myriad products into which it could be made. While unions had been bolstered by the brick and mortar of picket lines and strikes in the North, another type of structure had been hammered into being in the South and Southwest—the cotton textile industry's version of the company town. These towns were isolation wards where nothing entered or exited except by company edict; but company heads in Fayetteville, North Carolina; Greenville, South Carolina; Prattville, Alabama, and the like were self-righteous: They were providing work for "their people"—native, white, "un-Bolshevized" former farmers and mountaineers; they were restoring a devastated land.

Today the chambers of commerce of these towns claim they have diversified, but there are still such places as Easley, South Carolina, which boasts seven large cotton mills (two owned by a Dan River subsidiary, the rest by Alice Manufacturing), many other textile processing plants, and a slogan, "What Easley Makes, Make Easley." Just as the monotonous rows of company-built houses are hardly obscured by additions and shrubs, the intangible vestiges of that repressive era can still be perceived there and elsewhere in the Cotton Belt. Only 10.5 per cent of all textile workers, for example, are organized, making textiles the least unionized industry in the country.

In Great Britain, on the other hand, cotton workers have been among the most strongly organized groups of wage earners since the 1870s. Until World War I, British cotton workers' unions were the only ones organizing women effectively: In 1910, the cotton unions' female membership was 150,000—70 per cent of all unionized women. And in 1958, a six-month stoppage at a Rochdale mill not only achieved the reinstatement of a union representative whose discharge had occasioned the strike, but also the dismissal of the manager responsible and the reorganization of the firm.

The unions gave British cotton workers the power to demand that byssinosis be checked, while much of the rest of the world—including the U.S. Cotton Belt—was still laboring under the old common-law theory that employees must run all work-related health and safety risks. In 1932, the British government, for the first time anywhere, officially recognized byssinosis as an occupational disease. Five years later, there were more reforms; under the Factory Act of 1937, the British mandated medical inspections of workplaces, compulsory reporting of industrial diseases, and compensation of disease and disabled workers.

In sharp contrast, the U.S. Public Health Service concluded in two 1933 reports that dust concentrations in American cotton mills were too low to impair worker health. In 1945, a U.S. Department of Labor report stated that byssinosis was not a problem in the nation's cotton mills. Even as recently as 1961, health officials here were insisting that while byssinosis might affect British textile workers, somehow it did not affect our own.

Government has explained the discrepancy by a feeble argument based, predictably, on technology. Recently the Labor Department magnanimously lauded the British scientists' early efforts and concluded on its own behalf: "The current prevalence of byssinosis among American textile workers may be due to the shift to mechanical harvesting of cotton following World War II and the resultant increased amounts of trash and soil in the raw cotton."

There is no mention of the possibility of technological backwatering—the laboratory politics of delay; no mention that, for centuries, textile workers have been known to suffer from respiratory diseases of one sort or another; no mention that, in company towns in the U.S. Cotton Belt, unionless workers were kept docile and naive about



the connection between their ailments and work condition by company-paid teachers, ministers, nurses, and doctors.

Since a breakthrough in 1968, Federal officials have been pressured by labor and social activists—the Textile Workers Union of America and the North Carolina Public Interest Research Group among them—finally to do something about byssinosis. What government has done, however, has been sorely inadequate, and so is what it proposes to do in the future.

Almost a decade ago, a team led by Dr. Arend Bouhuys of Yale found a high incidence of byssinosis at cotton mills run by inmates at the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta, prompting adoption of a cotton dust exposure limit under the Walsh-Healey Act. However, the limit—1,000 micrograms of total dust per cubic meter of air, which is written 1000  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ —covered only Federal employees, and besides, it was soon proven to be much too lenient.

Since enactment of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, little has changed. Although private-sector cotton workers are presently covered by the law, which adopted the 1000  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  standard, enforcement has been a charade and a new, more stringent cotton dust standard has yet to be set. Furthermore, this situation persists even though six years have gone by since the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) itself declared cotton dust to be one of the five most dangerous of 22,000 toxic substances present in American industry today.

Initially, OSHA appeared to be floundering because of inadequate funding and the usual snafus that encumber a budding bureaucracy. However, Watergate investigators later discovered that OSHA's sluggishness had been politically maneuvered. In 1974, they found a memo written by OSHA's first administrator, George C. Guenther, which stated that the agency would table action on "highly controversial standards" (cotton dust, presumably, included) during the 1972 Presidential campaign. It also suggested that Richard M. Nixon's fund raisers would do well to stress the advantages of four more years of softpedaling with OSHA under the Republicans. That was called a "sales point."

As we dig out from under the Nixon-Ford years, OSHA's abilities—and sensibilities—seem to be improving somewhat. President Carter's Labor Secretary, Ray Marshall, citing OSHA's "neglect" and "chaos," has said he intends to "change the agency's direction." However, if Marshall means the OSHA's past bias toward business will be adjusted, as it should be, toward workers, then the agency's so-called economic feasibility studies and statements challenge his good intentions.

"Although OSHA's first and prime responsibility is to assure employees safe and healthful places of employment," OSHA has recently written about itself, "feasibility is a legitimate factor to be considered in the setting of occupational safety and health standards." Sustained company profits, at the continued expense of worker health and safety, are worth the price, a hazardous job is better than no job, the statement implies, as did Marshall himself when he recently termed unemployment a larger concern than occupational health and safety.

Accordingly, since the new OSHA is still unwilling to make the about-face turn required to render workplaces hazard-free, still reluctant to penalize industry heavily, we are presented with expensive but virtually meaningless symbolic actions such as this: Although the long-promised cotton dust standard hearings are finally under way, OSHA is contemplating an "economically feasible" limit—somewhere between 200 and 500 micrograms of respirable dust per cubic meter of air—which OSHA's technical arm,

the National Institute for Occupation Safety and Health, has said is still unsafe.

"No environmental limit of cotton dust will prevent all adverse effects on worker health," NIOSH has, in fact, stated, and even OSHA must admit to this. In its own 1976 study, OSHA determined the following: If 129,000 workers were exposed to the current legal level of cotton dust exposure, over a period of time 23,497 would be likely to become byssinotics; at the proposed 500  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  level, the number would be 21,452; at 200  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , it would be 15,626; and even at 100  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , the level for which labor leaders are pressing, OSHA could predict 8,223 probable cases of the disease. What will be decided as OSHA sets the new standard, then, is just how far the compromise on worker health will be allowed to go.

Industry has, of course, been compelled to abandon its previous denials that byssinosis exists. Since the early 1970s, it has conceded that there is a problem. But it would not like to see OSHA set anything lower than the 500  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  standard—a level which could be achieved, according to one OSHA spokesman, at no cost to industry. "It represents nothing more than a new way of measuring the dust," the OSHA spokesman said. "It's just a new way of bookkeeping." And as OSHA's own 1976 study shows, the difference between 1,000 micrograms of total dust and 500 micrograms of respirable dust in terms of disease prevention is negligible. The difference between 23,497 cases by byssinosis out of 129,000 workers exposed, and 21,452 cases out of the same, is only 1.3 per cent.

Furthermore, even if the lowest standard being considered—200  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ —does go into effect, industry will have seven years to comply and then there will still be all the trials of enforcement—an area in which OSHA has not exactly distinguished itself.

Predictably, Secretary Marshall has asked that those who push for full use of the OSHA powers give him time—"a little breathing space," as he put it. With reference to byssinosis, however, his choice of words is more ironic than metaphorical. And in view of the absence of strong cotton worker labor leadership, the still formidable power of the cotton industry, and the fact that strict government policies seem to be the byssinosis victim's only real hope right now, the irony is greater still.

JOSEPH SCHLITZ BREWING CO.'S  
NEWEST PLANT LAUDED

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, last week, the newest and one of the largest of our economic good neighbors—the Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co.—celebrated the formal opening of their facility at Radisson, in the Town of Lysander, Onondaga County, N.Y.

Starting with a spectacular public display of fireworks on the evening of July 4—a community event watched by more than 200,000 persons—Schlitz has been opening its doors, and its corporate heart, to the people of the area in which they chose to build their newest brewery.

The economic stimulation provided by Schlitz to the Syracuse area and the 33d Congressional District began with the start of construction in 1973, and will continue as over 600 central New Yorkers become part of the permanent

work force. Annually, they will produce over 6 million barrels of Schlitz beer.

I am proud to recognize with appreciation their confidence in central New York, in the new community of Radisson, and in the natural and personal resources that abound in our area; and am privileged to salute Daniel F. McKeithan, chairman of the board, and Peter L. Stammberger, Syracuse plant manager, on the occasion of the brewery's official dedication.

AMBASSADOR YOUNG SPEARHEADS  
RADICAL CHANGE IN U.S. FOREIGN  
POLICY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 I testified in opposition to the confirmation of the Honorable Andrew J. Young as U.S. Representative to the United Nations. In that testimony given before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I pointed out that Mr. Young had for many years been an articulate and highly partisan spokesman for personally held convictions "that are at variance with long-standing U.S. policies and which are also at variance with the beliefs of the great majority of Americans."

Indeed, since his confirmation to the U.N. post, Andrew Young has served to spearhead radical alterations in U.S. foreign policy, alterations which are manifestly against the best interests of this country and of the free world. Specifically, these alterations are a policy of appeasement of the Soviet Union, its satellites and third world allies by actively supporting making Africa a "Soviet sphere of influence" and by agreeing to actively participate in the undermining of the countries of southern Africa which happen to be white-ruled, but in which people of all races enjoy more absolute freedoms than in the rest of black-ruled Africa combined.

Some columnists and broadcast commentators have tried to discount the U.N. Ambassador's headline-making statements by suggesting Mr. Young was either making quips or speaking casually without preparation and that therefore his statements did not express what he really meant. I disagree totally with that view, for in all the time Andy Young served here with us as the Representative of the Fifth District of Georgia no one ever accused him of taking a position he did not personally believe in.

As is well-known, overall direction of U.S. foreign policy has been placed in the hands of the Vice President, and many of his former Senate aides and political allies now hold key policymaking and evaluation posts in the Department of State and National Security Council.

The United Nations Ambassador works with these anti-Africa activists in formulating the actualities of America's

sellout not only of the white ruled countries of southern Africa, but also soon of our remaining friends in black-ruled Africa.

Concrete indications of a drastic change in U.S. African policy came last summer with the completion of a U.S. AID study not on whether, but on how the United States, anticipating an armed takeover of Rhodesia, Southwest Africa and eventually South Africa by the "national liberation movements," would supply food, technical assistance and other logistical aid to the regimes set up by these Marxist-Leninist, Soviet-backed terrorist groups in expectation that all agriculture, mining and social services would be destroyed by fighting and the death or flight of technically advanced white population.

On the evening of January 25, following that day's confirmation hearing, the CBS network televised a recorded interview with Ambassador Andrew Young conducted by Dan Rather on its "Who's Who" program. First Mr. Young argued that a bloodbath in southern Africa could be prevented only if the United States joins in support of the "national liberation movements."

In light of the over 15-year record for terrorist violence compiled by the "liberation movements," it is difficult to understand how Mr. Young can believe that the "liberation movements" would be less savage if we helped them take over. The fact remains that the African National Congress—ANC—of South Africa, the Southwest Africa People's Organization—SWAPO—and the Zimbabwe African People's Union—ZAPU—in Rhodesia profess Marxist-Leninist totalitarian ideologies, are sponsored and supported by the Soviet Union and were receiving such support long before the creation of the Organization of African Unity. The Pan Africanist Congress of South Africa—PAC—and the Zimbabwe African National Union—ZANU—espouse the Maoist variant of Marxism-Leninism and are sponsored and supported by Peking.

Since Mr. Young is a personal friend of Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe, the founder and leader of the Pan-Africanist Congress whose terrorist arm is called Poqo, he might be expected to be aware of the Maoist stance of the PAC which states it is waging a "people's war" that is actually only the usual terrorism.

Or indeed, since Andrew Young was a Member of this House last summer, he might be expected to know about the statements made by the spokesmen for the southern African "liberation movements" at a conference held in the U.S. Senate by the Fund for New Priorities in America. There the PAC spokesman joined with his fellow terrorists to state that whites living in southern Africa should not be permitted to emigrate in the event of a takeover because they owed a "blood debt" to the "liberation movements" which they clearly intend to collect.

Perhaps in Mr. Young's terminology, a "bloodbath" is a long drawn out process, so that if the United States joins in supporting the "liberation movements" and

aids in collapsing South Africa and Rhodesia, then all the slaughter will be over relatively quickly.

I would again draw attention to the fact that these terrorist "national liberation movements" whose leaders were trained in strategy by the Communist superpowers have always deliberately made the civilians, black and white, on farms and rural villages, their main target for butchery so that the survivors would be demoralized if not into cooperation with the terrorists, then into non-opposition. ZANU, ZAPU, and SWAPO have been particularly active in this sort of terrorism. A SWAPO member called F. Nangolo was executed on May 30. Described by SWAPO as a "political prisoner," this "freedom fighter's" "fight against oppression" consisted of murdering a black woman and child on one farm and a white farmer and his wife on another.

Returning to the January 25 CBS interview, Rather asked Young:

But isn't an armed, protracted guerrilla warfare already assured with the presence of the Cubans and the Soviet Union's influence in that part of the world?

To this, Ambassador Young replied:

No, it's not assured. In fact, there's a sense in which the Cubans bring a certain stability and order to Angola, for instance, in that the enemy all over the world I think is chaos. \* \* \* I have no question in my mind but that we could negotiate very successfully a withdrawal of Cuban troops from southern Africa.

The "stability" brought to Angola by the Soviet Union's Cuban surrogates is the "stability" of the most oppressive, brutal and systematic form of totalitarianism ever developed in this world, Marxist-Leninist communism. What is significant is that communism's rigidity is offered as the alternative to "chaos."

The Cuban troops in Africa have been performing invaluable services for the Soviet Union not only in conquering a substantial portion of Angola but in retraining and equipping the Katangan guerrillas and sending them against Zaire and now in large numbers moving into Ethiopia to aid and "advise" the revolutionary Marxist military regime in that country strategically located on the Red Sea.

Since the Cuban military forces are proving such valuable assets for Soviet expansionism in Africa and appear to be essential to the success of any major armed action against the southern African countries, the price for their removal from Africa in any "negotiations" would not only be U.S. collusion in causing the collapse of the southern African countries via economic and arms embargoes, but doubtless also include assurances that only the Soviet-controlled terrorist movements would take power and not those sponsored by Red China.

On his African trips, Ambassador Young has met repeatedly with the leaders of the terrorist movements, as well as with the rulers of the so-called "frontline" states which border South Africa and Rhodesia. Of these, Angola and Mozambique are Communist dictatorships ruled by the Soviet-backed

Marxist-Leninist terrorist movements who took over these former Portuguese colonies in 1975 following a leftwing military coup in Portugal. Tanzania is another Marxist-Leninist dictatorship which under its President Julius Nyerere has moved from allegiance to Peking's "Mao Thought" to alliance with the Soviets who have a shorter supply line. And the current principal adviser to Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda is the KGB "apparatchik" serving as the Soviet Ambassador in Lusaka.

Ambassador Young has himself emphasized that his "controversial" activist positions in favor of the terrorist movements are in fact the new foreign policy of the administration. On June 24, in an interview on WETA-TV, the local Washington affiliate of the taxpayer-funded Public Broadcasting System, Ambassador Young listed several nations on the African continent which had "achieved their independence through armed struggle." The three countries he specifically mentioned, Algeria, Angola, and Mozambique, actually attained "independence" in the form of a Marxist dictatorship following a prolonged campaign of terrorist atrocity. Ambassador Young continued stating:

\* \* \* even in those situations, there was a strong negotiating component. Now, the United States is trying to be that negotiating component for the transfer of power with a minimum of violence and destruction [in southern Africa].

He continued:

And I think if you look at some of the things that were controversial about my coming into this job four months ago, they're no longer controversial. It's a fait accompli.

And the policy that I started talking about in southern Africa, [that] policy is a policy of the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the National Security Council, everybody.

And it's not that it was my policy, but it's that the people coming in with the Carter Administration had a commitment to doing something about the problems of southern Africa, and they understood that to be critical to the credibility of the United States amongst the majority of the nations of the world. And I knew that was going to be the policy before I took the job.

It will be recalled that just after his appointment to the United Nations position was announced last December, Mr. Young said, "We need a strong Vietnam," and speculated that "Vietnam could develop into an independent Communist nation like Yugoslavia and be a buffer against China." This spring a Presidential delegation was sent to Hanoi to get the Communists' assurances that they are holding no American POW's despite the evidence to the contrary. Continuing United States-Vietnamese Communist contacts have been established. Mr. Young told his WETA/PBS audience:

I knew essentially what the policy would be on Vietnam. When the Secretary of State said it a week before I did, nobody made any fuss. A week later I said that within ninety days we'd probably have some discussions going with Vietnam. I think it took maybe forty-five days; and those discussions continue.

Andrew Young also had some interesting comments on how he believes the

press controversy has aided the administration's radical changes in American foreign policy. He said:

The thing is Jimmy Carter got elected on a kind of anti-establishment campaign. I mean they [the press and the public] interpreted it as anti-Washington. It wasn't anti-Washington; it was anti-status quo, see.

Now, when the press attacks me, they are the establishment, see. And what they've done is they've built up a tremendous national constituency for me and the things I stand for.

So, while it has hurt me personally sometimes to see my ideas distorted, that very distortion has made ordinary people come to my support.

What Mr. Young is saying is that the press attacks on him have brought people to his personal support without their checking to find out what he actually said or what are the full implications of the policies Mr. Young and the administration are advocating.

I find it interesting that for example in regard to Andrew Young's January 25 CBS interview, conservatives and anti-Communists were most concerned with Mr. Young's acceptance, indeed welcome, of Cuban troops in Angola and other African lands, while the liberal press chose to take out of context his remark that "communism has never been a threat" when in fact Andrew Young was expressing a number of complex ideas in a long and involved paragraph.\*

The controversy in the press has served to obscure the fact that a new foreign policy is being instituted by this administration, a foreign policy in which not only Africa but the Asian mainland is

\*Mr. Young's comments came after justifying the presence of the Cuban troops in Angola by noting that South African forces had initially invaded a strip of Angolan territory to defend a hydroelectric facility. He continued:

"And I must say that I share the kind of total abhorrence to racism which I think is characteristic of two-thirds of the world. Most colored peoples of the world are not afraid of communism. Maybe that's wrong, but communism has never been a threat to me. I have no love for communism. I could never be a communist. I could never support that system of government. But—it's never been a threat. Racism has always been a threat—and that has been the enemy of all of my life and, and everything I know about life."

This is actually a consistent statement if Mr. Young means that it is racism by whites that he finds abhorrent, not racism by brown, black and yellow people such as the repression of the national minorities in China by the Han Chinese, or the animosity between Malays and Chinese in Singapore and Malaysia, or the mass deportation of ethnic East Indians from Uganda.

Again, it would seem that Mr. Young does not count the black Marxist-Leninist regimes in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Ethiopia, Tanzania, and so on as being "communist." Clearly the black-run regimes are only "nationalist" to Mr. Young who declines to make an objective analysis of the concrete conditions in those countries which would show their adherence to "scientific socialism"—a euphemism for communism. And it would appear that his abhorrence of the white-dominated countries of southern Africa is such that he would prefer to have new Angolas and Mozambiques established throughout southern Africa.

CXXIII—1405—Part 18

being abandoned to the Soviet and Red Chinese superpowers.

In my January testimony against the confirmation of Andrew Young I warned what the selection of Mr. Young as a principal instrument of American foreign policy must signify. I based my predictions on his actions and statements during his 15-year public career. I pointed out that in repeated instances, Mr. Young had collaborated with Marxist-Leninists and militants in causes relating to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. I would again remind my colleagues that on April 13, 1970, on an ABC-TV news production on the Black Panther Party, Mr. Young said:

Western technology and western militarism has so interfered with the right of—the possibility of, say, democracy in Latin America, or real freedom in Africa and Asia, that it may take the destruction—and this of course is Panther ideology—that it may take the destruction of western civilization to allow the rest of the world to really emerge as a free and brotherly society, and if the white west is incapable of brotherhood with colored peoples then this small body of colored peoples, black people within the white west, may be the revolutionary vanguard that God has ordained to destroy the whole thing.

Then in response to the question, "Would you support the destruction of Western civilization if you were convinced that the rest of the world would thereby be liberated?" Mr. Young replied, "I probably would."

The legislative branch also plays a role in the determination of U.S. foreign and domestic policies. We must be prepared to exercise our oversight and other functions to serve as an effective brake on the wildly careening administration coach.

#### THE TAX BURDEN

**HON. DOUGLAS WALGREN**  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the letter of a constituent expressing his frustration regarding the tax burden he and many others are being forced to accept:

#### THE TAX BURDEN

I'm writing to express my concern for the ever rising tax burden I and many others in my income bracket are forced to accept.

Someone in Congress has conveniently set \$20,000 as the lower end of middle income. As such, every new law, rule, or regulation excludes those above this income from any easement in the tax load.

This policy is unfair as is the fact that one's tax load rises sharply above \$20,000. The federal government has reaped a bonanza from inflation because no adjustments have been made in tax rates, even though you people know better than anyone that the additional income due to inflation really leaves people worse off. So "Uncle" compounds our misery with a bigger tax bite.

Since 1971, my income went up \$9,096 or 66%. Income taxes went up \$1,916 or 107.6%. I have just been awarded an increase of 27% property assessment. The county is prepar-

ing us for a 5 mill or 12% property tax raise. The state is dickering for 1% more sales tax and 2¢ gasoline tax (22% raise).

What I'm saying to you is this, "I'm getting poorer the more I make. I have a few more dollars but I'm worse off because the dollars are worth less and less."

I'm also tired seeing the starving poor buying new cars and color televisions while I buy their food stamps, pay their rent, light, heat, etc. I'm being milked by Washington and I'm getting mad. (Sorry, but I get carried away when I think about the injustice Washington creates.) Where is the incentive to make more money?

Anyhow, I guess I've made my point and hope you see it and agree.

#### 201 YEARS OLD TOMORROW

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Members return to Washington from the 4th of July district work period, I commend their attention to a 4th of July article appearing in one of the local papers in my district. This column was originally written by Dennis Wheeler, editor of the Orland Park Star Herald, in 1975, and has been updated for this year's Independence Day observances.

I feel that this is an expression of real grass roots Americanism, and I wish to insert it at this point:

... 201 YEARS OLD TOMORROW

(By Dennis Wheeler)

When I was born, most political observers in the world said I would be dead within a year.

But I fooled them and lasted through a bloody revolution.

Then there was a period of uncertainty, during which my own countrymen weren't sure whether there should be one of me or 13. Finally, in 1789 (when I was still a child of 13), they decided I would be exclusive in this nation. They wrote a Constitution that made that fact clear.

Since then I have been through some good times and some bad times.

There have been some times of shame and some times of triumph. There have been moments when I have been a symbol of hope around the world. Also times when I have been an object of derision.

I have been saluted, talked about with deep respect, folded carefully and ironed religiously, rushed out of bad weather because I was loved, given to mayors by Congressmen to be flown in small towns, draped over the caskets of dead heroes.

I have also been intentionally soiled, thrown on the ground and trampled upon, torn down from in front of foreign embassies, burned by angry citizens who believed I had lost my meaning.

There have been moments when I was not proud of the uses to which I have been put. Some of my people have used me as one of their excuses for unjust or self-serving activity.

For example, back in the 1800's they said the things I stand for were good reasons for invading Mexico and for going back on treaties with the red men in the West and for intentionally stirring up a fight on the northern border of Maine in order to take over some disputed territory from the British.

Later, in 1898, it was questionable to me (and still is to many historians) whether or

not I should have been carried by super-patriotic types up hills in Cuba and into harbors in the Philippine Islands. I suspected at the time that the real reason for all that was a belief among my country's leaders that our nation had a duty to become the policeman of our hemisphere.

Just a few years ago, in the 1960's, the same questions were raised about my symbolism. This time, the debate grew so bitter that some of my own countrymen—many of them patriotic in their own way—seared my threads with flames in a desperate effort to argue that I had no business being in far-off Viet Nam.

Others have mistreated me over the years, not always in a physical way.

Politicians, some later proven to be crooks, have for years pointed to me with apparent pride and extolled my virtues. Some of these had actual little regard for what I stand for. In fact, some tried to use me as an accomplice in suppression—suppression of dissent, suppression of debate, suppression of racial and religious freedom.

But these low moments in my incredibly exciting 201-year life have been few. For most of my life, I have been so proud I have often thought I would unravel.

There was the night I was seen in the terrifying flashes of a sea war by a man named Key. The sight of me in that fearful moment moved the man to write majestic music in my behalf. I am proud that I still hear this music often. I am also proud that most of my countrymen still sing the words to the music with as much pride as I feel.

A little over one hundred years ago, my country was temporarily torn in two. One of my brothers flew in half the country and we were both wrenched by it. When the disruption was over, I again became the only one of a kind and this was accepted despite consuming post-war bitterness in our southern areas.

It is with deep pride that I can report the bitterness has ebbed and unity has returned. In fact, many think I am treated with more aplomb and dignity in the areas that once rebelled than in the northern places where it is possible I am taken sometimes for granted.

In 1917, I was carried across cratered fields in France, where my presence undoubtedly did much to save freedom in Europe. I am proud of that.

The same is so about my adventures overseas some 25 years later. That was a few years after some men filled with hatred held me up to scorn and tried to turn me into an object of disgust. I was in on the glory of the world's salvation from these men and some of the most threatening and inhuman ideologies the world has ever known.

There is one memory in particular I will always treasure. You've seen pictures of it. It was when my soldiers pushed me up on top of a mountain in Iwo Jima. Grown men cry when they look at the pictures.

Possibly "he thing I am most proud of is that I am the oldest of my kind in the world.

One of my cousins lived only a few weeks in 1917 in Russia.

Another stayed alive only three years in Czechoslovakia before he was slain by Communists.

Later, in the same country, a distant cousin was clanked into the pavement by tanks from the Soviet Union. The same thing happened to another brother a few years earlier in Hungary.

Relatives of mine have gone up and gone down in various places around the world. But only here in America has a Constitutional form of government preserved one of me for as long as 200 years.

Everybody has memories to be proud of or to be sad because of. Not everybody can be always proud of what they mean.

I can.

Despite the awful times, like when some of my leaders—Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, Kennedy—were needlessly murdered by fellow Americans, I remain proud of my meaning.

In spite of Haymarket Square, the Ku Klux Klan, Joseph McCarthy, My Lai, Watergate, the 1968 Democratic convention, the ouster of the Bonus Army, Birmingham, Selma and George Wallace in the Doorway, I remain proud of my meaning.

My meaning was and is that people, not kings or despots, should rule.

My meaning is that all persons should have the same chance to succeed.

My meaning is that the laws of the people are the alternative to the edicts of the few. And that the laws of the people may be changed for the better by the people.

My meaning is that the revolution in which I was born 200 years ago is an ongoing phenomenon. That change and improvement are built into the system through the use of voting booths.

My meaning is that people can speak their minds, pray in freedom, be tried for crimes by their peers.

Above all, my meaning is that a very advanced degree of personal freedom is possible even in a complicated society as long as there is the people's law.

Tomorrow, I'll be 201.

All over the nation, people will fly me in front of their homes.

I hope the same people will also pause to consider anew my meaning. That way, I'll live at least another 201 years, no matter what comes.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS PARADE

### HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the Polish-American community is a vibrant part of Cleveland's community. The following is a statement made by State Auditor Thomas E. Ferguson as the principal speaker at Polish Constitution Day observance sponsored by the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress, Inc., Casimir Bielen, general chairman, 6821 Fleet Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, telephone 641-6056. This event was held on May 1, 1977, in Greater Cleveland, Ohio. A large "Human Rights Parade" preceded the formal program held in front of the Alliance of Poles, 6968 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

#### STATEMENT

Reverend clergy, honored guests, officers and members of the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress, and friends:

It is a great honor to be granted the opportunity to address you on this the most important of Polish holidays, the anniversary of the Constitution of the Third of May. Polish history is rich with moments of glory and heroism as well as times of trial and sorrow. The Polish people could have chosen the date of any one of their great victories in battle, their revolutions against foreign tyranny or the mourning of a great tragedy to elevate to the position of foremost national day. Yet, they chose instead to honor the anniversary of their constitution, the most democratic of its day in Europe. Nothing could speak more highly for the Polish people. Americans are filled with admiration for this demonstration of Polish values and priorities.

The anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 is particularly relevant this year. As we reflect on our proud two centuries as a free nation, it seems evident that it is our constitution and the principles of justice, liberty and equality which are the essence of our heritage. The Polish Constitution was based on the same principles. Its adoption amounted to a revolution, a truly dramatic break with the past—different in form, but not in spirit, from our American Revolution.

The central theme of today's Polish Constitution Day centers around "human rights." Today the Soviets are marching on Red Square for less "human rights," while the Poles in Greater Cleveland are marching down Fleet Avenue for more "human rights" throughout the world. The "human rights" embodied in that first Constitution adopted in Poland in 1791 do not exist in today's Poland.

The Carter Administration in its first few weeks, has spoken out strongly against the lack of "human rights" in Poland and other Eastern European Nations. On August 1, 1975, the United States, the Soviet Union, and 33 other nations signed the Helsinki Pact. This pact was supposed to allow more "human rights" in Poland and other countries dominated by the Soviet Union. The Russians have consistently violated the "human rights" aspects of the Helsinki Pact. Through the efforts of Congressman Millicent Fenwick, the U.S. Congress passed the "watchdog legislation" to monitor the "human rights" sections of the Helsinki Pact. The Russians, however, have refused to allow this "watchdog committee" to enter the Eastern European Nations to determine if the Russians are conforming to their agreement. It is also my understanding that the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress, Inc., played a leading national role in getting the U.S. Congress to pass the "watchdog legislation." Your public affairs director Casimir Bielen played a central role in this campaign. Each senator and key representative was contacted.

President Carter is championing "human rights" throughout the world. The President's strategy is to keep the Soviet Union on the defensive. Carter has seized the ideological initiative with his human rights campaign. Moscow is worried and is hitting back hard. Moscow is accusing the United States of "interfering in their domestic affairs." Our answer should be that the Soviet Union has been sowing distrust in American hearts for many years. It has violated agreements with us regularly. President Carter said, "I am firmly committed to more 'human rights' not only as it deals with the Soviet Union but all other countries."

All of this is in striking contrast to the position taken on the subject of human rights by Presidents Nixon and Ford and by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The clearest example of the unwillingness of the U.S. to involve itself in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union during that period came with Ford's refusal, on the advice of Dr. Kissinger, to meet with Alexander Solzhenitsyn the Russian exiled writer. Now that he is out of office, Ford says this refusal was an error.

The Carter Administration position on "human rights" should be applauded. It is long overdue.

While Soviet Leader protest against U.S. policies on human rights and arms control, the Carter Administration is going ahead with yet another move sure to anger the Kremlin.

The Administration is pushing for a sharp step-up in U.S. efforts to broadcast news to the peoples of Russia and Eastern Europe.

President Carter wants to build powerful new transmitters to penetrate the jamming of U.S. broadcasts by Communist regimes. If Congress goes along, millions of new listeners would be added to the about 100 million Soviet-bloc citizens who already are

reached by the Voice of America and two other U.S. financed radio networks.

The architect of the broadcast policy is Carter's national-security adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski. The Polish-born aide believes the U.S. has unwisely neglected Eastern Europe in recent years. Brzezinski favors increased people-to-people contacts, in contrast to the government-to-government approach of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. And he sees radio broadcasts as a good medium for such contacts.

President Carter should also be recognized for the exit of Helmut Sonnenfeldt, the Kissinger assistant, who advocated the "organic integration" of Eastern European Nations with the Soviet Union. Under this policy, Poland and other Captive Nations would be absorbed into the Soviet Union like Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Stability in Europe is certainly a goal shared by rational people everywhere. Stability, however, will come through liberalization within Eastern Europe and the freer flow of people, ideas and information between East and West. The United States must, therefore, continue to encourage programs toward these ends. I am confident that the American people will not accept a shift away from this sound policy. The support and encouragement of trends toward greater freedom in Poland and other countries corresponds to present day American interests and is in harmony with our democratic traditions. Coincidentally, it is also consistent with the principles espoused by the Polish Constitution of the Third of May.

Thank you.

#### TEN YEARS A CARDINAL

### HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I paid tribute to John Cardinal Cody, Archbishop of Chicago, who recently commemorated his 10th anniversary as a Cardinal.

While I was home in Chicago during the recent recess, I read a tribute to the Cardinal in the New World, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

This editorial, written by A. E. P. Wall, the editor of the New World, appeared in the July 1 issue of that newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share this editorial with my colleagues in the House. The editorial, "Ten Years a Cardinal," reads as follows:

#### TEN YEARS A CARDINAL

(By A. E. P. Wall)

Ten years ago a man and an archdiocese were honored in an uncommon way.

Now the people and the institutions of that archdiocese honor the man.

They honor him for the special dedication, even the hard labor, required for the leadership of the largest archdiocese in the United States.

Many have called it an almost impossible job, and few would bear up under its burdens.

John Patrick Cody, named a cardinal of the Church a decade ago, has carried that burden since he became the sixth Archbishop of Chicago in 1965.

For the Church, the world and the country the past dozen years have included progress and crisis, harmony, and tumult, consensus and dissent.

It is a period that has demanded much from its leaders, taken much from them; a period of quick criticism and muted praise.

It has been a time of paradox, with earnest cries for strong leadership and resistance to it.

Few are required, even for a day, to carry the responsibilities that press upon the Archbishop of Chicago. Few are equipped to handle those responsibilities even when they are supported by the affection and good will of those they serve. Even fewer are able to carry on when criticism turns into resistance.

The demands of leadership, seldom light, are rarely as intense as those presented day by day and hour by hour to the one who is responsible before God for the spiritual welfare of two and a half million members of the universal Church.

It is a responsibility that includes concern for the solution of problems that have defied the specialists in many fields. For John Cardinal Cody this required labor and leadership in helping to meet the needs of young and old who seek an education nourished by Christian faith; of the sick, those who need physical, mental or emotion support; of the socially disadvantaged, including the poor and neglected of all ages; of all the victims of prejudice and all whose lives are blighted by circumstances within the power of Church, family, government, community or institution to solve.

These concerns of Chicago's cardinal go beyond the work of the Church itself, but the scope of that work alone is almost incomprehensible to friends, supporters and critics.

For Cardinal Cody is responsible, as a successor to the apostles, for no fewer than 445 parishes. Pause a moment to think about the involvements of one parish, and then ponder the implication of responsibility for 445 parishes.

Within his direct area of responsibility are six colleges and universities, 25 diocesan and parochial high schools, 49 private high schools, 388 parochial elementary schools and nine more private elementary schools; 23 general hospitals and six schools for nurses; three homes for dependent children and 16 for invalids and the aged; 10 seminaries; enough cemeteries to cover a dozen square miles.

There's much more than that to call upon the time, attention and stamina of the Archbishop of Chicago.

For Cardinal Cody there are further responsibilities of a national and international dimension, including a continuing service to the Holy See.

He is a man equipped for such service, a man of personal warmth and wide education. He's earned three doctorates, and is serious about a bishop's role as teacher.

To children throughout the area, to the thousands of adults he encounters year by year in his pastoral work, to the sick he visits in hospitals, to accident victims who often find him at hand even before their treatment begins, to the elderly who experience his personal ministry, to those who work takes them frequently to his busy desk, John Cardinal Cody is known not as a remote public figure but as a warm and encouraging friend.

Tens of thousands of readers of this newspaper were not yet born when, in 1931, John Patrick Cody was ordained on December 8 in Rome.

Thousands of other readers cannot recall the day 30 years ago when Father Cody was consecrated a bishop.

Today that man is known as one who is determined to lead, to serve God and God's people—a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church who retains all of the enthusiasm, creativity and devotion of the Father Cody ordained nearly 46 years ago.

#### OUTRAGEOUS HOSPITAL CHARGE

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, a plain-speaking constituent of mine who has frequent dealings with the health care system has written to me explaining the hardships many patients face. She has experienced and witnessed the major problems with the current insurance arrangements. She offers clear examples of outrageous hospital charges and sensitively describes the fear of those who simply cannot afford to make up the difference when a hospital demands more than "allowable charges." You will find her account infuriating and moving. She simply reports the facts.

The account follows:

MAY 10, 1977.

Rep. WILLIAM LEHMAN of Florida,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REP. LEHMAN: I always feel you pay attention to my letters and I try to make it something important.

I was recently hospitalized for 10 days. I am a heart patient and have been in several times so I know something about hospital policies. I must say they are just awful now. My bill was over \$3,300 when it use to be about a thousand. If you ever are going to bring down health care costs, you should start with the hospitals! I know some doctors overcharge, but I haven't had that experience—it's the padding of bills and if you dare question them, they get awfully mad. They are a mean bunch and immediately go on the defensive which shows they know they are wrong. Put a ceiling on what they can charge. I will not name the hospital but the doctors seem to have no control on how much they will run up a bill. They gang up together and all do the same thing. For instance, I had to have a PT each day, a simple blood test for the clotting of the blood. That was because of my heart. I have no blood trouble, and my laboratory bill should have been no more than \$110. But they billed me for \$599—making tests costing \$40 and \$50 that I didn't need. They said Medicare paid it, why are you kicking? I told them because it wasn't right. I didn't need it. They got mad at me.

Then I asked for a heating pad for neuralgia in my leg one night. I supposed they would just loan it to me for a while, but they left it down there 6 days, part of the time it was hanging on the wall. When I got my bill, I found they charged me \$8.95 a day rent for it, or over \$50.00. You can buy a good new one for about \$12.00 that will last for years. Wish I had taken mine along but they probably wouldn't have let me use it. Also, the doctor ordered 2 pairs of elastic stockings for me and they charged me over \$40.00 for them! You can get them for about \$5.00 a pair in a store that sells these things. These things I know were padded—altogether my bill was at least \$700.00 more than it should have been. They charged me over a hundred dollars for medicines when I could have bought them and taken them myself for 3 or 4 dollars! Your real "rip-off" is from the hospitals. There is no end to what they will charge and the Congress should put tight controls on them.

Don't give my name to anyone, I am intimidated, afraid. Why not ask people to write in or send their bill in for investigation. Surely the Congress can do something.

JUNE 13, 1977.

DEAR MR. LEHMAN: I am not sure Medicare won't be up to their old tricks of disallowing certain charges, then the patient has to pay them. They just take a pencil and mark through the charges and in the next column write "allowable charges", meaning all they will pay. The patient has to pay the difference. Then Blue Shield will pay only what Blue Cross allows and again the patient has to pay the difference. They are terribly expensive too (Blue Shield).

I had something like that when I was hospitalized as I wrote you. I am a heart patient and they had no room in intensive care. So they put me in Progressive Care which is a "nothing." Just having a little something around your neck that picks up the heart beat in the intensive care room. That was all. Still they charged me \$185.00 per day for that room as intensive care. Dr. said it was not. The room I was in was wired for Telemetry, which is what I had. Dr. had to make a call to my room, then to the real intensive care room, to follow the chart and get their reports, then come back to my room and record it on the chart there. It all took twice as long.

When I got my bill the charge was not for the regular \$20.00 which they allowed, but he charged \$25.00 because of the extra time he spent. But they would only allow me \$20.00 and I had to pay the difference. Blue Cross said for me to write in for a review and see if they wouldn't pay for the extra Telemetry calls, because of the extra time involved. They wrote back "no—\$20.00 was all they allow." So again I had to pay.

Can't you put into that bill that they can't push the difference on to the poor patient?

JUNE 17, 1977.

I had another bad experience this week. Because of much dizziness etc., my Dr. thought I should have a brain scan. I took one 5 or 6 years ago. It required an hour in time, he took about 10 pictures and the charge was about \$100 dollars. This time he spent 30 minutes doing it and took only 4 pictures. The charge was \$175.00.

When I came out a woman was sitting at a desk and said, "You owe me \$175.00." Of course I complained. She said we are *tightening up* and charging and collecting *now*. I asked her if everybody who came in there had \$175.00 for her, she said, "not always, but we try to collect now." I asked her why not send it to Medicare and Blue Shield for me like you used to do—then they pay you? She said "We don't do that anymore—we want it *now*." She was ugly about it, too, Mr. Lehman. The only answer is a National Health Insurance as much as I dislike it. It's better than nearly doubled charges now. People can't go on. It is a shame. I saw two young fellows in their 30's—she demanded \$81.50 from him and \$75.00, from the other one. They were perhaps mechanics or some such work. They had their wallets open and one asked her to take a Master Charge or something—the other one asked her to take a check and they both looked worried to death. They just couldn't afford it.

#### THE JEWS OF ILYINKA

### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

With a contempt typical of totalitarian regimes, the government of the

Soviet Union continues to harass its own citizens, to deny them the basic right of living their lives as they see fit, or to leave the oppressive surroundings of a nation which has made its contempt for them clear. The Soviets continue this harassment at the very time they are engaged in discussion of the implementation of the Helsinki Accords, signed last year, which includes provisions guaranteeing the human rights of signatory nations' citizens.

Lest any of us continue to have doubts about the Soviet's contemptuous interpretation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords and their treatment of Basket Three as meaningless and inapplicable, I would like to share the following report prepared by the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry on the plight of 120 families in the village of Ilyinka in the U.S.S.R.:

#### THE JEWS OF ILYINKA

Traditional Jewish life is still maintained by most of the inhabitants of the Jewish village of Ilyinka in the Voronezh region of the USSR.

The origins of this singular settlement of 120 families comprising some 650 souls in the midst of rural Russia are unclear. Russians call these Jews "geri", similar to the Hebrew term of "ger" for convert, and it is possible they were converted some time in the 19th century. There were originally three Jewish villages in the region; two assimilated completely and are now Russian. The authorities are pressuring the Ilyinka Jews to assimilate as well. Despite this, their dedication to Jewish tradition is so great that at least 90 percent still are observant of the Commandments as Kashrut, the Sabbath, circumcision, covering of the head by men and married women, and daily prayer in the Ashkenazi tradition. They have contact with the Moscow Synagogue from which they receive some calendars, mezuzot and other ritual items.

In Ilyinka, as in all of the Soviet Union, the rest day is officially Sunday. It is very hard to keep the Sabbath on Saturday, but the Jews refuse to work and attempt to suspend all tasks. Ilyinka is a *kolhoz*—collective farm—and the authorities are making Sabbath observance more and more difficult.

Nine of ten Ilyinka Jews would like to make aliyah. Their problems with the authorities arose when Shmuel Matveev's sister emigrated with her family from Baku in 1974 and sent official invitations to her siblings in Ilyinka. In the next few months, several families managed to leave. In retaliation, the authorities announced they would no longer tolerate the departure of the Ilyinkaites, declaring they did not recognize them as Jews.

Meanwhile, the KGB summoned Shmuel Matveev for a talk about "propaganda", and his sister's letters from Israel were never delivered. He stopped working in protest; his son Yakov was immediately drafted. KGB officials told Shmuel he was a "rebel", and he was arrested and imprisoned for a month during Passover 1975. For three days Shmuel only drank tea because he was given chametz which he would not eat. He was accused of saying dirty words to someone in the street, but demanded witnesses which the authorities could not produce. "We believe our witnesses more than you," he was told. During the interrogation he asked if he had been imprisoned because of his desire to go to Israel, and understood from the official's response that the answer was "yes".

After a month in prison, he was released with the promise that he would soon receive an exit visa. But 1½ years passed, during which time he wrote many appeals, before he

could leave with his wife Dina, son Yakov, and daughters Rachel and Ida, and in the end was given only 10 days to clear out and not even permitted to sell his house. "If you are late you'll never be allowed to go," he was told. Others have been given one or two months to settle their affairs.

Most Ilyinka Jews are not as fortunate, and the invitations from Israel are kept in the desk of the kolhoz chairman V. Tarasov who occasionally shows them to the Jews saying, "Don't even hope to get them because you have no business going to Israel." Shmuel himself was shown 120 undelivered invitations and told, "We don't want you to go to the Zionists. We hate you."

Nevertheless, families have managed to receive the invitations through relatives who live in other parts of the country, sometimes 1000 kilometers away. But this is not easy at all, as the authorities seek to isolate Ilyinka as much as possible. For example, Grigory Efimovich Varnavsky's son-in-law, who lives in Tollaty, had managed to receive their invitations in his name. When he set off to take them to Ilyinka, he was caught by the police, but managed to escape. By the time he was recaptured an hour later, he had already passed the documents to an Ilyinka inhabitant, who delivered them to the Varnavskys.

But often even those with invitations are blocked, as the kolhoz chairman simply does not write out the recommendations required by OVIR, the emigration office in Voronezh. Since collective farm residents do not have internal passports, the Ilyinka Jews cannot move to a more favorable location.

In June 1976, three Moscow Jewish refuseniks attempted to visit Ilyinka to interview the Jews, but were seized by police within three kilometers of the village, searched, interrogated for two days, and thrown out of the area. Village Soviet chairman V. Lebydev told them that "the atmosphere in the village is very strained and unhealthy and that the village soviet would not allow anybody to interfere in the affairs of the village."

On June 19, 1976, a local newspaper, Zariya, attacked Shmuel Matveev's exit application, declaring, "Who wants this man to leave Russia? Only the Zionists from Tel Aviv and the U.S."

There are now at least sixty "refusenik" families in Ilyinka. The situation there is described by Ilyinkaites now in Israel as "like under Hitler. The Jews are isolated, they cannot leave, and it is near impossible to receive invitations now." Even Shmuel's daughter Rivka who lives in Dnepropetrovsk and has not applied to leave suffered a nervous breakdown as a result of her parents' suffering before their exit.

Ilyinka's existence was accidentally discovered by Soviet Jewish emigration leaders. It is entirely possible there are many more isolated, unknown groups of Jews scattered throughout Russia dreaming of coming home to Israel.

This SSSJ report is based on documents from the unofficial Moscow Helsinki watchdog committee, and especially on interviews conducted in Israel by SSSJ coordinators Michael Sabin and Rita Laufer, with the help of Luba Reines.

#### YOUTH CAMPS ARE A STATE MATTER

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have pointed out that there are limits on what the Federal

Government can or ought to do. Washington bureaucrats should not have their fingers in every actual or apparent problem. Many matters should be left to the judgments of State and local governments.

Unfortunately, however, the trend has been to federalize the issues. A bill recently reported out of the Education and Labor Committee on which I serve—the Youth Camp Safety Act—is one more example of Federal intrusion into State and local affairs.

This bill would establish national standards for youth camps. A new Office of Youth Camp Safety within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would issue rules and regulations affecting the more than 10,000 youth camps in America.

Nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick, in arguing against the bill, recently wrote the following:

The bill falls into a pattern that crops up with ominous frequency in Washington. The wrong-headed theory behind this pattern is that uniformity is good, diversity is bad; federal control is superior, state regulation is inadequate; Congress understands the needs of the people, the state legislatures do not. . . . Through this insidious process, the states systematically are reduced to little more than administrative agencies for the exercise of federal power.

I strongly agree with these views. We need less, not more. Federal control and bureaucratic regulations. The proposed Youth Camp Safety Act should be defeated.

Following is the full text of Mr. Kilpatrick's article:

**JAMES J. KILPATRICK—YOUTH CAMPS ARE A STATE MATTER**

Let me return to the pending Youth Camp Safety Act. The bill came out of the House Education and Labor Committee by a 25-7 vote on May 13; it now rests in House Rules, awaiting a green light to send it to the floor. The bill is a fundamentally bad bill—and the adverb merits emphasis.

Our structure of government rests upon two fundamental principles. One is the separation of powers, which has no bearing here. The other is federalism, which is directly at issue.

This well-intentioned but misguided bill would create a new Office of Youth Camp Safety within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The director of this office, with the assistance of an advisory council, would promulgate rules and regulations having the force and effect of law. These rules would be binding upon the estimated 10,500 youth camps across the nation.

The director's authority would include, but it would not be limited to: "personnel qualifications for director and staff; ratio of staff to campers; sanitation and public health; personal health, first aid and medical services; food handling, mass feeding and cleanliness; water supply and waste disposal; water safety, including use of lakes and rivers; swimming and boating equipment and practices; firearms safety; vehicle condition and operation; building and site design; equipment; and condition and density of use."

The committee report gives lip service—but no more than lip service—to the thought that these are primarily state responsibilities. The general idea is that the states are to be encouraged to enact their own laws embodying at least the minimum standards laid down by the federal office. But (and this is the first hooker), any state that failed or

refused to enact such legislation would be federally controlled anyhow; and (this is the second hooker), even those states that did comply would remain subject to continuing federal jurisdiction and monitoring.

The bill includes all the usual trimmings: inspectors, reports, forms, statistical data, fines of \$500 to \$1,000 a day for non-compliance, rights of appeal in the federal courts, and so forth. All this elaborate structure is designed to provide campers with safe and healthful conditions free from hazards likely to cause death, serious illness or serious accident.

To return to the main point: The bill falls into a pattern that crops up with ominous frequency in Washington. The wrong-headed theory behind this pattern is that uniformity is good, diversity is bad; federal control is superior, state regulation is inadequate; Congress understands the needs of the people, the state legislatures do not.

We see this pattern in pending proposals for a federal no-fault insurance law. We see it in President Carter's instant registration bill. We have seen it in such areas as occupational safety, clean air standards, and in hundreds of programs requiring matching funds for federal grants in aid. Through this insidious process, the states systematically are reduced to little more than administrative agencies for the exercise of federal power.

It was never meant to be this way. The Tenth Amendment, that great key to the house of our fathers, sets forth the American plan in words that are too plain to be misunderstood and too precious to be corrupted: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Surely the power to regulate youth camps could not reasonably be numbered among the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution.

**JAMES R. SCHLESINGER**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know the Honorable James R. Schlesinger for a number of years. At the present time my dealings with him as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Technology have brought me rather close to him.

There have been many individuals in the Washington arena who have been the subject of writers describing their traits and characteristics; but I do not believe any can match the description of Mr. Schlesinger as written by Mr. Fialka of the Washington Star. Mr. Fialka has caught Mr. Schlesinger in all of his many positions of public service, of which there are many. He is truly a public servant, dedicated to this country and to his own personal beliefs, and I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, the article by Mr. Fialka:

**HE PLAYS EACH GAME BY ITS OWN RULES**

"So far, war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way."—William James, "The Moral Equivalent of War."

(By John J. Fialka)

The command center for President Carter's "moral equivalent of war"—the effort to

unite the nation to solve the energy crisis—is a cramped, somewhat disorderly office in the west wing of the White House.

On nearly every flat surface, there rests an open can of pipe tobacco. The desk is a tangle of file folders and paper. The man who runs the office is an amateur bird watcher who wears rumpled suits. Sometimes he shows up for work wearing one red sock and one blue sock, but nobody mentions it.

The picture of the bird he has hung on the wall near his desk may be the visitor's first clue that this man is not your prototypically disorganized, gentle, absent-minded professor. It is a portrait of the white gyrfalcon, one of the most ruthlessly efficient hunters in nature. It can plummet with blinding speed, catching lesser birds unaware, killing them in midair.

"Oh that," explains James R. Schlesinger, offhandedly. "That's just something the Air Force once gave me."

At age 48, Schlesinger is now among the most durable, veteran players in Washington's public arena. In 1970 we saw him as the young assistant director at the Office of Management and Budget who infuriated the military by pruning their budgets.

Then there was Jim Schlesinger the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and Jim Schlesinger the head of the CIA. Then there was Jim Schlesinger Secretary of Defense, who was fired after complaining bitterly that the White House and Congress were pruning the Defense budget.

"He plays each game as he finds it, by its own rules," explained one veteran Schlesinger watcher. "And he plays it hard."

By this time he has mastered much of the town's bureaucratic machinery. He knows the ropes at the White House and he knows more of our military and defense secrets, perhaps, than any living man.

Now meet Jim Schlesinger in his latest role—Schlesinger the lobbyist, the man picked to convince Congress and the public to submit to President Carter's energy package, one of the most complex and far-reaching economic changes ever to be sent up to the Hill.

**HIS FAVORITE METHOD: ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS**

On the surface, Schlesinger does not seem to be cut out for lobbying. He is not a backslapper or a gladhander. He has none of that slow, easy charm that seems to sell so well on Capitol Hill. He hates small talk and is said to abhor cocktail parties.

How does he do it? With the facts. Facts. He pounds them in, makin' as many as 30 of what lobbyists call "personal contacts" with congressmen—either by phone or in person—on a given day. His favorite method is "one on one," a quiet give-and-take with a member that might produce that extra vote.

How well is he doing? It depends whether you talk to his friends or his enemies—over the years Schlesinger has acquired a number of each. According to his enemies, none of whom wanted to be quoted, Schlesinger has been guilty of oversell.

"He can be a pain in the ass," said one committee chairman. "He pushes too goddamn hard. Sometimes he wears you a little thin. He keeps boring in and boring in. He keeps pestering and bothering you."

"I enjoy the exchange with him," said a younger House Democrat. "The thing about Schlesinger, what's nice, is if you make a point with Schlesinger, he absorbs it. From that point on he's adjusted his argument to accept the point that you've made."

"He has better rapport with younger members than older ones," the congressman added. "It's funny. Ideologically, he is closer to the chairman than the younger members. It's a mixed bag."

Just what will come out of this "mixed bag" this fall, when the energy package may be completed by Congress, is uncertain. There have already been heralded victories and defeats, but "this is the first inning of a nine-inning ball game," as one Schlesinger aide noted.

#### HE'LL BE AN ENERGY CHIEF WITH CZAR-LIKE QUALITIES

What is certain is that when the fruit of his work, the new Department of Energy (DOE), comes into being, with an estimated \$10.5 billion annual budget and nearly 20,000 employees (making it the 7th most expensive federal agency), the nation will have its first "energy czar" with some truly czar-like qualities.

Since Schlesinger signed on last winter as President Carter's chief energy adviser, the press has had only a few glimpses of him. The most memorable one was on April 20 after Schlesinger and his staff had spent two months of seven-day weeks, struggling to meet Carter's deadline to send the energy package to Congress.

The deadline was met. Schlesinger was ready to explain the package's complexities to more than 300 reporters who jammed an Old Executive Office Building auditorium for a background briefing. Everything was in order except for a lone reporter in front who wanted to ask a question before Schlesinger had completed his presentation.

"We'll run this thing," Schlesinger said, glowering at him. The questions came when they were supposed to come, at the end of the briefing.

A little thing, but little things like this add up during a public career as long as Schlesinger's. The 20 or so people interviewed for this story all admitted that Schlesinger often seems kind of arrogant.

#### HIS BEST FRIENDS ADMIT HE'S AN ARROGANT MAN

Even his best friends will tell you this. "Goddamn right, it's arrogance. And it's not a kind of arrogance, either, it is arrogance," explained Joe Laitin, currently the top press aide at the Treasury, and one of Schlesinger's longest friends in Washington.

It is not, Laitin added, that Schlesinger goes out of his way to antagonize people. "He wants to make damn sure that people respect him for his mind. It would just kill him to think that people would like him for his charm. He'd feel defeated."

In February 1969, when Schlesinger first arrived in Washington as assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget, it seemed clear to Laitin that here was a man with the credentials to go far. As an undergraduate, Schlesinger was summa cum laude at Harvard. He obtained his Ph.D. in economics there in 1956.

After four years as an assistant professor of economics at the University of Virginia, Schlesinger produced a book, "The Political Economy of National Security," which challenged a number of strategic assumptions of the day, including the assumption that there would be enough oil to go around in time of war.

The book impressed the RAND Corp. and, in 1963, Schlesinger became a senior staff member of the California research company. Later he became RAND's director of strategic studies.

A man who has described himself as a "moderately conservative fellow," and an admirer of the late Republican leader Sen. Robert Taft, Schlesinger was deemed to have the right political stripe for the Nixon administration.

#### TOOK ON THE PENTAGON AS THE CHIEF OF OMB

Once installed at the Bureau of the Budget, Schlesinger promptly took on the Pentagon, asserting that it had "drowned itself" in poorly analyzed information from Vietnam. He also attacked major weapons programs,

trimming \$6 billion from Pentagon budget requests.

"I suddenly realized he was a remarkable young man" recalls Laitin, who was a Bureau of the Budget press aide at the time. "I decided that some of the people around town ought to get to know him."

Among "the people" Laitin knew were political columnists and a few veteran reporters. Schlesinger later proved to be a valuable contact for them because wherever he went he had a tendency to make waves.

After being named the head of the AEC in 1971, he held a meeting of nuclear power industry executives—members of an industry accustomed to extremely friendly dealings with the AEC—that "you should not expect the AEC to fight industry's political, social and commercial battles."

Later, Schlesinger confounded nuclear critics by bringing his wife and two of his daughters to Amchitka Island in the Aleutians to witness the test of a nuclear warhead that the critics charged would harm the island's environment.

In late 1972, Schlesinger became one of a handful of Nixon administration officials who escaped the widening vortex of Watergate by walking around its edges, filling the vacancies created by it.

#### JOB HE PRIZED MOST: SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

He replaced Richard Helms as director of the CIA and tore into the agency's "old boy" clandestine services operation. A thousand of the agency's 15,000 employees were dismissed or scheduled for early retirement.

On May 10, 1973, Schlesinger was given the one job he prized among all others in Washington, he became secretary of Defense when Elliot Richardson was shifted to the Justice Department to replace Richard G. Kleindienst.

At Defense he implemented a profound change in the nation's nuclear weapons strategy, switching from the theory of an all-out "assured destruction" rain of missiles that would obliterate major cities of the Soviet Union in the event of a nuclear attack on the United States or its allies.

Arguing that the devastation of such an attack might inhibit the United States from using its nuclear capability if the Russians decided to attack Western Europe, Schlesinger advanced the strategy of a "limited nuclear war," changing missile targeting so that the first waves of missiles could fall on military targets such as major oil facilities or missile silos.

The theory, as Schlesinger once explained it to a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, was that if it was clear to both sides that urban centers were not being hit "when the existential circumstances arise, political leaders on both sides will be under powerful pressure to continue to be sensible." Knowing the United States had the ability to make a limited response, he argued, would lessen the temptation for the Russians to take a limited step toward war.

#### "HE INSPIRES LOT OF PEOPLE BY PROVIDING INCENTIVES

One former Defense Department official, who knew Schlesinger during his Pentagon days, said Schlesinger had difficulty relating to large numbers of people and preferred to work with a small staff of favorites.

"He runs these large organizations somehow by force of personality. He inspires a lot of people, partly by providing incentives, partly by intimidation. A lot of people three times removed think they're working for him. (Former Secretary of State Henry A.) Kissinger could also do that. He (Schlesinger) is a leader, not a manager."

In November 1975, then-President Gerald R. Ford fired Schlesinger after a series of internal disputes over a White House move to cut \$10 billion from the Pentagon's fiscal 1977 budget. This time Schlesinger was ve-

hemently on the side of the military calling the cuts "deep, arbitrary and capricious."

Underneath the dispute, according to some who were involved in it, was Ford's feeling that Schlesinger was being haughty and arrogant to him and to key members of Congress. Schlesinger is said to have had a way of not looking at Ford during Cabinet meetings, addressing his remarks only to men whom he considered to be his intellectual peers, like Kissinger.

"I don't think President Ford was ever comfortable with Jim," explained one Schlesinger aide.

Ford's successor, Jimmy Carter, on the other hand, is believed to be a man who is very comfortable with Jim Schlesinger. During the fall campaign, Schlesinger was invited to come to Plains to brief Carter after Schlesinger's return from a trip to China.

#### MANY SIMILARITIES FOUND BETWEEN HIM AND CARTER

During a four-hour meeting, Carter's first meeting with Schlesinger, the president-to-be discovered that the two shared a number of similarities.

Both are cold and analytical—not ideologues—in their approach to politics. Both are religious. Carter is a Baptist lay preacher. Schlesinger, a Jew, became a Lutheran after leaving Harvard and is known to read theology during his leisure hours.

Both have considerable knowledge of and respect for the powers and the dangers of nuclear weaponry. Both are hard-liners when it comes to dealing with the Russians.

In April 1976, in a lecture at Harvard, Schlesinger argued that "the focus of repression, Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, has . . . once again reminded us of the totalitarian nature of the Soviet state," in a speech that seemed to anticipate Carter's "human rights" thrust at Soviet internal policies.

Although they have been described as fiscal conservatives, both are pragmatic in their approach to economic policies. "He sees the concept of a free market as a useful tool," said one Schlesinger confidant, "but it is not an altar."

One difference between Carter and Schlesinger, a difference that may grow during the legislative struggles over the energy package, is in the area of nuclear proliferation. Carter believes that the international trend toward the use of plutonium as a nuclear fuel will present severe security risks because a group of terrorists or a small, unfriendly nation could use the fuel to make a nuclear weapon.

#### MAY BE LESS PESSIMISTIC ON PLUTONIUM ISSUE

Schlesinger, who has written a number of scholarly articles on the subject, is said to be much less of a pessimist on the subject.

In an article written 10 years ago for the "Yale Review," Schlesinger asserted that there was an "enormous gulf" between the threat of having a primitive nuclear weapon and the threat of being able to deliver it with a sophisticated delivery system.

"... A question arises whether the actual dimension of the threat merits the note of desperation that has occasionally crept into public discussion," the article asserts.

During the recent battles over whether to build the plutonium-producing Clinch River breeder reactor, Carter has attacked the device because of the danger in the widespread use of plutonium fuel. Schlesinger, on the other hand, has tended to play down that theme, concentrating instead on the argument that the Clinch River project is not cost effective.

The interplay between the two men has shaped much of the energy package. Carter launched it in a burst of idealism, using a phrase Schlesinger borrowed from an earlier professorial type from Harvard—William James, an American philosopher, who wrote the essay "The Moral Equivalent of War" in 1910.



The essay is a strident defense of pacifism, arguing that the time may come when men will willingly make sacrifices for peaceful domestic goals with the same passion that they exhibit during wartime.

As used by Schlesinger, the theme means that the energy question is one that will need the commitment and social unity of wartime, although it will not necessarily require a wartime economic footing.

THE ENERGY PACKAGE: IT WAS "QUICK AND DIRTY"

Despite its lofty beginnings, the energy package has its faults, partly because it is a package of extraordinarily complex proposals, any one of which might take years to design properly and pass through Congress. For political reasons, however, Schlesinger and Carter decided the package had to be slapped together and sent to Congress within two months.

"It was quick and dirty, if you want to put it that way, but it had to be. Any delays would have meant that Congress would have put it over until next year, an election year, and that would have caused prolonged delays," explained one Schlesinger aide.

Schlesinger already has taken some lumps trying to sell the package. (Rep. Ken Holland, D-S.C., recently told Schlesinger during House Ways and Means Committee hearings that the lack of any apparent real sacrifices in the energy plan meant "we are dropping a moral equivalent of a water balloon.")

But nobody ever said lobbying would be easy. Schlesinger is working the Hill nearly every legislative day now. It is a new role for him, but he has been around a long time. He has acquired powerful friends (among them Sen. Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Senate Energy Committee) and he has never been known to give up easily.

And, rhetoric aside, when it comes down to arguing the specifics of the package, there are not too many people around who can keep up with Schlesinger because he tends to carry his briefcase around in his head. "The preparation you have to give Schlesinger is just minimal compared to other people," says Fred Hitz, Schlesinger's top legislative aide.

"He doesn't need a flotilla of swamis running around and slipping him pieces of paper."

#### MORE IMPORTANT THINGS THAN HOLDING INTERVIEWS

The press may not see much of the selling of the energy package, though, because the chief lobbyist prefers to work behind the scenes. Accused by one questioner of "stonewalling the press," Schlesinger stood recently at the National Press Club, complacently puffing his pipe, trying to tell them, in his fashion, that holding a lot of interviews would be an endless task and that he has more important things to do.

He did it with what he said was a quote from Sir Robert Walpole, an 18th century English statesman: "Gratitude is the lively expectation of favors about to be conferred." (Actually, the quote is "The gratitude of place-expectants is a lively sense of future favours.")

In this aspect, Schlesinger has no apologists. "He does have a problem," admits Laitin, who was press aide for Schlesinger at the Pentagon. "As a professor he did not like dull students. He does not like dull reporters. I've tried to get him not to look at the press as a group."

"He's one of those stand-up guys, a good player," says another Schlesinger supporter. "Nobody says you have to have an easy personality to be good."

## AMERICAN APPEAL FOR THE POLISH WORKERS

### HON. MILLENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, about 1 year ago, on June 26, the Polish Government acknowledged that its announced food price increases did not have the support of the Polish people. Severe worker riots throughout Poland convinced the Government that the price rise should be withdrawn. Many of the workers who demonstrated were arrested at that time, leading to the creation of a Workers' Defense Committee.

The Workers' Defense Committee has come under attack by the Polish Government in recent weeks and 11 members of the committee and their sympathizers were arrested in May 1977. Members of the committee arrested were: Miroslaw Chojecki, Jacek Kuron, Adam Michnik, Antoni Maciarczyk, and Piotr Naimski. Friends of the committee who were arrested were: Sewerin Blumsztajn, Wojciech Arkuszewski, Jan Litynski, Wojciech Ostrowski, Jan Josef Lipski, and Hanna Ostrowska. Two of the sympathizers were released in June because of ill health, but the others remain in prison. Dr. Edward Lipinski, an 88-year-old economics professor and member of the committee, demanded on May 25, 1977, that the committee be released "because we are convinced that they did not commit any crimes."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an appeal sponsored by three American Nobel laureates from Harvard University in behalf of these human rights activists who are in prison because of their political views:

#### APPEAL

MAY 31, 1977.

To Henryk Jablonski, Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic.  
To Stanislaw Guca, Speaker of Parliament of the Polish People's Republic.  
To Piotr Jaroszewicz, Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic.  
To Edward Gierek, First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party.

On September 23, 1976, a number of concerned Polish citizens set up in Warsaw the Workers Defense Committee to provide legal, medical and financial assistance to workers victimized during and after the June 1976 price riots.

Its members were subjected to harassment and intimidation by the police, and to death threats from anonymous callers. Recently, after having received such threats, Stanislaw Pyjas, a student actively working for the Committee, was killed in unexplained circumstances. In connection with Pyjas' funeral, six members of the Committee, Chojecki, Kuron, Lipski, Maciarczyk, Michnik and Naimski were arrested and are now in prison pending the investigation of their cases.

We deplore the escalation of repression in Poland against people whose only crime consists in defending basic human rights of others. We urge that the Polish government abide by the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights and the Helsinki Agreement that it has endorsed and by the relevant articles of the Polish Constitution. As a first step toward the implementation of the rule of law, we call upon the leaders of the Polish People's Republic to release immediately the imprisoned members of the Workers Defense Committee.

Sponsored by:

Kenneth J. Arrow, Nobel Laureate, Department of Economics, Harvard University.  
William Lipscomb, Nobel Laureate, Department of Chemistry, Harvard University.  
George Wald, Nobel Laureate, Department of Biology, Harvard University.

## VOLUNTEERISM: A DUAL MEANING

### HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, volunteer. As a noun or verb, this word has been synonymous with service.

It has another meaning, however, that is sometimes obscured. It also means commitment—to an idea, an issue, a cause. Citizenship.

In remarks before Long Island's Nassau-Suffolk Volunteer Conference, Harry Chapin, a brilliant artist and concerned citizen, spoke of the dual meaning of volunteerism. As excerpted in Newsday on July 3, I would like to share Mr. Chapin's comments with my colleagues:

#### THE SATISFACTIONS OF BEING A VOLUNTEER

(By Harry Chapin)

We are all searching for a positive affirmation of our existence, some indication that it matters whether we are alive.

Extraordinarily enough, people do not realize that the best way of getting this is by dealing with people around them on a positive basis. We need to be in touch with people. We need to reach out and see their eyes and hear what they are saying.

The satisfactions that I have received in the last few years are not from gold records, or album successes, or even money I have earned, but from being involved with the meaningful issues that attract the good people. As Pete Seeger calls them, "the people with the live hearts, live eyes and live heads." I don't get caught on the word "volunteer." I just say we are in a participatory democracy, where we are all supposed to be armchair experts on hunger, economics, defense and ecology—all the various fancy things that the supposed experts are telling us about. If we do not get involved to that degree, then we are not doing what the American system was set up to do.

The genius of America is a collective genius—all of us working together on things. We are all supposed to be arguing in our schools, homes, churches, streets and taverns about all these things; and whenever we have seen two or three people get in a room to make decisions for us—we see it get screwed up.

Volunteerism is a right, and we volunteers are carrying out the heritage of this country. I, therefore, challenge the people here not to be passive or just pat ourselves on the back and say what nice people we are. Rather than saying how wonderful we are, the whole job is to get more people to go out and do it—not only because volunteering is rewarding, but because it is our responsibility.

All too often volunteers are considered as "softies and liberal dogooders." The whole concept of women being second-class citizens because they volunteer is also in need of change and must be attacked. I challenge you to be more aggressive and remember that we are the American dream. We who volunteer are saying that there is something important enough for me to do, no matter if I'm getting paid or not because life gets down to ideas, as well as guns and butter, and mean national income and balance of trade—and how much money we have in our pockets.

We have seen so many people from the middle class on up in our society basically end up lost because they have put all their stake in life into money, and they have seen how shallow it is. So what I'm saying is when you volunteer, you are doing something that means enough to you to do it for no money—and you are doing something that is really life-oriented.

Without volunteers in our society, the quality of life would immediately drop. However, we must get at our problems by treating the causes and not just the symptoms. Our job is not just to clean up the dirty linen that other people create. If we are willing to commit our time for no money, we should damn well make sure that other people are not just creating horror shows that we are supposed to clean up because we are "nice people."

So the job for volunteers is really to be sophisticated enough to realize when we are being asked to do cleanup tasks and when we are really being asked to do something about solving the problems. There has been some controversy regarding the merits of "service-oriented volunteers" as opposed to "change-oriented volunteers."

I do not believe it is a cut-and-dried issue. However, if certain forces are creating hunger and all that we are doing is feeding hungry people without treating the causes of that hunger, we are being silly and we are not taking our time and effort seriously. All we are doing is putting a Band-Aid on a bad situation. So the minute we make the commitment to volunteer, we are telling ourselves: "We are serious people; we really want to do something." At that point, we have to be sophisticated enough to find the places where our effort will really make a difference.

The greatest lost resource in our society today is the elderly. The whole concept of putting old people away is obscene in every sense of the word. When old people are living on fixed incomes in a society faced with inflation and increases of the cost of living . . . and you have people who have to buy a room and some heat . . . and some light and the telephone . . . and then some food—it's no wonder you find they're eating only one meal a day. And when you find they have worked 20 or 30 or 40 years; earned a decent retirement, and they are eating only one meal a day—that is an indictment against all of us.

The sad thing is that we only react when people howl. These old people are not radicals. They are very conservative. They do not want to accept food stamps. They do not want to go on welfare; they have too much pride. They do not want to go through the humiliation.

And, if we do not address ourselves to those silent people, then we are really indicting ourselves. And I would like to think that we have sharp enough eyes to see through the walls where those lonely people live. They are slowly dying in the most degrading situations possible.

As Bob Dylan said, "He who is not busy being born is busy dying." Those of us who are playing ostriches are in fact saying that we don't give a damn. What we are saying, then, to our kids is that all we are doing is trying to hold on until our old age—and if the world should fall apart, that's fine—because we have lived our lives. I hate to think

that this is what we are saying to the people we have brought into the world.

We cannot rely on the politicians to solve our problems for us. As a friend once said, "The politician is one who is adept at riding waves . . . Let us not be naive about what our responsibility is. Our responsibility is to make waves."

We must all go that extra mile. We must be aggressive in the sense of challenging others and making them realize that the American dream implies that all of us must be actively involved.

We all have the potential to move the world . . . and the world is ready to be moved.

#### TRIBUTE TO STATE SENATOR LOPRESTI

### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to the former State Senator Michael LoPresti of East Boston, who passed away on June 11, 1977. In Michael LoPresti's passing the people of East Boston have lost a truly dedicated and hard working public servant.

Michael LoPresti thoroughly enjoyed the political and legislative process and conscientiously and affectionately devoted himself to voicing the concerns and needs of his constituents. Respected by his colleagues in the Senate, Michael LoPresti served his constituents of East Boston and indeed the whole Commonwealth with distinction. Though quiet and reserved in personality, his word was always golden; and acts of loyalty to his family, friends, and constituents were the guiding norms of conduct in both his public and personal life.

I call to the attention of my colleagues and submit for the RECORD two articles that more fully describe the character of the late State Senator Michael LoPresti:

[From the Boston Globe, June 22, 1977]

THEY WON'T FORGET LOPRESTI IN E. BOSTON,  
NORTH END

(By Jeremiah V. Murphy)

A few years ago old Mike LoPresti left his home over in East Boston on an election day and was driven in a Cadillac to the North End to campaign for his son in his successful state senatorial race.

He was a 65-year-old short and balding guy who felt right at home in the Italian North End, because he had grown up on Charter street and got into politics as a young man and eventually served in the Senate himself.

But that morning he was in the North End looking for votes for his son, so there he was working Hanover street and greeting old friends by their first names. Now you have to understand that he didn't come on strong and buttonhole people. That just wasn't LoPresti's style.

He stood there and quietly passed the time of day and when somebody told LoPresti that he had just voted for his son, old Mike would hold out his right hand and softly say, "Thank you." That's all.

But the thing that got to me that morning was the obvious respect LoPresti received from the North End people. It wasn't that back-slapping style you see around many other old pols. It was respect for an old friend.

So I thought of that scene when I read the other day that former state Sen. Mike LoPresti Sr. had died at age 68.

His death is noted here because he was unique among the flamboyant and often windy East Boston and North End pols. It is a tough district to represent, because the need and want are there and anybody who knows anything about Boston will recognize that fact.

His political battles with then Sen. Mario Umana were slam-bang-drag'em-out brawls, but they eventually ended up as old and dear friends.

Now there is no intention here of canonizing Mike LoPresti, because he still looked out for himself pretty good and probably cut a few corners along the way just like any other pol.

But his quiet and unassuming approach was still different and his word was good and that was the most important part. So he got respect.

He grew up poor and went to grammar and high school nights and eventually graduated from Suffolk Law School. Mike got a job back in the old days working as a secretary for then U.S. Rep. Tom Flaherty and had a big role in handing out jobs.

That is probably when the phrase started in the North End and East Boston and Charlestown: "You better see Mike." Through the years a lot of people went to see Mike LoPresti for help.

He served in the Senate and took a couple of shots at congressional seats but lost both times to now House Speaker Tip O'Neill . . . but the hell with all that. Almost everybody in Boston knows about his political career.

The years went by and Mike and Anna LoPresti raised a nice family of two sons and two daughters. He and Lucky Boorstein had started a concession stand years ago at the old East Boston Airport and when the aviation boom started they were in good shape.

They formed Skyline Enterprises and for 27 years operated the Logan Airport food and drink concessions. LoPresti made a lot of money, but it all ended abruptly last March when a 10-year lease expired and Massport awarded the new contract to a lower bidder.

LoPresti quietly said after the Massport vote: "I just saw 27 years go down the drain." Some of his friends claim he actually died of a broken heart.

The wake was held the other night over at the Rapino Funeral Home near Maverick square in East Boston, and you had to wait 45 minutes to get in the door, because the crowd was so large.

There were former Govs. Foster Furcolo and John Volpe and former Reps. John Toomey of Cambridge and Tim McInerney of Roslindale and Angelo Berlandi and Mike Nazzaro, both from the North End. There was former Senate president Johnny Powers and current president Kevin Harrington and scores of others.

But most of all, there were maybe thousands of just plain everyday people, and perhaps they remembered when Mike was always good for a double sawbuck to tide them over until payday, the man you went to when your son needed a job or when your landlord was giving you a bad time.

People remember and it really doesn't make much difference if you're talking about families in Bennington street tenements in East Boston or in red brick townhouses on the right side of Beacon Hill. If their roots are there, they will remember all right.

They remembered Mike LoPresti the other night, because he didn't change when he became a big pol or later when he made a barrel of money. He was the same old Mike and helped out even when he was out of office.

He had earned their respect.

[From the Post-Gazette, June 22, 1977]

MICHAEL LOPRESTI

The death of a person be it a mother, father, brother, sister, a relative or friend is always a sad occasion.

But when one loses a man of the calibre of former Senator Michael LoPresti of East Boston, it is a tragedy.

Michael LoPresti brought hope where there was none, he brought love where it was necessary and gave a helping hand when it was needed.

While in public office as Senator, he learned his lessons well and passed his knowledge on to those in need. How many in public office have this quality? They are few and far between.

It is a matter of record that most politicians when they lose an election or leave public office voluntarily they forget their constituents and forget those who assisted in their endeavors. Not so with Michael LoPresti! His heart and soul stayed with the public even when he was out of public office. "Mike" as he was affectionately known, found the time to always be there whether it was for his buddies that he served with at the State House, his former constituents, charitable organizations or his beloved family. What more can one ask of a man. His breed is hard to come by.

He left a legacy which will long be remembered and go down in political history. He understood the qualities of mercy and he practiced them. He was strong of mind and character, yet he never abused these qualities. He only used them for the good of the human race. He knew well the meaning of "forgive" and "forget". With former Senator LoPresti the quality of mercy was important. It was the key to the future of this state and yes, if you will, the future of America.

His principles were above reproach. He was a "giver" not a "taker". His quiet, unassuming manner will leave its mark on mankind, for this was one of the qualities of this man that got results for him, his family and his constituents when he served the commonwealth.

What else can you say about a man who was a "super" human being in every shape, manner, and form?

Yes, we will miss Michael LoPresti, for the good he imparted will be most difficult to forget.

June 11, 1977 was a black day because of his passing and that date will be hard to forget.

### CYPRUS—3 YEARS LATER

#### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, we shall pass the third anniversary of the tragic events in Cyprus. On that day Turkish troops, using American-supplied weapons, began their occupation of Cyprus. There are still over 25,000 Turkish troops on the island, and I feel that we have a responsibility to express our continued concern over the lack of progress toward reaching a settlement on Cyprus.

The pathos of the situation has been increased by the thousands of people who have been displaced from their homes. These people often live in wretched conditions and are unable to support themselves. Justice demands that these victims have their homes and property restored to them.

As an article in the London Times of June 17, 1977, indicates, conditions are not easy even for those who were not forced to evacuate.

I ask the other Members of Congress to join me in expressing their humanitarian concern on this anniversary:

POLICE AND BARBED WIRE GUARD ONLY SIZABLE GREEK ENCLAVE LEFT BEHIND TURKISH LINES IN CYPRUS

(From Robert Fisk, Rizokarpaso, Northern Cyprus June 16)

There are 1,510 Greek Cypriots living in the remote village of Rizokarpaso, 70 miles behind the Turkish lines in Cyprus. They subsist on tiny, poor farms, surrounded by Turks in a township ringed by barbed wire and Turkish Cypriot soldiers.

Some of them cooperate with the local Turkish Cypriots, trying as best they can to show the Turks that they want to live in peace with them. Others, particularly the old, are frightened people, living under police surveillance and expecting any day to be evicted from their homes.

Rizokarpaso is almost inaccessible to foreigners. The Greek inhabitants—the only substantial Greek Cypriot community still in Turkish-controlled northern Cyprus—have not left the few square miles around their homes for three years.

To the Turkish Cypriots they represent a community in need of physical protection whose members elect, in increasing numbers, to join their families in the south of the island. To the Greek Cypriot Government they are hostages, harassed by the Turkish authorities and under constant threat of losing their homes and possessions.

The Turkish Cypriot authorities normally insist that journalists wishing to visit Rizokarpaso are accompanied by a government official. This week, however, driving a Turkish Cypriot car and brandishing a Turkish tourist map of Cyprus at the three roadblocks outside the village, I travelled to Rizokarpaso on my own and spent three hours talking to Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

For much of the time I was watched by two plain-clothes Turkish Cypriot policemen. Many of the Greek Cypriots I approached said that they were too frightened to talk to me. Some said they regarded the Turks as their friends. Others appeared terrified of the police and complained that local Turkish Cypriots had stolen their farm animals and wanted to take over their homes.

The road to Rizokarpaso runs through peninsular hills, through the village of Yialousa which is now almost totally occupied by Turks, and along a three-mile track whose surface is so pitted with holes that a motorist is forced to drive at only five miles an hour.

Along the route, Greek Cypriot churches lie deserted, their doors frequently forced open and their ornaments and chandeliers smashed on the stone floor.

Rizokarpaso is a neat little village. The whitewashed church, cared for by two elderly priests, stands to the north of the little square around which are three coffee shops. Two are Turkish and one—a converted slaughterhouse where the Greek Cypriot *muhtar* (village headman) has his office—is Greek. When I reached the village there were 12 Greeks sitting on wooden chairs under the verandah of their coffee shop.

One of them, a man in his sixties with a bushy moustache and fluent English, nodded when I approached. "Who are you?" he said, and when I told him I was a journalist he glanced over my shoulder and asked if I had come alone.

He introduced me to the other 11 Greeks. Most were retired farmers, who owned livestock and lived in small bungalows, while two others were young men who worked the fields. All said they would not tell me their names.

"Do not tell the police you have spoken to us", the man with the moustache said, "or they will throw us out." It was a hot afternoon and the village square was empty except for my parked car. I asked whether the Greek Cypriots wanted to stay in the village or whether—as the Turkish Cypriot authorities often claim—they wanted to leave for the south of the island.

"We want to stay," the man said. "Why should we leave? Our homes are here and we have nothing else. Our farms are here. Sometimes the Turks try to take our animals. I tie my goats to my bed at night to stop the Turks stealing them. They want our homes but we do not want to give them up. Sometimes the police tell us we cannot work our fields. The police are no use in protecting us."

The man paused, looked over my shoulder at the square and said: "Police—do not tell them I have talked to you." Walking towards me across the square was a young man in sunglasses wearing a red teshirt.

As he came closer, the Greeks huddled round a table and turned on a radio loudly. "Welcome," the young man said to me, extending his hand. "Can I help you?" When I asked him who he was, he said simply: "I'm the police."

Why had I come to Rizokarpaso—the Turkish name for Rizokarpaso—he wanted to know. What did I want? Had I talked to the villagers? The Greek Cypriots watched us intently as they bent over their radio.

The policeman with the red teshirt was to become an almost permanent feature of the landscape. He stood outside the little concrete police station with its Turkish flag and watched me as I walked to the Turkish coffee shop near the church. Yes, one of the Turks there said, they were friendly to the Greeks but many Greeks had left the village of their own accord.

Statistics show that 3,151 Greek Cypriots lived in Rizokarpaso before the division of the island in 1974. Only two Turks lived there then. There are more than 400 today, living in what were Greek Cypriot homes.

Just opposite the police station stands "Louis's fresh fish restaurant" although the Greek Cypriot owner—"Mr. Louis" to the villagers—explained that he no longer had the food to run a restaurant. "I've been here since 1974," he said, "but we have to make the best of life under the circumstances."

As we talked he moved farther and farther away, sweeping the verandah of his house with a broom and eventually turning the corner of his house so that we could no longer continue the conversation.

I saw him later entertaining several Turks to coffee, including a Turkish policeman. Even the Greek *muhtar* has a portrait of Kemal Ataturk, the founder of the Turkish state, hanging on the wall of his office.

### THE MINUTEMAN III PRODUCTION LINE SHOULD NOT BE SHUT DOWN

#### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the Department of Defense announced its plans to terminate production of the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile. The Soviet Union has five ICBM's in production at this time, while the Minuteman III is the free world's only ICBM in production.

A modernized replacement for the Minuteman III, presently called the

"M-X", is in the early research and development stages and could not be ready for deployment until the mid-1980's, assuming everything goes well.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—got off to a shaky start earlier this year, and there is no assurance yet that an acceptable extension of the SALT agreements will be negotiated with the Russians. Indeed, there are strong reasons to believe the exact opposite. For this and other reasons which I articulated in a letter to the President late last month—the text of which follows these remarks—I believe it is very unwise and imprudent to propose terminating this production line.

The Defense Department's action, if it is to remain effective, must be sustained by Congress by approval of a rescission proposal. These funds were duly authorized and appropriated by the Congress last year and, therefore, represent the collective judgment of both Houses of Congress. The burden of proof for eliminating these funds is and must be on the administration.

I am convinced that this action is an improper and unwise course to take. I intend to fight this decision every step of the way, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this important effort.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I respectfully request that the text of my letter of June 28 to the President be inserted in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1977.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are advised that the Secretary of Defense is reviewing the Minuteman III ICBM program and that he will very shortly make a recommendation to you concerning the future of that program. Last year Congress authorized production of an additional 60 Minuteman III missiles, and approximately \$265 million was appropriated to carry out this procurement.

Earlier in the month the Air Force announced contracts implementing the purchase of the 60 new missiles.

As we understand it, the Secretary is considering two options: (1) to fulfill the Congressional authorization in full, permitting the contracts to continue for purchase of the 60 missiles, or (2) to recommend that the contracts be terminated after delivery of the first 10 new missiles. Option 2 would require Congressional approval under the Budget Act.

We hope that the Secretary chooses option 1, and we are sending him a copy of this letter to encourage him to make that choice. However, we felt we should contact you as well and urge you to reject any recommendation that Congress be asked to approve termination of this program at this time.

Our reasons follow:

1. Until we have a new SALT agreement with the Soviet Union, it would be imprudent to shut down the free world's only ICBM production line. The Russians have five such lines in operation, and in the event no agreement on arms limitations is reached, we should be in a position to do whatever is necessary to assure our defense. Re-starting a line that has been shut down will be extremely difficult, time-consuming and very expensive.

2. Termination of the contracts after delivery of the first 10 missiles does not con-

stitute saving five-sixths of the funds. Quite the contrary. Long lead-time items and termination penalties result, we are informed, in a situation where only \$60 million of the \$265 million will remain if the contracts are terminated after delivery of the first 10. Put another way, the first ten missiles will cost the taxpayers \$20 million each, while the other 50 have a unit cost of only \$1.2 million.

3. Abrupt termination of the contracts would have a devastating effect on employment in a number of acres, including our own Western New York region. The contractors would have no chance to seek alternative programs and massive lay-offs would be unavoidable.

The Minuteman III production team is highly skilled. They have built the world's most accurate and reliable strategic missile under conditions totally free of financial or other scandals. Because it might jeopardize our SALT negotiations, because completion of the remaining fifty missiles will cost, per missile, about 1/20 of the unit cost thus far of the first ten missiles, and because of the potential effects on regional economies around the country, we urge you to instruct the Department of Defense to carry out these contracts to completion.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. LAFALCE,  
HENRY J. NOWAK,  
Members of Congress.

#### REVIVING MIDWAY AIRPORT

#### HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the revitalization of Midway Airport was the key topic of discussion at a recent luncheon attended by Illinois Representatives and members of the Chicago South Chamber of Commerce. I and other members of the Illinois congressional delegation, along with Representative GLENN ANDERSON of California, told the chamber we strongly support renewed service at Midway.

Representative ANDERSON, chairman of the House Aviation Subcommittee, announced to chamber members that he plans to hold hearings on renewed service at Midway in the near future in Chicago.

Speakers at the luncheon cited a number of compelling reasons for reactivating Midway, including: Traffic congestion going to and at O'Hare Airport; the convenience of Midway to persons living on Chicago's South Side; wasted fuel and time caused by airplanes waiting to land at O'Hare; and the potential for generating business in South Chicago.

Jack Bowen, deputy commissioner of aviation for the city of Chicago, and Robert Swaney, president of the Chicago South Chamber of Commerce, also addressed chamber members on the need for reviving Midway.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article I have written on Midway Airport, formerly the world's busiest but now a virtual ghost town. The article appeared in the Southtown Economist on June 22, 1977:

#### WASHINGTON LETTER REVIVING MIDWAY AIRPORT

(By Rep. Morgan F. Murphy)

A survey of air passengers last November showed that Midway airport has the potential to service one out of three persons flying in and out of Chicago. Some 32 per cent of those surveyed said they would use Midway if there were enough flights. The survey was conducted by the Midway Reactivation Task force, which solicited the views of 11,000 passengers on planes scheduled to leave from O'Hare airport.

It is not hard to understand why so many people want the airport revived. For one thing, Midway is a more convenient drive than O'Hare for persons leaving from the South Side and the South and Southwest Suburbs. Midway is also a welcome alternative to O'Hare's congestion. For the harried air traveller, O'Hare's parking lots can fill up fast, resulting in long walks, parking tickets and missed flights.

In addition, Midway would generate much-needed business for Chicago's South Side. That is one reason why the Chicago South Chamber of Commerce is pressing for the airport's reactivation.

There are some hopeful signs that Midway may be in store for a revival. Although the major airlines have refused to transfer flights from O'Hare to Midway, a number of smaller airlines have asked the Civil Aeronautics board's permission to begin short-haul, low-fare flights at Midway.

One applicant, Midway (Southwest) Airway, has proposed daily and weekend flights at fares ranging from 24 to 53 per cent less than standard coach fares. Another airline, Midway Airlines, has proposed daily round trips at similarly reduced rates. Other applicants include: Delta Airlines, Chicago Airlines, Trans World Airlines, Northwest Airlines, North Central Airlines, Ozark Airlines, V/right Airlines, Southern Airways, and Continental Airways.

If the CAB permits low-fare service at Midway, some of the bigger airlines may be lured into competition. Since 1970, the major airlines have considered a return to Midway to be unprofitable. They point to their estimated \$35 million loss when they tried to revive the airport seven years ago. But if the smaller airlines are successful, the larger ones may decide to switch some of their long-haul flights from O'Hare to Midway.

What are the prospects for Midway's revitalization? No one knows for sure. The CAB is presently entertaining the applications of 11 airlines that want to provide low-fare service at Midway. In order to keep the Midway case manageable, the CAB has decided to consider only the six largest air travel markets proposed by the applicants. The cities under consideration for service from Midway are: Minneapolis/St. Paul, Detroit, St. Louis, Cleveland, Kansas City, and Pittsburgh.

But even with this narrowing of the case, the proceeding will probably take a long time. Hearings may not begin for two to three months, after which the CAB could very easily take a year or more to make a ruling. And of course, there is no guarantee that the CAB will rule in favor of Midway service.

Some might say the chances for a favorable ruling are against the odds. Historically, the CAB has not been receptive to new entries into the air service market. Since 1939, when the present airline regulatory structure was created, the CAB has turned down virtually every new air carrier that has applied for long-haul routes.

Nevertheless, the mere fact that CAB is considering applications to service Midway is encouraging, given its history of opposing new entries. Moreover, the Carter adminis-

tration, the Department of Transportation, and the Justice department have all come out in support of renewed service to Midway.

If the CAB should rule against Midway service, the issue of airline deregulation will take on new importance. Some argue that the present regulatory system should be replaced with a more flexible one that makes it easier for new airlines to enter the air service market. Even the CAB has told Congress to change its charter so the government can gradually get out of the business of telling airlines where they may fly and what fares they may charge.

Not everyone, however, is convinced that airline deregulation is a good idea. The major airlines (except United) fear that the removal of regulatory controls would create chaos in the economically troubled industry. Labor groups believe that increased competition would reduce major airline flights and throw thousands of employees out of work.

But all this is down the road. For now, the future of Midway airport is in the hands of the CAB. Let us hope that the decision is in favor of a revived Midway airport.

#### SEALED BIDDING FOR TIMBER SALES

### HON. JOHN KREBS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that sometime in the near future H.R. 6362, to repeal the sealed bidding requirement in the sale of timber from national forests, will be before the full House. This bill cleared the House Committee on Agriculture on May 23, 1977 by a vote of 22-20.

As background for this upcoming vote, I thought it might be useful to share with my colleagues two recent editorials; one from the California-based McClatchy papers, and the other from the Washington Post. Both of these editorials speak for themselves:

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1977]

#### HOW TO BUY A TREE

Consider the social value of collusive bidding. Think, for a moment, of all the ways in which the wink, the nod and the prearranged price can serve to strengthen community ties and local values. Perhaps you think we're kidding. But Congress isn't. The Senate's Energy and Natural Resources Committee has just voted, 11 to 3, for collusive bidding on those grounds. The 11 senators take a deep and abiding interest in community traditions.

Last year, without giving it much thought, Congress passed into law a provision designed—all too effectively—to end collusion in the bidding for the right to cut timber in federal forests. The new law merely required sealed bids instead of oral auctions. Sealed bidding has been the practice in most of the country. The exception was the Pacific Northwest, where the rigging of timber auctions was becoming notorious.

Collusive auctions permit the insiders—the companies regularly working an area—to divide up the sales among themselves and hold down the payments to the government. Equally important, it permits them to band together to keep out the outsiders. When the new law went into effect, the first response was a loud and steady yowling from the

Northwest. Then came a steady hammering on congressmen's doors.

This sudden threat to the established folkways of the region would mean, according to some of the timbermen, upheaval and social collapse. Towns would be left destitute, children would go hungry and crime rates would soar (except, of course, for the crimes of fraud, collusion and violation of the anti-trust statutes). Confronted with this dire prospect, Congress is acting fast.

Corrective legislation to restore oral—that is, collusive—auctions in the Northwest has already cleared the House Agriculture Committee. Things also look pretty good in the Senate Agriculture Committee, which shares jurisdiction with the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The cause of community preservation and economic togetherness rests in good hands.

[From the Fresno Bee, June 2, 1977]

#### KEEPING TIMBER SALES HONEST

We hope Rep. John Krebs, D-Fresno, succeeds in his efforts to keep sealed bidding as the way for selling most government-owned timber in the West.

Krebs cosponsored a 1976 law to require the sealed bid procedure, but a bill to amend that law and return to oral auctions has cleared the House Agriculture Committee. If it does, Krebs says he will fight it on the House floor.

A number of timber industry representatives don't like sealed bidding. They assert it allows outsiders to win timber sales contracts away from local communities.

They prefer oral auctions, under which purchasers have the option of raising bids in public competition. This, they contend, gives local bidders a better chance.

We think their fear of local harm is exaggerated. A Justice Department survey showed that out of 234 recent sealed bid timber sales in the Pacific states, only 19 went to firms operating outside the normal sales areas.

Under the sealed bid system, each bidder can submit only one bid corresponding to his interest in a given sale. It reduces the possibility of bid rigging, and helps insure the government will be fairly compensated for a publicly owned resource.

Several criminal investigations of bid rigging under the oral auction system are under way in three states, including one in the Sierra National Forest. There is enough question about the system to give another method—sealed bidding—a chance to be tried.

As Krebs says, it is premature to repeal a section of the law before its effect has been conclusively determined. Sealed bidding ought to be given a fair chance.

#### CONGRESSMAN GILLIS W. LONG URGES HOUSE PANEL TO CONSIDER TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA

### HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues testimony that I recently gave before the House Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Surface Transportation on behalf of this Nation's rural citizens.

The text follows:

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Rural Caucus would like to commend and congrat-

ulate you and the members of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee for your foresight and initiative in scheduling and holding this series of hearings on the vital problems of surface transportation and to thank you for giving us this opportunity to appear before you.

Before processing further with my remarks on the substance of the hearings, I would like to describe briefly in the structure and objectives of the Congressional Rural Caucus. Somewhat more than one hundred members of the House from both parties formed the Caucus five years ago. Our decision to organize into an ad hoc caucus stemmed from our concern that the rural areas of this nation—more particularly, those communities with populations of fewer than 50,000—simply were not receiving their fair share of Federal expenditures. We were concerned particularly with transportation, housing, education and other high priority issues.

Accordingly, we structured ourselves into the following substantive committees: agriculture, energy and natural resources; communications and transportation; education, human resources and vocational education; environment; public works and related facilities, water and waste disposal; financial resources and rural development; health; housing; legislative oversight; and rural disadvantaged. The respective chairmen of these committees comprise the Executive Committee, which also includes the Caucus Chairman, Honorable John Breckinridge.

So that the Caucus may remain currently informed on substantive issues affecting our rural communities, each committee is linked to an advisory team whose members are in close touch with rural residents and jurisdictions.

As an example, I have the privilege of serving as Chairman of the Committee on Communications and Transportation, and it is in that capacity that I present the views of our committee today. The advisory team to the CRC Committee on Communications and Transportation consists of persons representing such organizations as the National Association of Counties, the Council of State Governments, the National Rural Center, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, Public Technology, CB Magazine.

If I had to define the overriding purpose of the Caucus, I would answer that it is to improve the quality of life in our rural areas. Too frequently the voice of the rural areas is completely drowned out by the voice of the urban areas where equally grave problems admittedly exist. The needs of our urban areas are generally painted in more dramatic terms because of the sheer numbers of people involved, but that does not mean that our rural citizens are any better off. Rural people need jobs just as badly as urban people do, and the corresponding needs for better housing, better education, better health facilities and better transportation systems are just as great.

The CRC Committee on Communications and Transportation has assessed some of these needs as they affect those two substantive areas included in the name of the Committee, and we have identified the problem of obsolete and deteriorated highway bridges on the Federal Aid System, nearly one That is because without an adequate network of safe bridges, such areas as schooling, commerce, postal service, agriculture and the like become moot. It is universally admitted that our highway system is our economic and social lifeline, but without safe bridges that lifeline cannot be sustained.

There is little need here to recite the dreary bridge statistics of which you are so well aware. By now, all those interested in the highway system know that of nearly 250,000

bridges on the Federal Aid System, nearly one in five (or about 40,000) have been classified by the Federal Highway Administration as either structurally unsound or functionally obsolete. We are aware also that this does not take into consideration the tremendous problem of the 65,000 bridges off the Federal Aid System which also can be categorized as deficient or obsolete. And of course no one who has been following these hearings can fail to be impressed by the cost estimates of the Federal Highway Administration for correction of these problems—at least \$12.4 billion for the replacement of the bridges on the Federal Aid System and an estimated \$10.6 billion for replacement for those off the Federal Aid System.

Of even greater concern to the Rural Caucus is the slow pace at which this problem has been and continues to be addressed.

The special bridge replacement program was established by Section 204 of the Federal Highway Act of 1974, and funds were authorized for FY '72 and FY '73. Section 204 of the Federal Highway Act of 1973 continued the program by authorizing funds for fiscal year 1974, 1975, and 1976. And Section 202 (5) of the Federal Highway Act of 1976 extends the program by authorizing funds for FY '77 and FY '78. In 1976, the fifty states submitted 16,452 applications for federal aid funds for the replacement of these deficient bridges.

And yet, what have we been able to accomplish? With one out of five bridges in the Federal Aid System being classified as deficient or obsolete and with 33,000 bridges that are posted for less than legal loads, we have replaced or are in the process of replacing under the Emergency Bridge Act only 978 bridges!

At this rate it is no wonder that the number of deficient and obsolete bridges reported each year by the states to the Federal Highway Administration continues to increase. For example, compared with the 40,000 bridges reported in the 1976 report to Congress, a year earlier there were only 34,700 bridges in this category.

So while we continue to take one step forward to correct the problem, we slip back two steps each year with more and more of the bridges on our highway systems inadequate to handle the traffic required of them.

In the face of this ever growing problem, therefore, the Communications and Transportation Committee of the Rural Caucus would like to recommend certain positive, corrective actions:

1. We believe that the authorization contained in Section 144 of Title 23 of the U.S. Code for the replacement of bridges on the Federal Aid System should be expanded to also provide authorization for the rehabilitation of bridges. It seems only prudent that, wherever possible, some portions of the structures should be retained and repairs made that will bring them up to safe, modern standards. As a matter of fact, this is probably what would be done in actual practice by the states anyway, but an amendment to Section 144 would allow for the utilization of federal funds in this more economical program.

2. If any meaningful results are to be achieved in the solution to this problem, more funding must be made available to the states. This is a critical problem, the solution to which cannot wait. We believe that an authorization and appropriation of at least \$1 billion per year for the next twelve years is the minimum that should be approved and even at this rate we will be able to take care of only the problems that are evident today. Obviously, during the next ten years additional bridges will become deficient or obsolete and the backlog of work will continue to build up. Therefore, we also recommend:

3. That an immediate inventory be made of bridges that are likely to be classified as deficient between now and 1990 so that we can have some estimate of the accruing needs on bridges during this period, in addition to the existing inventory of backlog needs.

4. We further believe that the states no longer can afford to match federal dollars on a one-to-three basis for a program of this magnitude. We therefore recommend that the matching ratio be changed to at least 80% federal and 20% state or local in order to relieve the states of some of their matching fund problems, and one of our members, Congressman Mike McCormack, strongly advocates a 90-10 ratio.

5. Since even this program addresses itself only to the 40,000 bridges on the Federal Aid System, we further recommend that some percentage of the funds each year be granted to the states for inventorying the bridge problem off the Federal Aid System. While we recognize that there are significant philosophical questions as to whether federal funds should be used for the reconstruction or rehabilitation of bridges off the system, we do recognize as a federal responsibility the measurement of the magnitude of the problem for the off-system highways.

6. Finally to implement the recommendations for the billion dollar program, full utilization of the public employment, the public works and manpower programs to increase opportunities for veterans and youth should not be overlooked in our battle for the repair and rehabilitation of rural bridges. More meaningful employment for rural youth in particular cannot be found in any other field.

Mr. Chairman, we thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony and would be glad to answer any questions you might have.

#### NO BAN ON SACCHARIN

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the past several decades the Federal Government has rapidly grown in size, cost, and complexity. Along with this growth the Federal Government has intruded more and more frequently into the personal lives of its citizens.

The proposed ban on saccharin is one of the latest and most blatant examples of unnecessary governmental interference. If the Food and Drug Administration has its way, saccharin in foods and beverages will be prohibited.

I am absolutely opposed to such a ban. I strongly support efforts to prevent the prohibition on saccharin from going into effect. To do otherwise would be a flagrant violation of the freedom of choice of Americans.

As most Americans are aware, saccharin is an important food additive. It is used as a sugar substitute by millions of diabetics and overweight persons. In fact, an estimated 10 to 12 million persons in the United States rely upon it as a sweetener. To now outlaw this ingredient would work a major hardship on the people who depend on saccharin.

The importance of saccharin is apparent from the words of the Food and Drug

Administration. In announcing its intention to ban saccharin, the FDA said:

Saccharin is the only artificial sweetener currently approved for use in the United States. At least five million pounds a year are used in food, about three-quarters in diet sodas and the remainder in dietetic foods and as a table top sweetener in place of sugar.

A ban on saccharin would fall especially hard on diabetics. Donald Corning, chairman of the board of the American Diabetes Association, testified that the ban would "cause a disastrous change in the control and lifestyle of the diabetic."

The justification for the proposed ban, moreover, is extremely tenuous. The Food and Drug Administration did not, as you would think, conduct its own separate investigation into saccharin. Instead, it relied upon tests conducted on rats in Canada.

And how those rats were treated. They were given the equivalent of the amount of saccharin that would go into 800 bottles of diet drinks a day. Even the most ardent saccharin user falls well below such tremendous usage levels.

In summary, a ban on saccharin would be extremely unwise. Congress should move immediately to protect the right of Americans to freely use saccharin. It is time to call a halt to this unnecessary and unwarranted governmental intrusion into the personal lives of our citizens.

#### HONOR ROLL OF SUPPORTERS OF THE NATIONAL CONSUMER CO- OPERATIVE BANK ACT, H.R. 2777

### HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act has strong support throughout both Houses and both political parties.

We now have more than 100 cosponsors in the House and 35 in the Senate. In addition, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is supported by one of the broadest coalitions to ever appear before the Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs Committee. This includes urban groups, rural organizations, all consumer organizations, State and local officials, religious organizations, labor and community development organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the sponsors in the House and the Senate of H.R. 2777 and S. 1010. This legislation will be on the Floor of the House on Wednesday.

#### HOUSE COSPONSORS OF CONSUMER CO-OP BANK AND BILL NUMBERS

Clifford Allen (Tenn) 3694.  
Frank Annunzio (Ill) 3692.  
Les AuCoin (Oregon) 6540.  
Herman Badillo (N.Y.) 3692.  
Alvin Baldus (Wis) 3693.  
Max Baucus (Mont) 3694.  
Edward Beard (R.I.) 3692.  
Jonathan Bingham (NY) 6540.  
James J. Blanchard (Mich) 3694.  
Mrs. Lindy Boggs (La.) 3692.  
Richard Bolling (Mo.) 3692.  
David E. Bonior (Mich) 6540.  
William Brodhead (Mich) 6540.

George E. Brown, Jr. (Cal) 3692.  
 John L. Burton (Cal) 3693.  
 Phillip Burton (Cal) 6540.  
 Bob Carr (Mich) 6540.  
 Shirley Chisholm (NY) 3694.  
 John Conyers (Mich) 3692.  
 James C. Corman (Calif) 3692.  
 Baltasar Corrada (P.R.) 3694.  
 Norman D'Amours (N.H.) 3694.  
 George E. Danielson (Cal) 6540.  
 Ronald Dellums (Calif) 3692.  
 Butler Derrick (S.C.) 3693.  
 Charles Diggs, Jr. (Mich) 3693.  
 Christopher Dodd (Conn) 3693.  
 Tom Downey (N.Y.) 6540.  
 Robert F. Drinan (Mass) 3693.  
 Robert Edgar (Pa) 3692.  
 Don Edwards (Calif) 3694.  
 Allen E. Ertel (Pa) 6540.  
 Walter Fauntroy (D.C.) 3694.  
 Donald Fraser (Minn) 3693.  
 Richard Gephardt (Mo.) 3694.  
 Mark Hannaford (Calif) 3693.  
 Michael Harrington (Mass) 3692, 6540.  
 Tom Harkin (Iowa) 3694.  
 Herbert E. Harris, II, (Va.) 6540.  
 Augustus Hawkins (Calif) 3694.  
 Ms. Elizabeth Holtzman (N.Y.) 6540.  
 Carroll Hubbard (Ky) 3693.  
 James M. Jeffords (Vt) 3692.  
 Robert Kastenmeier (Wis) 3693.  
 John J. LaFalce (N.Y.) 3693.  
 Robert Leggett (Calif) 6540.  
 William Lehman (Fla) 3694.  
 Jim Lloyd (Calif) 3692.  
 Andrew Maguire (N.J.) 3694.  
 Edward J. Markey (Mass) 6540.  
 Romano Mazzoli (Ky) 3693.  
 Paul McCloskey (Cal) 6540.  
 Matthew McHugh (NY) 3693.  
 Stewart McKinney (Conn) 3693.  
 Ralph Metcalfe (Ill) 3692.  
 Mrs. Helen Meyner (N.J.) 3694.  
 Abner Mikva (Ill) 3693.  
 Ms. Barbara Mikulski (Md) 6540.  
 George Miller (Calif) 3692.  
 Norman Y. Mineta (Calif) 6541.  
 Joseph Minish (N.J.) 3692-3.  
 Parren Mitchell (Md) 3693.  
 John J. Moakley (Mass) 3692.  
 Toby Moffett (Conn) 6541.  
 John Moss (Cal) new bill.  
 William S. Moorhead (Pa.) 3692.  
 Robert N. C. Nix (Pa) 4365, 6541.  
 Richard Nolan (Minn) 6541.  
 Mary Rose Oakar (Ohio) 6541.  
 James Oberstar (Minn) 3693.  
 Richard Ottinger (NY) 3693.  
 Leon Panetta (Calif) 6541.  
 Jerry M. Patterson (Cal) 6541.  
 Claude Pepper (Fla) 6541.  
 Melvin Price (Ill) 6541.  
 Charles Rangel (NY) 3692.  
 Henry S. Reuss (Wis) 3692-2777.  
 Frederick Richmond (NY) 3694.  
 Peter Rodino (N.J.) 3692.  
 Benjamin Rosenthal (NY) 3694.  
 Edward Roybal (Cal) 3693.  
 Fernand J. St Germain (RI) 2777; 3592-3-4; 6540-41.  
 James Scheuer (NY) 3692.  
 Patricia Schroeder (Colo) 6541.  
 John Seiberling (Ohio) 3693.  
 Paul Simon (Ill) 3692.  
 Neal Smith (Iowa) 6541.  
 Stephen Solarz (NY) 6541.  
 Gladys Spellman (Md) 3693.  
 Fortney (Pete) Stark (Cal) 6541.  
 Newton Steers (Md) 3694.  
 Paul Tsongas (Mass) 3692.  
 Morris Udall (Ariz) 3694.  
 Bruce Vento (Minn) 3693.  
 Henry Waxman (Cal) 3693.  
 James Weaver (Oregon) 3692.  
 Tim Wirth (Colo) 6541.  
 Chalmers Wylie (Ohio) 2777; 3692.  
 Robert Young (Mo) 6541.  
 Leo Zeferetli (N.Y.) 3692.

SENATE COSPONSORS OF CONSUMER CO-  
 OPERATIVE BANK BILL: S. 1010<sup>1</sup>  
 Wendell Anderson, Minnesota.  
 James Abourezk, South Dakota.  
 Birch Bayh, Indiana.  
 Edward W. Brooke, Massachusetts.  
 Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota.  
 Clifford P. Case, New Jersey.  
 Frank Church, Idaho.  
 Alan Cranston, California.  
 John C. Culver, Iowa.  
 John A. Durkin, New Hampshire.  
 Thomas E. Eagleton, Missouri.  
 Mike Gravel, Alaska.  
 Gary Hart, Colorado.  
 Floyd K. Haskell, Colorado.  
 Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon.  
 Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota.  
 Henry M. Jackson, Washington.  
 Jacob K. Javits, New York.  
 J. Bennett Johnston, Louisiana.  
 Edward M. Kennedy, Massachusetts.  
 Patrick Leahy, Vermont.  
 Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland.  
 George McGovern, South Dakota.  
 Thomas J. McIntyre, New Hampshire.  
 John Melcher, Montana.  
 Lee Metcalf, Montana.  
 Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin.  
 James B. Pearson, Kansas.  
 Claiborne Pell, Rhode Island.  
 Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Michigan.  
 Paul Sarbanes, Maryland.  
 John Sparkman, Alabama.  
 Robert Stafford, Vermont.  
 Adlai Stevenson, Illinois.  
 Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey.

#### ASSOCIATE RECALLS GENIUS OF EDISON

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to reintroduce to the collective memory of this distinguished body today a living link with one of the towering heroes of our American culture, indeed, of the world. As an active associate and friend of Thomas Alva Edison during the last 8 years of that great man's life, George E. Stringfellow, himself one of the Nation's dedicated servants, remains forever closely tied to our Nation's history.

As an active senior citizen of 85 years, George E. Stringfellow was born in Virginia, where he has now returned. Along the way he spent much valuable effort in the State of New Jersey, where Edison had appointed him sales manager of the Storage Battery Division in 1923. After 40 years of dedicated service to that milestone company, he was able to retire as senior vice president, and has since devoted himself to his many civic and charitable interests. At one time or another, George E. Stringfellow has been involved as president of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, of which he is an honorary life member, serving on the board of that distinguished organization; he has also been made an honorary life member of the

Academy of Medicine of New Jersey, has given 2 years as chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Finance Committee, served two terms as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the Oranges and Maplewood, has received many citations and citizenship awards, not least of which was a commendation from the Brotherhood of Christians and Jews for bringing about better understanding. He has worked with a New Jersey home of disabled soldiers, served as president of the New York City Kiwanis, and done just far too many more things to recount here.

Another interest, however, is spotlighted today: that is Stringfellow's devotion to the memory of Edison and to the Nation's high esteem of that great genius. Recently I joined in cosponsoring a resolution (H.J. Res. 467), which would highlight Thomas A. Edison's inspiring contribution of over 1,000 useful inventions, and celebrate, upon the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the invention of electric light, that legendary man who helped unite the world by way of technical communication.

Today I am truly honored in sharing with my colleagues recent articles which appeared in the Washington Post and in the Miami Herald, in my area, which tell us facts of lasting interest about the man, George E. Stringfellow, who was so closely associated with the great Thomas A. Edison:

[From the Miami Herald]

#### FRIEND REMEMBERS EDISON, THE LIGHTER

1922: Thomas Alva Edison hires George E. Stringfellow, 28, to be a sales manager of Edison Inc.

Update: The bright young assistant hired by Edison is in his mid-80s now. Time has not dimmed his memories of the man who invented the incandescent electric light and brought one-half of the world out of darkness forever.

Stringfellow, closely associated with Edison during the last eight years of the inventor's life, rose to become executive vice president of the company.

Today, he is a director of crippled children and cancer societies. He also is a director of an appliance company. He is a past imperial potentate of the Shriners.

He still drives an automobile, but he prefers to walk. "The parts of the body rust out faster than they can wear out. A long time ago, I decided I wasn't going to sit around and let them rust out," he says.

So, every other day, he walks the four miles from his Arlington, Va., home to Washington, D.C., and there he meets and chats with friends. His favorite topic: Thomas Alva Edison.

Stringfellow hopes that his telling stories about the inventor might "inspire future Edisons."

For instance, Stringfellow relates that when the boy Edison learned that balloons fly when filled with gas, he persuaded another boy to take a triple dose of a powder that fizzes when it comes in contact with water. Edison's reasoning was that this would fill the boy's stomach with gas, and he too would fly.

The result: no flight, one stomach ache. Years later, Edison perfected an electric vote-recording machine. He tried to sell it to Congress but was told that such a device was the last thing congressmen wanted. Said one: "It takes 45 minutes for a roll call. In

<sup>1</sup> Republicans in italics.

that time, we can trade votes. Your machine would make that impossible."

The young inventor decided: "I will never again invent anything which nobody wants."

He kept his word, Stringfellow notes. Among Edison's 1,097 inventions were the fluorescent lamp, the phonograph, the fuse, the mimeograph machine, the microphone, motion pictures, gummed tape and waxed paper. And there were all kinds of sockets, switches, conductors, wiring circuits, meters and generators—out of which have grown the electronics and wireless communications industries.

Invention did not come easy to Edison. "Genius is 99 per cent perspiration and 1 per cent inspiration," he explained.

Edison foresaw the atomic bomb: "There will one day spring from the brain of science a machine or force so fearful in its potentialities, so absolutely terrifying that even man, the fighter who will dare torture and death in order to inflict torture and death, will be appalled, and so will abandon war forever. What man's mind can create, man's character can control."

The first half of Edison's prediction already has come true, Stringfellow points out.

Because the inventor was able to see beyond so many horizons on earth, it somehow seems necessary to pay more than passing attention to his final vision. On Oct. 18, 1931, from a large canopied bed in his West Orange, N.J., home, Edison, dying at 84, murmured these last words to his physician: "It is very beautiful over there."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1977]

ARLINGTON MAN, 85, RECALLS LEGENDARY INVENTOR EDISON  
(By Lynn Darling)

Sitting in his small Crystal City office lined with fading photographs, George E. Stringfellow is miles and years away from West Orange, N.J., where he worked for Thomas Alva Edison during the last eight years of the inventor's life.

The "old man," as his 85-year-old former associate calls him, died in 1931, and today marks the 130th anniversary of Edison's birth. But the years roll back easily for Stringfellow as he recounts the carefully stored stock of anecdotes in the hopes that his stories "will inspire future Edisons."

Glimmers of the man who disdained the title of scientist and called himself a "commercial inventor" show through as Stringfellow, dressed in a blue suit with the diamond pin that identifies him as a past imperial potentate of the Shriners, recalled the first day he met Edison in 1922.

Although Stringfellow had worked in Washington as the manager of the district office of Thomas Edison, Inc., since 1918, he had yet to meet Edison when a call came to report to headquarters in West Orange. "I'd never seen Edison," Stringfellow said. "He was just a name to me."

When he did meet the inventor of the incandescent electric light, Stringfellow recalled, he saw a 73-year-old man "who hadn't shaved in several days, wearing an acid-eaten duster and looking at me with those bright blue eyes of his." The inventor of a thousand modern day necessities "took a squint at me," Stringfellow said, "and I stood at attention." It was then that Edison offered him the job of general sales manager of the storage-battery division.

"I told him I wasn't sure I wanted the position," Stringfellow said. "I said to him, 'Mr. Edison, you fire men quite frequently and at my age (28 at the time) I can't afford to say that I'd been fired by Mr. Edison.'"

Stringfellow thought it over that evening, however, and the next morning, having received assurances of relative job security, he took the position. He remained with Edison, Inc., for 38 years, he said, rising to executive vice president.

Although Stringfellow remembers Edison as having little interest in the financial end of his enterprises, a scrapbook filled with yellowing, handwritten memoranda from the inventor himself testifies to a man who did not keep his mind solely on test tubes and induction coils.

"Stringfellow," reads one of the memos from 1924, "I have not been under any delusions as to our sales force. Every sales manager we have has been a mental moron and I have kicked for years. I am glad you are changing and letting go the dead beats and are forming a well organized sales force."

Another memo followed quickly when Stringfellow made a decision without consulting Edison on a now-unremembered matter. "Stringfellow," reads the hastily scrawled note, "I suggest that as I have about \$20 million worth of past experience that a proposal be put to me that has been suggested to ascertain if I know any reason why it shouldn't work. Edison."

Stringfellow knew a hint when he saw one. At the bottom of the note there appears this appendage, followed by Edison's initials: "This is a good idea, and will be done in the future."

The bright young assistant is now an old man himself, and earnestly he spins his stories from the comfort of his office in an elegant 11th floor apartment in Arlington. There are tales of a practical joke played on the inventor when he was working around the clock inventing the phonograph. A breakfast of ham and eggs was ordered around 3 a.m., but the inventor fell asleep before it arrived. His associates, Stringfellow said, substituted a dirty but empty plate for the full one in front of him. When Edison awoke, Stringfellow recalled, Edison looked at the plate, rubbed his stomach, and said, "All right, boys, let's go to work."

In 1928, toward the end of Edison's life, Stringfellow recalled, he asked the inventor to write an article for the company's newsletter. "I'm feeling so bad that my mind refuses to function," came Edison's written reply. "Write what you think it should say and send it over."

Stringfellow realized then, he said, that it was "time to extract everything I could from his mind" for use after Edison died. Every Saturday, he said, he sent Edison a list of questions to answer for use in future emergencies when the inventor wouldn't be there to answer them in person.

One of the questions Stringfellow asked Edison was to "describe the effects upon the life of the Edison cell (battery) due to the presence of the following impurities." About 40 elements are listed on the sheet still in Stringfellow's possession. The only one to receive the clipped answer of "Don't know" was zirconium.

The answers proved invaluable, Stringfellow recalled, six years after Edison's death. In 1937, the company received a shipment of iron ore that contained a quantity of nickel for use in storage batteries. Stringfellow went to the vault where he kept the questionnaires and there was the answer: Nickel would cause no harm. If it had, the plant would have had to close temporarily.

#### REPUBLICAN NATIONAL HISPANIC ASSEMBLY ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS REFLECTING THEIR VIEWS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Hispanic Assembly

adopted a number of resolutions at their annual conference held in June, which I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point. These resolutions are self-explanatory and properly reflect the views of the Hispanic community.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION'S RELAXATION OF RELATIONS WITH CUBA WITH A VIEW TOWARD RECOGNIZING THIS TYRANNICAL REGIME WHICH WILLFULLY VIOLATES THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ITS CITIZENS

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly is totally opposed to violations of human rights; and

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly denounces the inherent inhumanity of the communist totalitarian system of Fidel Castro known for torturing and executing its political prisoners; and

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly further denounces the little publicized fact of the imprisonment of more than 1,000 political dissenters by the Cuban dictatorship; and

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly violently objects to Castro's public acknowledgement that the right of a free press will never be permitted in Cuba; and

Whereas, The Castro dictatorship is actively engaged in acts of armed intervention in countries throughout the world, and is unequivocally committed to intervention and the support of armed revolution in other countries; and

Whereas, the Castro dictatorship's expropriation of more than \$2 billion from United States corporations and citizens without due compensation constitutes willful violations of international laws; and

Whereas, despite these blatant violations of human rights and international laws, the democratic administration of President Carter is presently engaged in promoting normalization of relations with this tyrannical regime.

Therefore, be it resolved, that The Republican National Hispanic Assembly condemns the Castro dictatorship, its inhumane treatment of many of its citizens, its armed intervention in the affairs of other countries, its attempts to export the Marxist ideology in the Western Hemisphere and throughout other countries of the world; and

Be it further resolved, that this Hispanic Assembly considers these actions as being contrary to the best interests of the United States; and

Be it further resolved, that The Republican National Hispanic Assembly committed to the American beliefs of freedom, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, considers the Carter Administration's admitted intention to normalize relations with Cuba, a blatant blunder in U.S. Foreign Relations, which is inconsistent with his Administration's policy on human rights.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE TERMINATION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO THE TRADITIONAL, FRIENDLY ALLIES OF THE UNITED STATES, THE COUNTRIES OF LATIN AMERICA

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly of the United States believes that the United States should acknowledge and give strong support to its traditional allies and friendly nations; nations which have proven their friendship and support over the years; and

Whereas, The Republic of Nicaragua traditionally has been friendly and has voted and supported United States foreign policies in all international forums and has done much for the betterment and uplifting of the human welfare of its people within the framework of constitutional government and



a two party system which prevails in that country; and

Be it therefore resolved, that The Republican National Hispanic Assembly is in total disagreement with the recent action of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress of the United States in the termination of all military assistance programs to such proven friendly nations as Nicaragua, a country that offers great promise in uplifting the welfare of its people; and

Be it further resolved, that The Republican National Hispanic Assembly expresses its support for whatever appropriate action should be taken by the Carter Administration and the Congress of the United States to immediately re-establish all military assistance programs that have been recently suspended to the traditionally friendly nations in the Western Hemisphere.

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HUMAN RIGHTS BUT  
OPPOSING COMMUNIST OPPRESSION**

Whereas, The Republican National Hispanic Assembly of the United States is opposed to the violation of basic human rights under any circumstances and by any groups of "liberation fronts" or official institutions; and

Whereas, the Assembly denounces vigorously the constant violation of human rights by the various Marxist-revolutionary fronts in the various countries of the world, specifically in Latin America and Africa, where without any justification the so-called "freedom movement forces" are attempting to overthrow the existing governments, whatever the nature of those governments, to impose their own brand of totalitarian dictatorship, and in so doing are perpetrating some of the most horrendous crimes against humanity, such as kidnapping, assassinations, blackmail, extortion, torture, executions against representatives of what they call the Establishment.

Be it therefore resolved, that it must be recognized that these Marxist-revolutionary movements, led by Cuba in the Western Hemisphere and in Africa, affect the security and the rights of other countries to live in peace and for their people to live normal lives without the constant threat of these so-called "liberation movements".

Be it further resolved, that the United States should denounce vigorously Marxist-oriented efforts to overthrow established governments, particularly when those governments are guaranteeing the safety and the rights of life of their people. At the same time the United States should promote respect for basic human rights of the people of all countries.

**INTERNATIONAL INTEREST IN  
GENETIC RESEARCH**

**HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it may soon be necessary for the Members of this body to consider the need for enactment of legislation on an issue which has aroused an unusual degree of controversy in both scientific and public discussions. The new ability to manipulate experimentally the basic genetic material of a cell—known as deoxyribonucleic acid or DNA—has produced a science and public policy issue of considerable importance. DNA recombinant molecule research, which is what one of these new

techniques of genetic manipulation is called, has been under examination as a potential public policy issue for several years and is finally being addressed in proposed Federal legislation. It is clear that the policy implications are not going to be resolved easily.

DNA recombinant molecule research is being encouraged by proponents for the potential benefits it appears to offer, such as the biological production of a pure form of insulin and other drug products, for its potential contribution to basic biological knowledge, and for other practical applications in agriculture and industry. At the same time, a potential risk to the public health and the environment, as well as philosophical problems dealing with the social aspects of the technique, are being cited by opponents of the research.

The fact that there are so many unknown factors which must be estimated means that society, and the Congress, must exert a considerable effort to maintain a high level of awareness about the DNA recombinant molecule issue and to be prepared to take the best actions determined to be necessary. My statement today is in part a request that the Members become familiar with this issue before it reaches the House for consideration in the form of legislation.

Few developments in biological research have aroused such widespread and truly international debate as the DNA recombinant molecule research issue. I noted this fact during a recent official visit to France when the topic became a part of our policy discussion. I believe that the Members of the House should be aware that most of the nations in Western Europe are engaged in the same task with which we are struggling in the United States; namely: How are we to permit the continuation of biological research using DNA recombinant techniques which scientists tell us offers such great potential benefits to society and at the same time insure that applications of this new knowledge do not place our citizens or the environment in some unexpected jeopardy? Should Federal regulation preempt local regulation? How should responsibilities be assigned? What form should the regulating body assume? How much regulation is required? What authorities need to be assigned by legislation?

There are now at least five major organizations trying to coordinate this international debate. These include the World Health Organization—WHO; the International Council of Scientific Unions—ICSU; the European Molecular Biology Organization—EMBO; the European Science Foundation—ESF; and the European Commission of the European Economic Communities.

Some sort of advisory or voluntary organizational structure for review of DNA research now exists in most Western European countries, and Canada, Australia, and Japan are involved in these debates. Some of these countries, as in the United Kingdom, have established formal organizations such as their Genetic Manipulation Advisory Group—GMAG—and

these groups review the proposed research protocols and determine whether the recombinant research should proceed. Research guidelines very similar to the guidelines developed by our National Institutes of Health are utilized to provide direction. As in the United States, except for Government-funded research, participation by submittal of projects for review and acceptance of the guidelines is mostly voluntary. The Netherlands and Sweden are considering the need for special legislation just as we may be required to decide here in the House in the near future. The United Kingdom is taking action to secure legal compliance with regulations established by its Health and Safety Commission. In all of these actions, the Western European nations are watching our proposed legislative activity with great interest.

It is important that we all realize that the DNA recombinant research issue cannot be dealt with in isolation from the rest of the world. Just as it is necessary for the Congress to evaluate the relative merits of permitting potentially different sets of State and local regulations to emerge as contrasted with Federal preemption of State and local option, the Western European nations are beginning to see the international implications of different national rules and guidelines.

Scientific research capabilities are no longer confined within national barriers. The international diversification of our large commercial firms, particularly the drug firms, has eliminated such limitations if indeed they ever existed. We need to evaluate the information being made available from the debates in this country and abroad and determine the full implications of any of our decisions before we enact legislation in this area. Fortunately, these debates on genetic manipulation are occurring in the formative stages of public policy. We have a unique opportunity to make sound decisions if we can muster the attention to detail required to sort out the facts from the conjecture. The House Science and Technology Committee, Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology has already devoted a series of hearings to the science policy implications of this issue, and the record of these hearings will soon be available for your study.

I believe that the DNA recombinant molecule research issue has many implications for science policy which extend beyond the immediate task of regulating a specific type of genetic manipulation. I urge the Members to become familiar with this issue before we must make a decision on any legislation which may come before us. The House Science and Technology Committee has had prepared an informative background report for the Members which can be obtained by contacting the committee for copies—Genetic Engineering, Human Genetics, and Cell Biology. Evolution of Technological Issues. DNA Recombinant Molecule Research [Supplemental Report II] December 1976. The Congressional Research Service has prepared an issue brief which is available on this topic and which they can provide on request. Their

issue brief provides current information on the status of legislative actions being considered in the Congress and cites other sources of information. I offer the services of my office to any Member who desires additional information and I assure you that this issue will have my own continuing attention. This is an issue of worldwide interest in which once again the actions of the United States are the center of attention and will have a far-reaching impact on world decisions.

#### BREEDER REACTOR PROJECT

### HON. PAUL E. TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon start debate on the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project. The issues involved range from international politics to national resource estimates. The future of the world's nuclear dependence and the course of our domestic nuclear energy policy is at stake.

A Boston Globe editorial on Saturday, June 25, 1977, presents a reasoned overview of the complexities involved. I place this article in the RECORD to aid in the coming debate:

#### THE CLINCH RIVER SHOWDOWN

President Carter's effort to restrain worldwide the development of advanced technology that has the capacity to produce materials for making nuclear weapons is essentially an exercise in international jawboning. A vote by Congress, over the President's strong objections, to continue development of the Clinch River nuclear breeder reactor would pull the teeth out of that effort.

Carter's attempts to rein in the development of breeders and nuclear reprocessing plants have been greeted with considerable skepticism among our allies in West Germany, France and Japan. Many in those countries view his pledge to guarantee them uranium for conventional reactors if they forego development of more advanced technology, with its bomb-making potential, as a sly attempt to gain dominance over their economies. Given the root cause of our own energy problems—undue reliance on foreign energy sources—their suspicions are certainly understandable, if unfounded.

Thus, to proceed now with the development of the fullscale prototype breeder reactor at Clinch River, while trying to impress upon our allies the wisdom of the opposite policy, would almost certainly doom the Carter initiative. It would be a clear signal to the world that the United States has embarked upon the commercial exploitation of the plutonium fuel produced by the breeders and essential to the making of nuclear bombs.

Given the incomparable risks to mankind of the proliferation of nuclear weaponry, the development of breeder reactors could be justified only in the most dire circumstances, when a failure to proceed threatened the very future of the nation. In the case of the Clinch River project that is emphatically not the case.

There is no evidence that the United States is about to run out of uranium for conventional reactors. In fact, a study by the Mitre Corp., financed by the Ford Foundation, has suggested the U.S. could safely and wisely

postpone development of the breeder, which produces its own fuel, until at least the year 2025.

And, the study concludes, that delay could be made without any severe impact on the nation's economy or on the development of breeder technology itself. It will be years before a breeder reactor is economically superior to conventional light water reactors, and a delay in the production of the first prototype will, in fact, give time to improve its design and efficiency.

The sense of urgency that until recently surrounded the American effort to develop a prototype for commercially produced breeders at Clinch River has been a major factor in heightening foreign interest in breeders. A policy reversal in the U.S. now may well slow foreign development efforts.

The House is expected to vote next week on a committee recommendation to appropriate \$150 million to keep the Clinch River project alive. It should reject that recommendation and demonstrate to the world that the U.S. is truly interested in halting the spread of nuclear armaments.

VERY REV. WILLIAM BASIL OLYNYK, M.A., D.D., PASTOR OF STS. PETER AND PAUL UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH, TO BE HONORED AT SILVER JUBILEE BANQUET

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1977

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 11, 1977, the parishioners of Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Youngstown, Ohio, will honor their pastor, the Very Reverend William Basil Olynyk, M.A., D.D., on the occasion of his silver jubilee as pastor. The banquet will be held at the Ukrainian Orthodox Center, 1025 North Belle Vista Avenue, Youngstown.

William Olynyk, son of Ukrainian immigrants John and Anna Olynyk, was born on February 17, 1917, in Goodeve Saskatchewan, Canada. He attended local public schools. In 1934, he graduated from high school at St. Joseph's College, Yorkton, Saskatchewan. In the fall of the same year, he entered the Basilian Fathers' Monastery and Scholasticate to study for the priesthood. He lived there as a full-time student until the fall of 1940. The scholasticate at that time was located in Mundare, Alberta.

Moving to eastern Canada in December of 1940, William Olynyk joined the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church under Bishop Bohdan Shpilka and the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. On July 13, 1941, William married Doris Golonsky in Hamilton, Ontario. On July 20, 1941, Bishop Bohdan ordained him to the priesthood in Detroit, Mich., and shortly thereafter assigned him to a newly organized parish in Oshawa, Ontario. Father Olynyk served as parish priest and as church and language teacher at St. John's Church in Oshawa, until the end of 1950. During his stay in Oshawa, he furthered his education in psychology, pastoral psychotherapy and comparative religions at

Great Lakes College in Detroit, Mich., where he earned the degrees of B.A. and B.D. on June 1, 1946. During that period, three sons—Roman, Zenon, and Ivan—were born to William and Doris.

Early in 1951, Father Olynyk was invited to come to the United States, where there was a shortage of clergy. His first charge in this country was the Holy Assumption Church in Passaic, N.J. His wife and sons came to the United States with him. In September 1952, he was appointed pastor of Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Youngstown, Ohio, by Archbishop Mstyslav and the Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA.

In the fall of 1961, Father Olynyk was invited to teach social science at Youngstown University on a part-time basis. He continued to do so until the end of the spring quarter in 1969. In the meantime, he had enrolled at the graduate school at Dubuque University in Dubuque, Iowa, where he took summer courses for a total of 15 semester hours in sociological studies. On April 15, 1966, he was awarded the doctor of divinity degree by the Evangelical College and Seminary of the Pacific Western University, with the approval of the late Metropolitan John, primate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the USA. On October 8, 1967, the bishops of the church raised Father Olynyk to the dignity of mitred archpriest.

In the summer of 1969, Father Olynyk enrolled as a student in the history department of the graduate school of Kent State University. On June 10, 1972, he was awarded the master of arts degree by KSU. He also completed many additional hours for his Ph. D. degree, and he had been asked by his professors to complete his studies at Kent State. As of this date, he has not decided whether to do so. He feels that living and working with people in a parish is more rewarding than anything else.

During his stay at Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Youngstown, Father Olynyk has baptized 383 children—as of June 19, 1977—joined 160 couples in marriage, and laid to rest 336 individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincere and heartfelt congratulations, and best wishes, to Father William Basil Olynyk on the occasion of his silver jubilee as pastor of Sts. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Orthodox Church. I also want to commend him for his outstanding and dedicated service to our community. When his many friends and well-wishers join in honoring him, I will most assuredly be there.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily

Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 12, 1977, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED  
JULY 13

8:00 a.m.  
\*Judiciary  
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 1682, to implement the treaties with Mexico and Canada on the execution of penal sentences.  
6226 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To consider proposed amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act.  
4200 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
To consider provisions relating to power sources of new facilities contained in S. 977, the coal conversion bill, and S. 701 and part C of S. 1469, the National Energy Act, regarding energy conservation in schools.  
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance  
International Trade Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the current state of U.S. agricultural trade and possible means by which agricultural exports might be increased.  
2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary  
Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the alleged restrictions against law enforcement intelligent operations.  
2228 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 1560, proposed Siletz Indian Tribe Restoration Act.  
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
Rural Development Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on energy needs in rural areas.  
322 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on legislation to amend the Truth in Lending Act, including S. 1312 and S. 1501.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.  
5110 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Communications Subcommittee  
CXXIII—1406—Part 18

To hold oversight hearings on the international telecommunications system.  
235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations  
To review the operation and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.  
4221 Dirksen Building

Human Resources  
To consider S. 1750, Saccharin Study, Labeling, and Advertising Act, and other committee business.  
Until 11:30 a.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic  
Economic Growth and Stabilization Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on Federal income tax policies.  
318 Russell Building

Rules and Administration  
To hold hearings on and to consider sundry legislative and administrative business.  
301 Russell Building

Select Indian Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings on the current organization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.  
1114 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
To hold a business meeting.  
2300 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.  
Armed Services  
Research and Development Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on and to consider the nominations of: Walter B. LaBerge, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army; Hans M. Mark, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force; and Antonia H. Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.  
212 Russell Building

2:30 p.m.  
Select Intelligence  
Collection, Production, and Quality  
To hold a closed business meeting.  
H-403, Capitol

JULY 14

8:00 a.m.  
\*Judiciary  
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 1682, to implement the treaties with Mexico and Canada on the execution of penal sentences.  
6226 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To continue to consider proposed amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act.  
4200 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee  
To receive a report from the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages on materials policy research and development.  
5110 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources  
To continue consideration of provisions relating to power sources of new facilities contained in S. 977, the coal conversion bill, and S. 701 and part C of S. 1469, the National Energy Act, regarding energy conservation in schools.  
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings on the nomination of John M. Ferren, to be an associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.  
3302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources  
Handicapped Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on proposed extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Education of Handicapped Children Act, and S. 1596, to establish a National Center for the Handicapped.  
6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary  
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee  
To hold hearings jointly with Human Resources Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research on the cost of drugs.  
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
Rural Development Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on energy needs in rural areas.  
322 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To consider recommendations to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on energy conservation in residential areas as contained in part A of S. 1469, the proposed National Energy Act, and S. 1397, to increase the size of the Board of Directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Communications Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on the international telecommunications system.  
457 Russell Building

Finance  
International Trade Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on numerous tariff bills.  
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations  
To review the operation and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.  
4221 Dirksen Building

Human Resources  
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the current quality of education in elementary and secondary schools.  
Until 12:30 p.m. 1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.  
\*Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on the auto fuel economy section of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.  
5110 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.  
Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee  
To mark up S. 1391, proposed Hospital Cost Containment Act.  
Until 3:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 15

9:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To continue to consider proposed amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act.  
4200 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

To continue consideration of provisions relating to power sources in new facilities contained in S. 977, the coal conversion bill, and S. 701 and part S of S. 1469, the National Energy Act, regarding energy conservation in schools.  
3110 Dirksen Building

## Judiciary

## Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1819, the proposed Federal Criminal Diversion Act.  
2228 Dirksen Office Building

## Veterans' Affairs

To consider pending calendar business.  
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry  
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee

To resume hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.  
322 Russell Building

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Robert H. McKinney, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.  
5302 Dirksen Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 1185, to regulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing.  
5110 Dirksen Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

## Consumer Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.  
6226 Dirksen Building

## Finance

## Social Security Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposals for maintaining the financial soundness of the Social Security system.  
2221 Dirksen Building

## Foreign Relations

To review the operation and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.  
4221 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

## Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings on the present status of the Department of Labor Task Force investigation of the Teamsters Central States Pension Fund.  
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume hearings to examine whether the President's proposed financial reporting system by energy industries will permit an assessment of the state of competition within such industries.  
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 18

10:00 a.m.

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on the nomination of Robert H. McKinney, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.  
5302 Dirksen Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.  
5110 Dirksen Building

## Finance

## Public Assistance Subcommittee

To resume hearings on H.R. 7200, dealing with the programs of supplemental security income, social services, child welfare services, aid to families with dependent children, and child support.  
2221 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

## Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on the present status of the Department of Labor Task Force investigation of the Teamsters Central States Pension Fund.  
1114 Dirksen Building

## Select Small Business

To resume hearings on administrative reporting and investment policies under the Employees Retirement Income Security Act; S. 285, diversification of investment of private pension fund assets; S. 901, to eliminate dual Treasury and Labor Department jurisdiction of ERISA; and S. 1745, to facilitate the establishment of employee retirement plans by small businesses.  
424 Russell Building

JULY 19

8:00 a.m.

## Agriculture

## Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the Federal Government's role in food safety and quality.  
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To review a report from the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages on materials policy research and development.  
5110 Dirksen Building

## Human Resources

## Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume hearings on biomedical research programs.  
Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1542, to extend to September 30, 1979, the Council on Wage and Price Stability.  
5302 Dirksen Building

## Budget

To hold hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

## Finance

## Public Assistance Subcommittee

To continue hearings on H.R. 7200, dealing with the programs of supplemental security income, social services, child welfare services, aid to families with dependent children, and child support.  
2221 Dirksen Building

## Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the following five tax treaties: Convention with Israel (Exec. C. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with Egypt (Exec. D. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the United Kingdom (Exec. K. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the Republic of Korea (Exec. P. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); and Convention with the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. C. 95th Cong., 1st sess.).  
4221 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

## Foreign Relations

To resume hearings on proposed Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties with the U.S.S.R. (Exec. N, 94th Cong, 2nd sess.).  
4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

## Human Resources

## Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on biomedical research programs.  
Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

## Veterans' Affairs

To consider pending calendar business.  
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 1542, to extend to September 30, 1979, the Council on Wage and Price Stability.  
5302 Dirksen Building

## Budget

To continue hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor traffic accident victims.  
5110 Dirksen Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

## Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1162, to repeal section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, which governs the inter-relationship among communications common carriers providing international record services.  
235 Russell Building

## Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the following five tax treaties: Convention with Israel (Exec. C. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with Egypt (Exec. D. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the United Kingdom (Exec. K. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the Republic of Korea (Exec. P. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); and Convention with the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. C. 95th Cong., 1st sess.).  
4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold oversight hearings on the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-210) and amendments proposed thereto.  
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To mark up S. 1594 and H.R. 5959, to revise and extend the Renegotiation Act.  
5302 Dirksen Building

## Budget

To continue hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

## Commerce, Science, and Transportation

## Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1162, to repeal section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, which governs the interrelationship among communications common carriers providing international record services.  
235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations  
To continue hearings on proposed Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties with the U.S.S.R. (Exec. N, 94th Cong., 2nd sess.)  
4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 22

8:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Separation of Powers Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the disposition of U.S. holdings in the Panama Canal Zone.  
6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To consider the nomination of Robert H. McKinney, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and H.R. 5675, to authorize the Treasury Department to make short-term investments of any portion of its excess operating cash balance.  
5302 Dirksen Building

\*Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 1077, to assure that essential maritime transportation is provided to Alaska, Hawaii, and certain U.S. territories.  
5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 25

9:00 a.m.  
Finance  
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on estate and gift tax problems arising from the Tax Reform Act of 1976.  
2221 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To resume oversight hearings on the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-210) and amendments proposed thereto.  
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 1724, to establish a Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.  
5302 Dirksen Building

JULY 26

8:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Ad Hoc Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 1503, to provide for the payment of losses incurred as a result of the ban on the use of the chemical Tris in apparel and fabric.  
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
\*Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee  
To resume oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.  
Until 12:30 p.m. 6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To resume mark up of H.R. 5294, S. 918, and S. 1130, to amend the Consumer Protection Act so as to prohibit abusive practices by independent debt collectors.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings on protocol to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Exec. A, 95th Cong., 1st sess.), and related protocols (Exec. B, 95th Congress, 1st sess.)  
4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 27

9:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
Health and Readjustment Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on a study by the National Academy of Science on health care for American veterans.  
6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
\*Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.  
Until 12:30 1318 Dirksen Building  
Human Resources  
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the role of the halfway house in the rehabilitation of alcoholics.  
Until noon 1202 Dirksen Building

JULY 28

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To mark up S. 695, to impose on former Federal procurement personnel an extended time period during which they may not work for defense contractors.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations  
To resume hearings on proposed Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties with the U.S.S.R. (Exec. N, 94th Cong., 2nd sess.)  
4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

10:00 a.m.  
Budget  
To mark up Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

AUGUST 1

10:00 a.m.  
Budget  
To continue mark up of Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

AUGUST 2

9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee  
To resume oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.  
2226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To mark up S. 1664-1669, to amend in several regards the law as it pertains to Federal regulation of financial institutions.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget  
To continue mark up of Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.  
357 Russell Building

Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 1792, to amend the Administrative Conference Act.  
6202 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.  
2226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue mark up of S. 1664-1669, to amend in several regards the law as it pertains to Federal regulation of financial institutions.  
5302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 4

9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.  
2226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To mark up S. 1542, to extend to September 30, 1979, the Council on Wage and Price Stability, and S. 1724, to establish a Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.  
5302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 23

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
International Finance Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the dimension of national debts and payments deficits, and the outlook for the future.  
5302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 24

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
International Finance Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on the dimension of national debts and payments deficits, and the outlook for the future.  
5302 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 8

9:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Consumer Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on automatic auto crash protection devices.  
5110 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 9

9:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Consumer Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on automatic auto crash protection devices.  
5110 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 21

9:30 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings on S. 364, Veterans' Administration Administrative Procedure and Judicial Review Act.  
Until 1 p.m. Room to be announced

SEPTEMBER 28

10:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To receive legislative recommendations from representatives of the American Legion.  
412 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.  
Human Resources  
Handicapped Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on proposed extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Education of Handicapped Children Act, and S. 1596, to establish a National Center for the Handicapped.  
1318 Dirksen Building