

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH L. BALZANO—
EXEMPLARY PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my personal honor to pay tribute to a good friend and outstanding public servant, Joseph L. Balzano, who is retiring after more than 12 years as president of the New York City Housing Patrolman's Benevolent Association.

Joe leaves behind a legacy of service and dedication which will endure for years to come. Joe's association with the housing police department encompasses more than two decades, more than half of these years spent serving as president and vice president of their Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. He exhibited strong but compassionate leadership, selflessly working to project and protect the rights of his fellow housing policemen. He owes much of his success to the personal touch he brought to the presidency and his ability to keep his members informed on all matters important to them.

As a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department I have developed many close friendships with others in law enforcement. None of mine are any closer than that I have with Joe Balzano. He displays the same qualities of dedication, loyalty, and compassion to his friends and this attributes to the enduring quality of his friendships.

The housing police as well as the city of New York are losing a fine leader in Joe Balzano. He will be missed by the members of the housing police. Yet his lovely wife Mickey and children Louis Joseph, Jr., and Donna, will have a golden opportunity to spend more time with Joe, so our loss is their gain.

At this time I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of Joe Balzano's farewell statement to the members of the Housing Patrolman's Benevolent Association contained in the November-December addition of On the Beat magazine:

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(By Joseph L. Balzano)

For more than two decades I have had the honor and privilege of being associated with one of the finest police groups in the nation. I have been a member of the Housing Police Department for twenty-two years. For more than twelve years I have served as president of the Housing Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, and for more than two years before that as vice president.

This is my final message to my brothers as head of the union. I thank you for the opportunity you gave me to serve you. It has been a period of my life that I shall never forget and one which I shall always appreciate.

I step down now from the presidency confident that your leadership rests in a splendid team. Over the years they have worked closely with me and I know them "up close," not as casual acquaintances.

If I would ask one thing of our wonderful membership, it would be to urge that you continue to work with the new leadership as

you did with me, and to give them your support for without it they cannot function effectively.

To be realistic, we must recognize that there are difficult days ahead and the officers of the association will need you if they are to overcome the obstacles they will be facing.

An honest appraisal tells us that police unions and, indeed, all unions of public employees will have rough going in the future. Our association must strengthen its ties with brother unions, both statewide and citywide, to hold to the gains we have won in the past. That will be no mean task when we consider the fiscal straits that our city finds itself in.

Your new president, Jack Jordan, is an able and politically wise gentleman. He and his team will be pursuing the priority programs important to all of us—the drive to rehire all of our laid-off officers and protecting the bill passed three ago known as the Precinct Bill. They will fight to secure a good contract for the membership because they know how hard the job is and how much effort and dedication our men put into their tasks.

As I look back over the years, my administration met successes and disappointments alike, but, fortunately, I think that our successes outnumbered the areas in which we met disappointments.

It is my wish and prayer that the future will show an increase in our success ratio, and I know the new officers will be battling towards that end.

My entire professional life has been in the field of law enforcement and with our union that I cherish so dearly. All of us mellow as the years pass, but my love for my fellow officers holds as much passion now and burns with as much vigor now as it did in the days when I was a much younger man.

You, my brother officers, have made a better person of me. I hope I have contributed in some measure to improving your lives as the head of your union. I thank you again for permitting me to have served you. I wish you well in the years ahead and a happy holiday season, coupled with good health for you and your families.

This is my so-long for now, but it will never be goodbye.

NATIONAL AIRLINES NEEDS EXPEDITIOUS ACTION OF THE CAB

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, serious snags have developed in the United States-British renegotiations of the existing international agreement authorizing and regulating U.S.-U.K. air services. These difficulties have serious implications to the American airlines which currently serve London. If these agreements are not resolved shortly, air service between the United States and Britain could be disrupted.

The airline most affected by these problems is National Airlines. The Miami-London route granted National 7 years ago is that airlines sole European route. If negotiations do stall, National stands to lose a great deal. Last year National carried over a quarter of a million passengers on its London-Miami route.

In view of these facts, the petition National has filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide service between

Miami and Paris for 1 year is given added urgency. If the petition is approved expeditiously, air service between these cities could begin as early as May 1 of this year. Therefore, if the renegotiation stalls further, National can continue its service to Europe.

Further, it would seem logical that the extension of this air service would certainly provide a good bargaining tool to U.S. officials in trying to secure an agreement with British officials. If Britain is aware of the fact that Paris is available as an attractive alternative, it may relent on its protectionist efforts to divide its air market.

National has proven its ability to provide outstanding service to its air customers. The European route has proven a boon to Florida's tourist economy. A second gateway to Europe would certainly be in the best interests of all involved—National and its employees, Florida and its economy, and the U.S. Government and its balance of payments.

As a representative of the State of Florida, I heartily endorse National's petition. I urge the CAB to give it the affirmative and expeditious attention it deserves.

FEDERAL SHIP FINANCING
PROGRAM

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1977, the former Secretary of Commerce, Elliot L. Richardson, announced that the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce had agreed to guarantee the financing for the construction of seven liquefied natural gas—LNG—vessels by and for the General Dynamics Corp. These guarantees, totaling \$730 million, pursuant to title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, represent the largest single guarantee not only in the history of the Federal ship financing program but any Federal guarantee program dwarfing the Federal loan guarantee extended to Lockheed Aircraft by almost a half billion dollars.

I understand the LNG vessels are being built in General Dynamics' Quincy, Mass., shipyard, will sail under the U.S. flag, and will be manned by U.S. seamen. They will be chartered by General Dynamics to Energy Transportation Corp., a U.S.-flag operator, which in turn will charter them to a subsidiary of Burmah Oil Co., Ltd., a British corporation, to transport LNG from Indonesia to Japan. While I do not question either the legality or the propriety of the transaction under existing maritime law, I have grave reservations on the broad policy issue of whether the U.S. Government should guarantee the financing of vessels ultimately chartered to a foreign corporation to carry LNG between two foreign countries. My reservations are essentially twofold.

First, admittedly there are certain benefits to be derived by the U.S. maritime community, but why should the U.S. Government risk the sums of money involved in this transaction, that is, the amount of the guarantee is more than 10 percent of the total guarantee authority of the Maritime Administration, to transport LNG from Indonesia to Japan? It appears to me that the benefits to be derived by the Governments of Indonesia and Japan, and Burmah Oil far outweigh those benefits. Second, the record developed during the year and a half Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee's examination of U.S. Maritime Policy establishes that the primary rationale for Federal assistance to the U.S. merchant marine, of which the Federal ship financing program is a part, is national security. I question how those seven LNG vessels can be considered an asset to the national security if they never touch our shores. Obviously, as a practical matter, we do not have any control over them. In my view the U.S. Government should not guarantee the financing for the construction of vessels in such circumstances.

Accordingly, I am introducing legislation today designed to preclude the Secretary of Commerce from making a guarantee of an obligation which aids in financing the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of a vessel engaged in foreign-to-foreign trading. I believe this legislation will serve as the vehicle for a full and frank exchange of views on this broad maritime policy issue.

THE LEVI LEGACY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Edward H. Levi, outgoing Attorney General, is to be commended for the respect and trust he restored to the position of highest law enforcement officer in the land.

He appeared before my Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee two times; first, to give testimony about COINTEL and domestic intelligence, and the last time to give testimony about new FBI and Justice Department guidelines in dealing with domestic intelligence. Both times he was impressive in his efforts to be cooperative and helpful.

In written communications with Mr. Levi, he helped reestablish a climate of trust between the legislative and executive branches.

During his tenure, Mr. Levi never simply waited for an event to happen to react, but frequently initiated communication with us on matters concerning his jurisdiction and ours.

I commend him for restoring public confidence to the office and for taking politics out of it.

I would like to enter another tribute to Mr. Levi which appeared in the Janu-

ary 26, 1977 edition of the Christian Science Monitor as an editorial:

THE LEVI LEGACY

Edward Levi set a refreshing tone as Attorney General when he offered no political or bureaucratic justification of FBI abuses but simply called them "outrageous." That was early in a tenure that went on to restore a sense of ethics and professionalism to an office which his successor will be challenged to leave in equally good order.

"I think there's enough dishonesty, and lack of candor, and instability, in our society as it is, and I don't think a government agency should add to that," Mr. Levi said. And he acted on his words.

Mr. Levi's record would have been even better if he had supported more stringent handgun control, for example, and not supported a return to capital punishment. He unfortunately also contributed to an air of uncertainty as to how far the Ford administration genuinely supported desegregation law.

But Mr. Levi eventually came out specifically against seeking the reversal of Supreme Court desegregation rulings. And he decided against the Justice Department's joining an appeal for Supreme Court review of the Boston desegregation decision. Thus he seemed to follow through on his answer to a question about the possible impact of Justice Department intervention in the Boston case: "You can be sure the Justice Department will do nothing to encourage violence." Some had felt that such high-level intervention might have fostered resistance to the law.

Mr. Levi also followed through on his stated concern about FBI abuses in counter-intelligence harassment and other matters. He reined in the agency with guidelines. He ended the years-long unproductive campaign against the Socialist Workers Party. He abided by strict standards on wiretapping.

When questions arose about President Ford's past political financing, Mr. Levi initiated an investigation. When Mr. Ford was cleared, the climate had become such that the finding could be accepted as truth rather than cover-up.

Mr. Levi had a lot to do with establishing that climate. We thank him for it and wish him well back in Chicago.

TRIBUTE TO ROGER LAWTON SIMMONS

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, it is speculated that just before the instant of death, the memories of one's entire lifetime flash across the screen of consciousness. I personally can neither prove nor disprove that theory. But I can say with greater certainty that some people who have approached death, and yet survived, seem to have drawn a profound strength from the experience.

Such a man was Roger Lawton Simmons, late a resident of Hamlet, N.C. Mr. Simmons barely escaped death on a World War II battlefield in the Netherlands—and finally kept the appointment on October 23, 1976. And upon the loom of the intervening years was woven a life of sacrifice, on the one hand, and on the other, a life of extraordinary human achievement.

It is not enough to declare that Roger Simmons was my friends, or that he was beloved by the citizens of his hometown. His compassion and his generosity knew no bounds. He poured them freely upon anyone in need and spent energy which he scarcely could spare upon any worthwhile cause.

Roger Simmons was disabled March 1, 1945, during a German artillery barrage on his command post near Horn, Holland. Injured in the left leg, he received routine field treatment and remained in the lines 4 days before being evacuated to a hospital. He ended up with gangrene, and almost lost the leg to amputation. Instead, he spent months in various hospitals undergoing treatment and recuperation.

It would have been perfectly natural for Roger to conclude that he had contributed to his country all that reasonably could be required of him. Quite to the contrary, he seemed to have assumed a greater debt of gratitude which he sought to pay through continual service to his fellow man.

Time does not permit a litany of Roger Simmons' activities in behalf of his community, his neighbors, and humanity at large. He spent almost 30 years as a newspaper editor, a profession notorious for its demands on personal time and energy. But in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, he left the following record of contribution:

He served as drive chairman, public relations director, or member of the board of directors of the March of Dimes, the Cancer Crusade, the Diabetes Association, Easter Seals, Cerebral Palsy, the Heart Association, the American Red Cross, the YMCA—and was chairman of the Mayor's Council for Employment of the Handicapped for 7 years.

He served on the boards of directors of McLaurin Vocational Center, First Methodist Church, Hamlet Rotary Club, the North Carolina Peach Festival, the United Way, the Bicentennial Commission, Hamlet Planning Board, the Bilingual Commission, the Railroad Museum, and the Boosters Club.

He was a member of Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, Military Order of the Cootie, Order of the Trench Rats, U.S. Army Association, and the Legion Go-Getters.

He served as commander of his American Legion post three times; as commander of his VFW post twice; chapter commander of DAV twice, and commander of his AMVETS post once. Further, he served in all four organizations at the district or department levels during his 30 years of membership, and once at the national level as the commander's aide-de-camp.

He was a director and club president of Rotary International in Hamlet and on the staff of the Rotary district governor as conference chairman in 1971. He was a Jaycee, serving that organization as club secretary, vice president and director, as well as being a State Jaycee director.

His greatest reward was the appreciation of his friends, but his distinguished service was not unnoticed by the organizations in which he served. He was win-

ner of the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award; the American Legion Meritorious Service Award; the VFW Loyalty Award; and in 1975, won the North Carolina Award for Distinguished Service to the Handicapped. Finally, he was honored by both the Governor's council and the President's Committee for Employment of the Handicapped. His military decorations included the Bronze Star for valor.

Mr. Speaker, those who labor under a heavy load of responsibility or find it difficult to reach out and take the hand of others in need would do well to look to the example of Roger Simmons for inspiration. Few of us have the interest or the energy to accomplish as much as he did, but all of us have the opportunity.

Had Roger Simmons died on the battlefield that day 32 years ago, the loss would have been deeply felt by intimate friends. He was spared, I believe, for greater purpose—and having achieved that purpose, his loss is felt by legions he has befriended. His life was an inspiration to us. We shall miss him. And we shall ponder who is capable and willing to take his place in the community, and in the State, here and for which he lived.

VOLUNTEER ARMY IS A SUCCESS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, the Volunteer Army is a success. Yet, those who have opposed it from the start again have begun an offensive aimed at making America's youth liable to conscription.

Because of all the misinformation disseminated about the representativeness of today's Army and the cost of our military personnel to the American taxpayer, I would like to insert into today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report I have written my constituents on this important issue.

The facts are on the side of the Volunteer Army. In coming months, I will be doing all I can to bring them out. For those who may have missed it, I placed George Will's excellent piece, "Profile of an Army," in the RECORD of Monday, January 31. My report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN
WILLIAM A. STEIGER

The volunteer army is a success. Both the quality and quantity of young men and women joining the nation's military forces since the last draft call, exactly four years ago, have been excellent.

Despite this fact, those who have always opposed the all-volunteer concept—such as Senators Sam Nunn and John Stennis—have recently begun an offensive aimed at again making America's youth liable to conscription. Apparently the change of administration is viewed as an opportune time to push for a return of the draft. There is no other good reason for this effort.

Even opponents of the volunteer army have had to admit that the services have been meeting their quotas and that the calibre of recruits has been very good. The only thread

they've been able to find in their fight to return to the draft has been the share of the defense budget taken up by military personnel costs.

That argument is spurious at best. What is not being told is that the percentage of the defense budget going to active military personnel has gone down from 31% to 27% from FY72 to FY77. There has also been a 1% decrease, from 18% to 17%, in the Defense Department Civil Service payroll.

Retired pay's share of the defense budget has tripled over the past 12 years. This, however, reflects the large number of retirees over this period, as we've shrunk to a smaller force, as much as it does the increase in pay.

What many volunteer force opponents forget is that well before the volunteer army came into being, the Defense Department was seeking to upgrade military pay. The reason was simple. Far too many enlisted men and women in the lower ranks were well below the poverty level. I visited a number of bases in the period before Congress raised military pay in September 1971 and was appalled at the conditions under which many of those serving this nation were forced to live.

Many service families still need food stamps and other government assistance to meet their daily needs. If the people seeking a return to the draft want to save money by doing so, they're going to have to reverse Congress' decision that those serving this country in the military are entitled to pay comparable to their civilian counterparts.

Defense Department officials have estimated that if pay comparability were abandoned and the draft re-enacted, a saving of \$1.7 billion is all that would be realized. If we simply abandon the volunteer force, retaining the present wage scale, defense budget savings would be much, much smaller—about \$300 million.

Curbing the pay of recruits means one thing: government at all levels will incur higher costs for welfare, other assistance payments and programs for those once again subjected to servitude at poverty-level wages.

If a return to the draft will save little money and create a lot of problems, what's to be gained? Rather than conscript the young and fool the taxpayers about the cost, Congress might better focus attention on needed reforms of the pay system for retirees.

Seldom in the nation's history have we had a stronger professional force than today. The services use two yardsticks to evaluate the quality of enlistees, the level of education and standardized test scores. High school graduates have been joining the services in increasing numbers since 1974. A higher percentage of enlistees are high school graduates today than in fiscal year 1964.

Furthermore, a recent study showed that as judged by test scores, quality has been maintained and in some instances improved significantly between 1964 and today. We've had a steady increase in enlistees with above average scores, a moderate increase in those with average scores and a steady decrease in those with below average scores.

There is just no case for those who claim we must return to the draft, and its concomitant disruption of families and young lives.

LET US CHANGE THE RULE FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in the January 10, 1977, Washington Post, Bill Gold's "District Line" column had a most interesting item regarding the

major inconsistency in the congressional mandated Postal Service regulations governing the size of packages that may be mailed from the various classes of post offices.

As a direct result of Mr. Gold's article, I have introduced H.R. 2885, which will restore consistency to the Postal Service's package size rules. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to take prompt and favorable action; I would add that this proposal has the support of Postal Service authorities.

Bill Gold's column follows:

ADD ANOTHER ITEM TO THE 1977 AGENDA
(By Bill Gold)

During the busy weeks before Christmas, several District Liners wrote to tell me they had difficulty in mailing large packages.

Their problem was that although small post offices will accept packages weighing up to 70 pounds, the limit at large first-class offices is 40 pounds. It seemed silly to readers that postal clerks should have to refuse them service on packages ranging between 40 and 70 pounds in weight—and then suggest on the sly that the package be taken to a smaller office, where it would be accepted. "Who makes such silly rules," one reader asked.

As we have learned in tracking down hundreds of life's little mysteries like this one, there is usually a reason for silly rules, or at least an explanation for how they came into being.

A bit of investigation in the present case turned up the fact that the weight limitation rule wasn't dreamed up by the U.S. Postal Service. It is a law passed by Congress (39 U.S.C. Sec. 3682).

As so often happens, private interest groups (spearheaded in this instance by REA Express) lobbied effectively to minimize the competition USPS would be permitted to give them. Congress bought their argument and ruled that only small rural USPS offices could accept packages up to 70 pounds (because the private carriers didn't have offices in rural areas).

USPS has repeatedly asked Congress to change the rule and permit all post offices to accept the larger packages. In recent years, USPS has accompanied this request with a reminder that REA Express has long since gone out of business. But Congress, in its infinite wisdom, has chosen to take no action.

Unless President-elect Carter can get Congress to put this matter on its agenda for 1977, postal patrons will continue to wonder why the post office nearest them refuses some of their packages and thus makes it necessary for them to drive 10 or 15 miles to a small rural office.

DEATH SENTENCE DESERVED

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, when Gary Gilmore recently became the focus of sick sensationalism, there was very little mention of his victims. A citizen of the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland has sent me a clipping of an editorial that provides the needed perspective. The editorial was written by A. W. Scott, publisher of the Gazette-Patriot of Carrollton, Ill., and I submit it for your consideration:

DEATH SENTENCE DESERVED

If we were to nominate the most nauseating news story of 1976, it would be the announcement that some money-hungry book publishers and motion picture producers are said to be interested in dramatizing the sordid story of killer Gary Gilmore—with Gilmore featured as a sort of hero. The propaganda buildup has evidently already started. Washington news writer Patrick Buchanan cites the following gem written by an unidentified "national correspondent": "Despite the violence that has punctuated his life in and out of prison, Mr. Gilmore had one side of his personality that showed some sensitivity, and he dabbled in poetry and oil painting." Buchanan promptly and accurately labeled this description of Gilmore as "sentimental swill."

In all of the attention being given to Gilmore's suicide attempt, his hunger strike, his jail-house betrothal and his past record as something of a prison escape artist, the reason why he was sentenced to death seems to have been forgotten. It is time that we remembered.

On July 20, Gilmore murdered David Jensen, 24, in a nickels and dimes gas station holdup. Jensen, a former missionary in the Mormon church, was working at the service station to help pay his way as a law student at Brigham Young University, and to support his wife and baby. None of that mattered to Gilmore, of course. David Jensen was gunned down in cold blood.

On the very next night, July 21, Gilmore pulled another holdup. This time his victim was Bennie Bushnell, a motel clerk in Provo. Bushnell, also married with one small child and another baby on the way, was working to earn money to get back into school. Bushnell followed the instructions of the robber to the letter. He turned over the money from the till: \$120. Then he was ordered to lie face down on the floor, which he did. Then Gary Gilmore, who, we are now told, "has some sensitivity," coldly fired two shots through his young victim's head.

If our sob-sisters are determined to weep tears, why don't they weep for the two widows and three orphaned children?

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal minimum wage stands as a barrier between hundreds of thousands of teenagers and their first jobs. This fact is skillfully illustrated in a column by Dr. Howard E. Kershner of the economics department, Northwood Institute. The column appeared in the January 20, 1977, issue of the Naperville Sun, a weekly newspaper serving part of the 14th Congressional District in Illinois.

I want to share Dr. Kershner's insight with my colleagues. I have in the past and will in the future support an apprentice wage law to cut teenage unemployment. I have also cosponsored the Honorable BARBER CONABLE's Youth Apprentice Tax Credit Act (H.R. 2404), which offers tax incentives to businesses who will hire and train young workers at apprentice stipends. Much good could

come from this legislation. It is my hope that more of my colleagues will agree with me after they read this column:

THE MINIMUM WAGE

(By Dr. Howard E. Kershner)

A black boy of about 17, with good health and good habits, spent his time in a playground, swimming, shooting basketball and drinking soda with a group of associates. The owner of a nearby garage and service station asked him why he wasn't working. He said he could not find a job because he had no marketable skills worth the minimum wage of about \$90.00 a week at the time.

"Why don't you learn a trade?" asked the man. "Because I don't have the money to attend school," replied the boy.

The man then said, "We could make a mechanic out of you at my garage in a year or two, if you would be willing to clean up, pump gas, wash cars and do jobs not requiring skill while you were learning the trade. Besides teaching you, we would pay \$1.00 per hour." The boy was eager for the job and said nothing would please him more. However, he added, "I have had such offers before, but Uncle Sam will not let me work for less than the minimum wage."

I used to park my car near the playground. There were many teenage boys, and often girls, whiling away the time in the swimming pool and at various games, drinking sodas and eating popcorn.

These young people are idle for the same reason just described.

Now and then one of them is recruited into the ranks of the criminal element. They are taught how to snatch purses, pick pockets, steal from stores, steal automobiles, sell dope, and other serious crimes.

"Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do."

Idleness is the greatest recruiting ground for crime. If these youngsters and millions like them throughout the country had jobs, the crime problems would be reduced to normal. But who can afford to employ them at present minimum wages when they have no marketable skills?

Why not have an apprentice wage that would enable these youngsters to earn something while they acquire some useful skill and gain the experience necessary to qualify them as full wage earners?

Why have the minimum wage? It is the principle cause of unemployment. But, if we are going to have it (for political reasons) why not establish an apprentice wage in order to save our precious teenagers, of both sexes and all races, from idleness. They would like it much better than loafing. They would earn something and would be acquiring useful skills.

Why breed crime? Why not make the boys and girls happy by offering them opportunities to do useful work and earn something while they are doing it.

This is the way to solve the problem of unemployment.

Where are the boys who used to deliver groceries and telegrams?

Where are the office boys who used to build fires, sweep floors, run errands, seal and stamp envelopes, wrap packages and make themselves useful around our offices?

I used to build fires and sweep floors for \$4.00 a week and was thankful to have the job. It kept me from being idle and was a stepping stone to something better.

The minimum wage and the lack of an apprentice wage is cursing millions of young people with idleness, breeding mischief and crime, and aggravating all the other economic problems that assail us.

WE CANNOT SAY WE HAVE NOT BEEN WARNED ABOUT NHI

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for some years now there has been an increasing clamor for national health insurance, mainly confined to special interest groups and their advocates in the Government who are convinced they can have their cake and get someone else to pay for it. Recently, the Democratic Presidential candidate campaigned on a platform which called for the adoption of a "comprehensive national health insurance system with universal and mandatory coverage * * * financed by a combination of employer-employee shared payroll taxes and general tax revenues." Within the first few days of the 95th Congress, major proposals for NHI were introduced offering a variety of plans for coverage and payment.

We have been told by the doomsayers that our Nation's health care system is approaching a crisis and that the only way to solve its problems are by imposing more rules, regulations, paperwork, and bureaucratic institutions on an already overburdened medical profession. Great hue and cry has been raised over the high costs and allegedly inferior quality of our health care in comparison to that of other Western countries, charges which I believe are not justified. National health insurance is demanded by some as a miraculous cure for whatever ails our system, with little thought as to the chaos such a solution would cause in the delivery of health care in this country.

A careful look at systems of socialized medicine in Great Britain, Sweden, and Canada should convince all but the die-hard advocates of a nationalized health care plan of the disastrous effect it would have on the overall health of Americans. Shortages of hospital beds, long waiting lists, even for necessary surgery, and the emigration of skilled physicians are serious problems in countries with national health systems, yet are unheard of in the United States. Such nationalized medicine is far from free, judging by the astronomical taxes in Sweden and Great Britain.

Many of those who have worked under systems of nationalized health services are now advising us to learn from their mistakes and to carefully consider the effects that the adoption of a comprehensive health program would have on the United States. Mr. L. F. Detwiller, an administrator in Canada's health program and an internationally recognized consultant and lecturer on health economics, warns of the costs and problems caused when free medical care on demand becomes a "right" paid by tax dollars and administered by Government bureaucrats. I am inserting his

article here for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the American Medical News, Jan. 17, 1977]

DRAMATIC COST ESCALATION TRANSFORMS HEALTH CARE PLANS INTO POLITICAL LIABILITIES

(By L. F. Detwiler)

The dramatic cost escalation of health care plans in recent years, especially those that are government sponsored, has changed them from political assets into liabilities.

Promised as a citizen's "right," the universal and comprehensive health program has become a financial nightmare for governments, which must provide the social capital to sustain the schemes. Perhaps Great Britain is the best example as to how difficult and controversial a government health system can be.

Underlying the whole problem are the basic principles on which the systems were established and whether health care is to be viewed as a "right," individual responsibility, or privilege.

This writer views it as the latter, it being something that a society bestows on itself by political decision and does so at the expense of other services, such as education, defense, and roads. Health care as a "right" has been promised by politicians seeking the vote since the early '30s, but in North America especially since World War II.

When viewed as a "right," this suggests an entitlement and not just something the individual would prefer or like to have. Instead, he can demand it, unless the promise carries conditions under which the "right" does not apply. Without such restrictions, any service promised as a "right" to one individual or group must be provided to all, regardless of cost and inconvenience. And, it must be of equal quality.

Little wonder then that demand, and hence costs, have soared under government-sponsored health schemes without adequate control mechanisms.

Most countries where the social programs have been implemented as a "right" are founded on free-enterprise economies. There are bound to be problems in meshing these two, especially if the hospitals, physicians, and other producers of health services continue to operate as autonomous units—in a free market place—but are financed by government money requiring political review and control.

Since the demand for care is literally insatiable, government regulation is inevitable. We must ration the procedures, with the criteria for entry and coverage eligibility becoming more important to the sick citizenry. Not only does the demand for care exceed supply, but each new medical discovery aggravates this situation.

Since the demand for care is initiated by the individual, in response to a symptom, the volume of care will depend on the priority that the individual assigns to his health, in relation to his other wants and needs. However, if there is no need to make any decisions as to whether or not something must be sacrificed if treatment is sought, there is no reason for the individual not to enter the system, and hence, there is an increase in demand.

By introducing prepayment health plans, both voluntary and governmental, we have radically altered the market place. We do not apply the price or sacrifice principle in deciding whether or not to use health services, as is the case in other areas of our activities. The public demand for health care is unleashed, because people can now have health care and other desired items as well.

We are not prepared to withhold services from anyone who has failed to provide for them through savings or prepayment, for to do so would be a denial of the Christian

ethic. As a result a laissez-faire society with a charitable conscience has created an inefficient and ineffective system of health care.

The priceless life has become priceable, with the health system having to compete with other services offered the public. In those cases where the government provides all of the funds, health must compete on a political basis with other governmental services.

The time has now arrived where governments are finding that the cost of their health systems is exceeding the political return. In some instances there is a political backlash because the government cannot afford to provide the service offered in return for the vote. While the cost of the original health plan was reasonable at the time the plan was started, medical advances have developed new treatments, some of which are terribly expensive (organ transplant) and must be made available to all of the population who can benefit from them, since they have been promised as a citizen's "right."

If all of the system capital comes from government, in order to have equal quantity, quality, and access, it may be necessary to lower the standard of care for some in order to have equal standards for all, although there are many people who are prepared to pay for higher quality as a matter of personal preference and priority.

Taken further, if the amount of social capital going into the health programs was totally committed to the delivery system, and there was little likelihood of this being increased, a government might look unfavorably on research simply because it would not have the funds necessary to provide the new treatments or drugs to all of the population as their "right."

Carried to the extreme, this could eliminate the research and development of new drugs and procedures. The drastic cuts in the National Institutes of Health budget in the United States and the Medical Research Council in Canada suggest that this may already be taking place.

It is probable that, in the long run, any government committed to a universal and comprehensive health plan as a citizen's "right" would be wise to build in some type of abatement or buffer to modify the public's demand for the "best possible health care" in order that it can at least provide a high level of basic health services.

If this isn't done, the government may become so hard pressed by the health professions and the public to continue to extend the system to include new and exotic treatment programs that it will have difficulty providing essential services. Add to that the pressures for "convenience health care" and the subsequent political backlash if it is not forthcoming, and the political liability of the system increases even more, adding to the already serious financial problems of operation.

It is not difficult to identify the effects of these policies in certain countries.

For example, in Canada, it has been necessary to impose firm administration controls on the construction and operational aspects of the hospital system. In spite of this centralized direction, the cost of the system has risen alarmingly, to the extent that the federal authority is now wishing to cancel out its 50% sharing program with the provinces. Understandably, the provinces are reluctant to agree to this, since the move would in essence, shift the entire responsibility of system control to the provincial governments and saddle them with the majority of increased cost of operations in the future.

For the past five years, federal-provincial conferences have been held at many levels to attempt to modify the federal-provincial sharing agreements but, to date, they have not been successful.

The federal authority unilaterally reduced

the percentage of sharing last year, and will be reducing the percentage further in the future, without the agreement of the provincial governments.

In Australia, a national health program was implemented on July 1, 1975, modeled on Canada. The problems of implementation and the escalating cost of the system were a major factor in the defeat of the Labor Government in December 1975.

One of the first moves of the new government was to modify the "Medibank" plan and return many of the features of the voluntary programs that had existed previously. In both Canada and Australia, the programs were developed on the concept of health care as a "right," but the cost changed the systems into a liability that is still a problem in Canada, but will likely be less of a problem in Australia—due to the modifications that have been put into effect.

In the United States, health care as a "right" has been proposed since the early '30s and was the vote-catching phrase on which Medicare was implemented in the '60s. It is the concept which has been proposed recently by many U.S. legislators.

The United States should examine the experience of other countries very carefully, the most important, perhaps, being Australia, so that it can learn why the Australian government moved so rapidly to alter its health care system modeled on the Canadian program.

It is probable that the United States, when it finally does adopt national health insurance, will continue with its pluralistic system.

The cost of health care has risen precipitously all over the world and is not restricted to government-sponsored health care programs.

However, any government planning to introduce a national health care insurance program should carefully examine the basic principles on which it is to be structured, and the types of controls that will keep its costs within reason.

Otherwise, it will turn into a political liability when what was hoped for was a political asset.

CREDIT UNION MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1977

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation which would permit Federal credit unions to operate more efficiently and to better serve the financial needs of their members.

As member-owned, member-managed, nonprofit organizations, credit unions are unique among financial institutions. Since 1934, they have been organized throughout the country by people who share a common bond. Credit unions have pioneered in providing low-cost consumer credit, consumer counseling and education, and other services to their members. Frequently, credit unions provide loans to persons who would have difficulty obtaining financing at other financial institutions.

In Maine, credit unions have enjoyed great popularity. There are 180 credit unions with a total membership exceeding 227,000 in the State. Credit unions in Maine grant approximately 120,000 loans per year to their members. And,

with the aid of the legislation I am sponsoring today, credit unions could be even more responsive to the needs of their members.

One of the most important provisions of the bill would allow credit unions to offer long-term home mortgage loans. This power should help stimulate the depressed housing industry as well as providing an additional source of mortgage funds for individuals wanting to purchase or build homes. Under the provisions of Maine's banking code, State-chartered credit unions are already permitted to offer home mortgage loans. Federal legislation is needed to extend the same powers to federally chartered credit unions.

In addition, Federal credit unions would be permitted to make conventional mobile home and home improvement loans with a maturity of 15 years. The present maximum maturity for all loans is only 10 years.

These two proposals—the long-term residential mortgages and the extension of the maturity limit to 15 years for home improvement and mobile home loans—would better enable credit unions to meet the housing needs of their members.

The legislation also establishes a National Central Liquidity Fund under the control of the National Credit Union Administration. This fund would assist insured credit unions in meeting a temporary high demand for cash. In times of severe credit restraint, a credit union may face an emergency and be unable to acquire short-term funds from the banking system. Emergency situations, such as a plant closing or a massive lay-off, could cause extraordinary savings withdrawals from credit unions. In this case, the liquidity fund would meet the need for capital, if the local traditional money source could not supply needed funds at reasonable rates.

Another provision of the bill would permit credit unions to offer personal checking accounts to their members. This provision was included in the Senate version of the Financial Reform Act, on which the House did not complete action in the 94th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, most of the powers of credit unions are unchanged from 42 years ago, when the Federal Credit Union Act was passed. We need to update and expand the services which credit unions may offer in light of the countless changes in society and in our financial system. The legislation which I am introducing today would provide credit unions with the financial tools to serve their members in the years ahead.

THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.,
NATIONAL HOLIDAY BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, we commemorated the 48th anniversary of the birth of Rev. Martin

CXXIII—217—Part 3

Luther King, Jr., and I am again introducing legislation to declare his birthday a legal public holiday. Nearly 9 years have passed since his tragic assassination in Memphis. Each year subsequently, I have introduced this bill in Congress and I am pleased to be joined this session by 102 of my colleagues from both side of the aisle. Eleven States, as well as most of the major cities across the country, already have set aside his birthday as a time of formal observance.

At this point in our Nation's history, Martin Luther King's life and work continue to exemplify in the most powerful way the striving of Americans for equality and justice, peace in the world, and reconciliation at home. Even after his death, respect continues to grow for his unshakable faith in people, his indomitable courage, and his magnificent ideals. To make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday would not only be a way to commemorate his life and to foster understanding among all members of society, but also it would enable citizens to reflect upon, and rededicate themselves to, what surely must be our overriding purposes as a nation.

It is my strong hope that this year we will finally enact this tribute to one of the greatest Americans of this century and thereby establish the first national holiday honoring a black American.

OSHA REAPS LITTLE PRAISE FROM
NATION'S FARMERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Richard Orr, rural affairs editor of the Chicago Tribune, is most knowledgeable in matters relating to the agricultural sectors of our country.

In his column of January 31, he analyzes the adverse affects of OSHA regulations on the Nation's farmers. His article follows:

OSHA REAPS LITTLE PRAISE FROM NATION'S
FARMERS

(By Richard Orr)

Farmers across the nation last summer guffawed derisively at a pamphlet, "Safety With Beef Cattle," issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

"When floors are wet and slippery with manure, you can have a bad fall," the pamphlet advised cattlemen. "You could trip over junk or trash."

As if that weren't sufficient warning of the obvious, OSHA went on to say "hazards are one of the main causes of accidents," adding, "You can make your work area safe by finding hazards and removing them."

Sen. Carl Curtis (R., Neb.), a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, thought such advice was "so incredibly arrogant and insulting that it nearly leaves me speechless." Rep. Thomas Hagedorn (R., Mich.), a member of the House Agriculture Committee, said the pamphlet must have been written "for a New Yorker about to visit a farm for the first time."

Hagedorn said 155,000 copies each of the "Beef Cattle" and 27 other OSHA pamphlets dealing with farm safety were printed at a

cost of \$347,000, and that the government paid Purdue University specialists \$119,500 for developing the material.

This is the only laugh farmers have had from OSHA, the Department of Labor agency which has become an increasingly dirty word in rural areas since it started in 1971. While the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ranks a close second in farmers' lack of esteem, OSHA has created the most dismay of the federal agencies attempting to regulate agriculture.

Farm leaders assert that farmers are not opposed to improving safety and health standards. However, they consider many of the OSHA proposals and regulations unreasonable, arbitrary, unnecessarily costly, and devised by bureaucrats unfamiliar with farming.

"How much cost do you think we've added to the price of a tractor with OSHA?" former Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz once asked. "About \$1,000, I'd say."

Apparently he was referring to OSHA regulations requiring tractors to be equipped with roll bars or roll-over protective cabs and seat belts.

OSHA created a furor last year over a proposal interpreted to require toilets and drinking fountains in corn and wheat fields. The proposal, apparently based on California fruit and vegetable growing conditions, spelled out detailed requirements for inside locks, toilet paper holders, water quality, signs for the basins, how the water should flow from the drinking fountains, and water temperature.

Rep. Daniel Flood (D., Pa.) said the proposal would require any farm with five or more employees to have a toilet within 5 minutes walking distance, regardless of whether an employee was riding a tractor, which would mean nine toilets per square mile on larger Kansas wheat farms.

Rep. Marvin Esch (R., Mich.) once pointed out that OSHA required 64 pages in the Federal Register to define and outline regulations pertaining to construction, use, and safety of a simple ladder.

The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), which wants Congress to repeal the law authorizing OSHA, is still boiling over so-called emergency pesticide safety regulations the agency promulgated in 1973: The federation and other organizations went to court to show there was no emergency and that even if there were, the proposed regulations would have been impracticable.

One of the proposed regulations, for example, specified that workers entering a field within two days after it had been sprayed with a pesticide would be required to wear impermeable clothing, face masks, gloves, and boots. Even workers who wanted more protection against pesticide contamination protested they wouldn't wear such clothing in the 100-degree-plus heat in which they often work.

The proposed regulation also required farmers to pay for washing such clothing or to construct their own washing facilities of a prescribed design. To comply with the latter requirement, some Wisconsin farmers would have had to apply for zoning law changes.

The AFBF spent \$10,000 to fight the case. The court returned \$94.56 for costs of printing the brief and the filing fee.

"The thing that burns up farmers most is the duplication of regulations and laws between state and federal governments, and even within the federal government," said C. David Mayfield, an AFBF attorney.

For example, OSHA regulations for temporary housing for migrant workers spell out detailed requirements for such things as size and construction of buildings, window screens, lighting, cooking equipment, beds to be a specified number of inches from the floor and a specified number of feet apart,

doors that have to swing shut automatically, air-tight trash cans, and toilets.

Another labor department agency, the Employment and Training Administration (formerly the Manpower Administration), has similar, though somewhat different, housing standards. Farmers must comply with one or the other set of standards, both enforced by OSHA.

But in addition, many states have their own public health laws that also prescribe housing standards—making three sets of detailed regulations with which farmers must struggle to avoid trouble with the law.

Last Dec. 30 a Federal District Court in Boise, Idaho, ruled that OSHA provisions authorizing safety inspections of business establishments and farms without a search warrant violated the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits unreasonable search and seizure. Rep. George Hansen (R., Idaho) halted the decision as putting OSHA "out of business," but farm leaders are awaiting an anticipated OSHA appeal to the Supreme Court.

Farmers' difficulties with EPA center mainly on its ban of several highly effective pesticides, which they contend increases their production costs. Farmers charge the EPA often takes an arbitrary and unreasonably rigid attitude toward pesticides, prohibiting their use without conclusive evidence of the risk of such chemicals to human health.

Allan Grant, AFBF president, recently requested a conference on the pesticide problem with President Carter. Grant hopes to obtain the Georgia peanut farmer's support for transferring EPA's administration of agricultural chemicals to the more sympathetic Department of Agriculture and for legislation exempting family farms from EPA regulations.

"Without the use of agricultural chemicals and drugs, agriculture cannot continue to provide sufficient quantities of high quality food and fiber to supply our existing markets," said Grant. "In any evaluation of chemicals and drugs, the rule of reason must prevail, with the possible detrimental effects considered in relation to the known benefits."

Many farmers also are concerned over current and potential EPA antipollution regulations pertaining to livestock feedlots. Current regulations force farmers with specified numbers of cattle, hogs, and sheep to obtain permits to operate.

To obtain a permit the farmer must install devices or take other measures to prevent pollution of rivers and streams by polluted water flowing from tiles, ditches, drains, or other "point sources."

Such measures are often expensive, and farmers point out that, unlike business firms, they cannot recover such costs by adding to the price of their product, which has to be sold for whatever it may bring on the open market.

ENERGY

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1978 budget for energy research, development, and demonstration programs presented to Congress by President Ford shows an overall 25-percent increase, with dollar cuts in only two areas: Energy conservation and solar heating and cooling.

This is, quite simply, an outrage.

The budget authority for the present fiscal year—1977—shows that 63 percent of the energy research dollar goes for nuclear energy, 18 percent for fossil fuels, 11 percent for solar energy, 6 percent for energy conservation, and 2 percent for geothermal.

President Ford's new budget for fiscal year 1978 has the fraction for nuclear energy rising to 65 percent, that for fossil fuels remaining at 18 percent, solar energy decreasing to 9 percent, and energy conservation decreasing to less than 5 percent, while geothermal increases slightly.

The total requested funding for nuclear energy is \$2.15 billion, while solar energy and energy conservation together account for only \$465 million.

The increase in nuclear energy funding—\$498 million—totals more than the combined funding for solar energy and energy conservation.

We are, once again, in the midst of an energy crisis that is gripping the Nation's attention. The crisis has actually been with us several years, and will assuredly remain with us for quite a few more years. Breeder reactors and fusion reactors cannot contribute significantly to our energy situation before the year 2000, by the most optimistic assessments, yet the fiscal year 1978 budget includes nearly \$1.4 billion for research into these options.

Energy conservation and certain solar energy technologies—such as solar hot water heating—can begin to contribute to an improvement in our energy situation right now—not in the 1980's or the 1990's or the 21st century, but in 1977—and they can do so economically.

Does it make sense that funding for research, development, and demonstration into these areas is reduced? Funding for energy conservation and solar heating and cooling is down from \$247 million in fiscal year 1977 to \$205 million in President Ford's fiscal year 1978 budget.

Solar hot water systems purchased for dwellings under HUD's residential solar energy demonstration program are costing under \$1,000 per unit on the average despite the lack of economies from mass production. A year ago the average cost was over \$1,800.

If the \$500 million increase for nuclear energy in the fiscal year 1978 budget had been applied to demonstrations of solar hot water systems, as an example, it would pay for over 1,000 demonstrations in every congressional district of the country—perhaps 2,000 units if prices continued to drop as they did in 1976.

President Carter is due to present a revised budget later this month. It is clear that the energy research, development, and demonstration budget of the Energy Research and Development Administration badly needs revision. Energy conservation and solar energy need increased funding. As a member of the energy subcommittees of the House Science and Technology Committee I intend to push for funding in these areas to reflect current realities.

TABLE.—BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR ERDA'S ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

	Fiscal year 1977		Fiscal year 1978 request	
	BA (mil-lions)	Fraction (per-cent)	BA (mil-lions)	Fraction (per-cent)
Nuclear energy:				
Breeder reactor.....	686	26.0	855	25.9
Other fission.....	552	20.9	784	23.7
Fusion.....	416	15.7	513	15.5
Total.....	1,654	52.6	2,152	65.1
Fossil energy.....	483	18.3	598	18.1
Solar energy:				
Heating and cooling....	86	3.3	45	1.4
Electric and other.....	204	7.6	260	7.9
Total.....	290	10.9	305	9.3
Energy conservation.....	161	6.1	160	4.8
Geothermal.....	55	2.1	88	2.7
Total.....	2,643	100.0	3,303	100.0

Source: ERDA factsheet.

ONE COMMUNITY'S APPROACH TO SOLVING JUVENILE CRIME

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 25 discussing the approach which the city of Deerfield, Ill., is taking to deal with its growing juvenile crime problem.

Central to Deerfield's program is to subject certain juvenile criminals to adult prosecution. Included among these crimes are vandalism. Since this program was implemented, vandalism crimes have decreased by nearly 40 percent.

Other features of the program deal with juvenile crime as a social problem, placing families in a position of accountability for acts committed by their children.

I have proposed legislation which would subject juveniles at the age of 15 to adult penalties for certain serious crimes committed. I consider this to be a fundamental need nationally if we are to arrest the growth of juvenile crime.

I offer this article for the consideration of my colleagues:

DEERFIELD STEMS JUVENILE-CRIME TIDE: "GET TOUGH, WORK CLOSER WITH YOUTH"

(By Robert M. Press)

DEERFIELD, ILL.—Bucking a state trend, reported acts of juvenile vandalism in 1976 dropped nearly 40 percent and bicycle thefts nearly 50 percent in this affluent suburb north of Chicago.

U.S. Government sponsors of a six-year study of juvenile delinquency in Illinois recently reported in Washington that an estimated one-third of all juveniles in Illinois have committed "at least one serious offense."

In Deerfield (population approximately 19,000), where the "serious" juvenile crime is usually burglary, the answer seems to be a combination of getting tough—and working closer with youth to steer them clear of trouble.

During late 1975 and 1976, several things happened here.

Among them:

The village passed two ordinances making juvenile vandalism an adult offense. Previously only the busy juvenile court heard such cases under state law. But sending 12 juveniles in the first nine months of 1976 to an adult court on vandalism charges has been a "deterrent" to others, village officials assume.

One ordinance subjects parents to a fine of up to \$500 if their children are convicted of vandalism twice within a year. So far, no parents have been fined under the ordinance, used only in the most flagrant of cases—but some parents are on notice following a first finding of guilt of their child.

In June, however, a New Jersey appellate court found a similar ordinance of Trenton, New Jersey, unconstitutional on grounds it denied parents due process.

Possession of small amounts of marijuana was made an adult offense.

A youth drop-in center program was expanded with the help of a full-time director. At the center, which teen-agers help run themselves, they can play Ping-Pong, watch TV, join "rap" groups, and plan trips.

Youthbound, a program of rock climbing and other events led by police, was expanded to include more frequent outings.

The trips "build up your confidence and you find out they [police] are not all that bad," says Danny, a 16-year-old youth who entered the program after he robbed a gas station.

The federally sponsored study in Illinois showed that of all youths questioned statewide: 13 percent admitted taking part in robbery; 40 percent admitted keeping stolen goods; and 50 percent admitted shoplifting.

The Illinois Mental Health Department is conducting the study with financing from the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which released the report. Researchers interviewed 3,180 youths between the ages of 14 and 18 in 40 of Illinois' 102 counties, and talked with 1,970 parents of those youths.

The study found that "peer group" influence, from youthful associates rather than parents, determines whether a specific youth will become delinquent. Sex, race, social class, coming from a broken home, or living in an inner city "really have relatively little influence."

One sociologist spent two years in an affluent Chicago suburb. He found that, so long as youths did "important things" right, other acts were not strongly opposed, the report says.

"Adolescents live in a near-vacuum of morality enclosed by the perimeter of the edict to achieve," the sociologist reported. "Anything that jeopardizes their occupational future is bad. The rest really doesn't matter."

Dr. Gary Schwartz, an Illinois state anthropologist and co-director of the study, said parents and institutions do have an influence on the "norms" or peer groups—but once peer standards are established they become the overriding influence.

Deerfield has had a full-time youth director, Thomas A. Creighton, for about four years. He works closely with the police, especially two officers assigned full-time to work with juveniles.

Youth "still want to know where the line is painted—and want to know the consequences, if they cross it," says Mr. Creighton. "Kids aren't let off the hook," he added in an interview at his office.

But neither are they simply prosecuted for their offenses. Offenders get a lot of time and attention from Mr. Creighton and the police youth officials who help them find better things to do.

"We're not in the business of collecting fines," says police chief Richard Brandt. "Our program is to change the behavior of the child."

Chief Brandt says he does not know which element in the village's "package" is bringing down the number of juvenile offenses, but he assumes it is a combination of all of them.

The ordinance involving parents was recommended by Mayor Bernard Forrest who says: "We felt parents were not paying attention to what the kids were doing."

But, asks Milton Rector, president of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency: "What good does it do to [involve] parents who have been incapable of disciplining the youngsters? It couldn't please some youngsters more than to see the old man have to pay up."

A better alternative, he suggests, would be to make greater use of juvenile courts to impose work orders and other forms of restitution on the offender—ideas being tried in Deerfield.

The good news from Deerfield has attracted widespread attention. More than 60 suburban and other officials in some 13 states—and even La Ville D'Alma in Quebec, Canada—have written here for "how did you do it?" information.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND TAXES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress one of the most widely discussed pieces of legislation was the so-called Humphrey-Hawkins bill. Though it was never acted upon, it served the purpose of focusing attention on a particular philosophy of economics and Government policy. This philosophy, in effect, argues that unemployment results from a failure in the market mechanism. Government, therefore, must step in and guarantee full employment.

I would be the first to agree that unemployment is an unnatural phenomenon which indicates a malfunction somewhere in the system. However, I believe that the source of this malfunction has been misdiagnosed by those who support the Humphrey-Hawkins concept. The malfunction does not lie in the free enterprise system, but rather at the doorstep of Government itself. In this sense, I think that everyone will agree that Government can and should do something about the unemployment problem.

In the following outstanding article, Prof. Arthur Laffer of the University of Southern California presents what I believe to be a persuasive argument that high tax rates are a fundamental cause for the current economic malaise. It would follow logically, therefore, that these tax rates must be reduced as a prelude to full economic recovery. Any so-called full employment program which does not significantly adjust the tax rates will inevitably fail. I believe that Professor Laffer's elaboration of

this point is highly significant and I commend it to my colleagues:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND TAXES

(By Arthur B. Laffer)

The Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act, which never came to a vote last fall because of the pre-election congressional rush to adjourn, will be re-introduced in the new Congress, possibly under an expanded sponsorship and in a slightly amended form designed to make it more acceptable to its congressional critics. But in purpose and intent it will remain the same.

Now, there is no economic issue ever that is more important than relieving unemployment and the related ills of misemployment, underemployment, and withdrawals from the labor force. Unemployment brings misery to the wage-earner and his family: everyone knows that. In addition, however, the market's failure to make use of a perishable natural resource makes all of us poorer, the loss far exceeding any strict dollars-and-cents measure. A large part of the United States' role as world leader is predicated upon our economic prowess. Our capacity to deter potential belligerents rests not only on our defense capabilities narrowly defined, but also on our production base.

But is a Humphrey-Hawkins type of program the solution to the problem?

No proposition is more obvious in economics than that if taxes on a product are raised there will be less of that product. Likewise, if subsidies for a product are increased, there will be more of the subsidized product. In the United States today we are taxing employment through a multitude of imposts such as personal and corporate income taxes. We are also subsidizing inefficiency, non-work, and the absence of production through agricultural subsidies, Export-Import Bank subsidies, the "retirement test" for Social Security, etc.

No wonder the United States today has so much unemployment! And the Humphrey-Hawkins bill will, if enacted, only continue and intensify these trends. First, the money to pay for it can come only from current producers and employers, thus adding to the already onerous tax on employment. Second, the money will be paid out as yet another subsidy of non-production. Thus it is inconceivable to me that such a program will do anything other than hurt workers, consumers, and the truly needy who rely on other government programs.

A firm's decision to hire is based, in part, upon the total cost to the firm of the employee's services. The more it costs a firm to hire workers the fewer it will hire; conversely, the less it costs a firm to hire workers the more it will hire. By the same token, a man's decision to work is based, in part, on the amount of money he will get for that work. The more the employee gets the more willing he is to work, and *vice versa*. Employees, it should be noted, are not concerned with the total cost picture; all they care about is how much they get, after taxes.

The difference between the wages firms pay and the wages employees receive is called the "wedge." This wedge consists of income taxes, payroll taxes, excise taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, and the cost of government-mandated paperwork.

Let us consider a case where the wedge (or tax) on a worker's gross wages of \$200 per week is 20 per cent. Assume that the employer pays half of that tax and the employee half. Under these conditions the total cost to the employer is not \$200 per week but \$220 per week. The firm's decision to hire is based exclusively on the \$220 figure. But the employee, after he has subtracted his tax-wedge share of \$20, is left with only \$180 per week.

It is easy to see what happens if the wedge is increased to, say, 40 per cent. Assuming it is still divided evenly, then wages paid by the firm rise from the \$220 figure to \$240; the firm will hire fewer workers. Meanwhile, wages received by employees will fall from \$180 to \$160; employees will be less willing to work. Both the firm's desire to hire workers and the workers' willingness to be hired will be reduced as the wedge increases. Output falls and the level of total employment falls as the wedge increases.

In the United States the wedge can be represented either by total government spending, or by the total of transfer payments. Basically, transfer payments are transfers of real resources from producers to people who do not produce; as such, they reduce the amount of goods and services available to the people who produced them. Transfer payments are therefore a tax on production and work, and a payment based upon a characteristic other than work. Some of the transfers may be based on population characteristics: age, residence, health, sex, race, etc. In many instances, transfers are a payment explicitly for non-work: agricultural subsidies, food stamps (which have a maximum income requirement), Social Security payments (which impose retirement), housing subsidies, and, obviously, unemployment compensation itself.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND TRANSFER WEDGE¹

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Government spending: Federal, State, and local	Spending wedge (spending divided by GNP)	Government transfers: Federal, State, and local	Transfer wedge (transfers divided by GNP)
1950	61.0	0.213	22.5	0.079
1955	97.9	.245	22.9	.057
1960	136.4	.270	36.1	.071
1965	187.8	.273	49.4	.072
1970	312.0	.318	93.1	.095
1975	525.2	.350	194.0	.129

¹ Source: Economic Report of the President.

In the table I have attempted to construct a time-series on the wedge, both in absolute magnitude and as a share of GNP. Of necessity, much is omitted from the figures, e.g.: 1) the market equivalent of the value to the owners of productive factors lost through restrictions on the use of their resources such as transportation regulations, pollution controls, health requirements, etc.; 2) the market value of the time people spend to comply with government regulations and forms; and 3) the total cost to firms of accountants and lawyers hired to assure compliance with government regulations. In spite of these omissions, which tend to understate the size of the wedge, the table is roughly indicative of the recent trends in the United States toward the growth of the wedge.

Depending upon the specific assumptions underlying the cost estimates, one will come up with a larger or smaller figure by which the Humphrey-Hawkins bill will increase the wedge. However, in virtually every respect this bill will place additional burdens on producers and workers and simultaneously give little in the way of final output in return.

The "reordering of national priorities" mentioned in the bill in fact means a continuation of current policy trends. The general tendency, with some notable exceptions, is already to make the economy less efficient, especially in the areas of energy and transportation. The added levels of bureaucracy required by Humphrey-Hawkins will be of little ultimate benefit to the country. And the value of the production of those to be employed under this program will, through no fault of their own, not be as high as the payments made to them.

Viewing the cyclical nature of the economy from this vantage point also gives us a slightly different perspective.

Let us imagine for a moment an economy that produces, say, 1,000 real units of output and has government transfers and purchases of 500 real units. In this case, the producers and workers who produce the 1,000 real units of output are able to keep 500 of those units. For every two units a man produces he gets to keep only one. Fifty per cent, the wedge, is taxed away and given to someone else.

Let us see now what happens if, for whatever reason, there is a shortfall of income or output from the 1,000-unit level to 900 units. In our economy, as output and employment fall, government spending rises, almost entirely as a result of increased transfer payments. Increases occur across a whole range of categories, including open-ended automatic increases in food stamps, Social Security benefits, education loans, and unemployment benefits. There will be newly legislated increases as well. For the sake of the example, let's imagine that government spending rises by 40 real units.

Therefore, while output falls from 1,000 to 900, government spending rises from 500 to 540. The wedge in the economy rises from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. Producers and workers receive only four-fifths of one unit for every two they produce, where as they used to receive a full unit for every two they produced. By increasing its spending during a recession or downturn in production, the government reduces the incentives to produce and work. Far from stabilizing the economy, such "countercyclical" spending will, in fact, accentuate the cyclical aspects of the economy.

Several features of Humphrey-Hawkins as drawn up last year directly accentuate the cyclical nature of the economy. By having a permanent countercyclical grant program to state and local governments, this bill would increase the severity of recessions and heighten excessively expansionary booms. The employment program would do the same. This program for all practical purposes raises the tax wedge during recessions and lowers the tax wedge during booms. As a consequence, the economy would become more unstable than it already is. Not surprisingly, the U.S. has just experienced the worst recession of the postwar period at a time when government spending is taking its greatest share of GNP and is geared most closely to the level of unemployment. The impact on inflation follows directly from the impact on real output and production. Inflation results primarily from too much money chasing too few goods. Reducing output and production, as I believe this bill would do, will lead to higher prices.

In sum, Humphrey-Hawkins will do the reverse of what it promises. It will 1) reduce total employment, 2) make growth more cyclical and less stable, resulting in 3) higher prices.

Nothing is more important than achieving full employment and balanced growth. But the way to achieve more employment and greater output is to make it more profitable for workers to work and for employers to employ. An economy does not reduce unemployment and increase output by taxing work and employment.

If we are ever to achieve a sustainable high level of output, we must reduce the tax wedge on producers and workers. These reductions must occur predominantly in the already overtaxed and therefore underemployed factors of production. It is especially important for the reductions to be on marginal rates of taxation. Three areas of taxation deserve special attention: taxes on corporate-held capital, personal income taxes, and the implicit taxes (such as minimum-wage laws) on the less-educated and disadvantaged participants in our economy. In addition to reducing tax rates on production and work, in-

equitable and distorted spending must also be restrained.

Corporate-held capital is taxed today at exceptionally high rates on the margin. Corporations pay a marginal tax rate of 48 per cent on each additional dollar of profit before anything goes to the ultimate owners of the capital. On what they receive after the corporate tax has been paid, the owners of the capital must then pay additional personal income taxes. Even if the marginal personal income tax rate were only 42 percent, this would imply that the tax wedge on corporate-held capital would be close to 70 percent. And that means the corporate and personal income taxes on reported profits. Because of the effects of inflation, reported corporate profits overstate actual economic profits. Inventory price increases are reported as profits when, in reality, they are not. Similarly, depreciation is calculated from the purchase price of the capital good, not the replacement cost.

In addition to these obvious considerations, some allowances should be made for capital-gains taxes, excess-profits taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, the cost of restrictions on the use of resources, and the cost of accountants and lawyers hired to comply with government regulations. All things considered, the total marginal tax wedge on corporate-held capital may well be in excess of 90 percent.

There must be some post-wedge yield if people are to be induced to save in order to provide the capital to employ workers. Thus reducing tax rates, especially the high marginal tax rates on capital, will reduce unemployment, decrease misemployment, reduce under-employment, and attract potential workers back into the labor force.

Another tax drastically in need of reduction is the personal income tax, especially since a substantial portion of the current rise in tax rates is due to the effects of inflation on progressive tax schedules. Perhaps the best single measure here would be to index the personal income tax. As a second best, individual exemptions and deductions should be increased across the board. And an across-the-board reduction in the tax rate (a negative tax surcharge) could be enacted.

The effect of minimum-wage regulations on the less-educated, disadvantaged workers is exceedingly severe. If a minority youth in a poor neighborhood would like to work for \$1.50 an hour, and a small minority-run business would like to hire him at that wage rate, it can't be done because of the minimum-wage law. After being chronically unemployed for a long period, such a person becomes close to, if not literally, unemployable.

Complicated tax schedules, arcane building codes, and other modern bureaucratic developments present a serious impediment to economic development by entrepreneurs in poor neighborhoods. As if it weren't already hard enough to start up a successful business in a poor neighborhood, the government-imposed tax wedge is probably highest there. It is precisely in these neighborhoods that another massive government program, Humphrey-Hawkins, is expected to undo the effects of all the previous similar programs.

I doubt very much whether the United States can maintain peacetime full employment without a substantial reduction in the level of government spending as a share of GNP. At the very least, this spending must be redirected in such a way as to reduce the direct incentives for nonproduction and non-employment.

The proponents of Humphrey-Hawkins argue that if the market won't provide ample employment opportunities, then government spending must take up the slack. By hiring previously unemployed workers, the logic runs, the government will place purchasing power in the hands of people who will spend. This spending in turn stimulates employ-

ment, and so the process continues. Even if the government employees produce nothing of value (such as holes first dug and then filled up again), the argument goes, the economy will still be better off in terms of total production and employment.

There are two critical questions to be asked here. First, how and from whom does the government get the additional resources to pay for the program? In the case of direct taxes the answer is clear. For every dollar a recently hired government employee gets, some private employee gets one dollar less; the increased spending by the government employee is exactly offset by the reduced spending of the now-taxed private employee. If the spending is financed by debt issue, then some borrower will be "crowded out" of the capital market and his spending will fall by the amount by which the government employees' spending rises.

Whether private producers are taxed out or crowded out, total aggregate demand will not change. Only if we totally ignore the real effects of the financing will we expect an increase in demand much less in real supply.

The second question is whether the total wedge will not increase and thereby lead to lower output. Using an admittedly extreme example, what would happen if the government raised taxes and spending to the entire amount of GNP? Does anyone for a moment think that output would not fall? People who feel that full employment legislation will move the economy to a higher level of employment and output have overlooked the facts that 1) the people who are taxed or can't borrow because of the financing of this program will reduce their spending to offset increased spending by those who receive the funds, and 2) with a larger share of output going to the tax wedge, employers and employees will switch from work and production into non-work and non-production.

TELEVISION VIOLENCE

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, television violence, as many of my colleagues know, has been the subject of much discussion over the past few years. For better or worse, watching television has become an American pastime and an estimated 15 to 20 million viewers are children of school age and younger. It is no wonder that parents are worried and alarmed over the impact television violence may have on their children.

In Chicago, local parent-teacher associations are joining with the national PTA in calling for a halt to such television programming. Concerned parents, educators, and civic leaders met last week at the Sheraton Hotel to express their opposition to the continued use of violence on television. Through their efforts, attention is being focused on the effects of television violence on our young people.

The House Subcommittee on Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings in July of 1975. At those hearings it was brought out by John Schneider, president of CBS broadcast group,

that between the hours of 8 and 9 p.m. the number of young viewers between the ages of 2 and 11 is about 14 million. This figure, according to Mr. Schneider, declines to around 5.6 million between the hours of 10:30 and 11 p.m. Quite a substantial number when you consider the age group.

Television is a prime learning tool in the lives of these youngsters. But unfortunately, television programming does not reflect the magnitude of its responsibility to viewers of all ages.

The participants at the hearing in Chicago cited the lack of reality in television programs. A stabbing, a shooting, a beating are portrayed as the natural way to get things done. Children learn that acts of violence will get them what they want.

Television, for the most part, is a world of fantasy and for children the distinction is never made between fantasy and reality. We see violence romanticized or having glamour. We see the he-man who gets what he wants through violence. What we do not see is the agony and suffering and death which accompanies these acts of violence. To children it is just a make-believe game where a man is shot, gets up, brushes himself off, and walks away.

In 1968, President Lyndon Johnson established the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. This Commission studied the violence portrayed in television programs. In 1969, the Commission issued the following statement:

We believe it is reasonable to conclude that a constant diet of violent behavior on television has an adverse effect on human character and attitudes. Violence on television encourages violent forms of behavior and fosters moral and social values about violence in daily life which are unacceptable in a civilized society.

The Commission went on to say that television was emphasizing "antisocial styles of life."

In 1975, a study by University of Utah researchers reported that children who view television heavily can become desensitized to violence in real life:

Normal emotional responses to human suffering become blunted and this desensitization may easily cause not only major increases in our society of acts of personal aggression but also a growing attitude of indifference and nonconcern for the victims of real-life violence.

Since the Federal Communications Commission instituted the "Family Viewing Hour," it has met resistance. In a recent court decision the FCC was held in violation of the first amendment. In spite of this adverse ruling, the FCC continues its fight for the "Family Viewing Hour."

Local PTA groups should be commended along with the national organization in drawing attention to the scope of this problem. Researchers and psychologists point out that regardless of family background, school performance, or home life, the single most important determinant of a child's aggressiveness is the amount of television violence he views. This is a powerful conclusion that no parent can take lightly.

EQUITY FOR DIVORCED WOMEN

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to reduce from 20 to 10 the number of years a divorced woman must have been married to an insured individual in order to qualify for social security benefits based on the earnings of her former husband.

Over the years the social security system has undergone continuous reevaluation to insure adequacy and equity. While the essential principles of the program have been maintained, social security benefits have been adjusted, thus demonstrating a sensitivity to a changing society and to the changing needs of particular segments of our populace. Nevertheless, there remain certain categories of persons, among them divorced women, who are still inadequately protected by social security.

Under current law, a divorced woman must have been married for at least 20 years in order to receive a wife's or widow's benefits. This 20-year marriage requirement is unduly harsh. Women who have been married, 14, 15, 19, even 19½ years, find themselves without any social security benefits, because of the arbitrary 20-year duration-of-marriage requirement. Yet a woman who was married for just a few years less than 20 years may have spent her prime working years in the home and, as a result, be left with either no social security protection or a very meager benefit based on her own earnings. Her likelihood of remarrying or finding new employment are dismal, at best.

This 20-year duration-of-marriage requirement is all the more inequitable in view of the fact that an undivorced woman may become entitled to a wife's benefit after only 1 year of marriage or to a widow's benefit after having been married for a minimum of 9 months.

The estimated cost of this legislation, \$70 million, is not prohibitively expensive, particularly in light of the fact that in the first year the legislation would affect close to 20,000 to 30,000 women. Approximately 5,000 more women would be eligible each succeeding year since most women who would be eligible for the benefits, were they to be enacted this year, are older women. Younger women, whose marriages last 10 years or more, if they do not remarry, generally do work, and upon retirement become eligible for benefits on their own account.

Mr. Speaker, our efforts to end discrimination against women—in this case, divorced women—must continue unabated, and I urge my colleagues to support the reduction in the duration-of-marriage requirement for divorced women:

H.R. —

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "20 years" in paragraph (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance "10 years".

SEC. 2. Section 202(b)(1)(G) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "20 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 years".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

THE NEED FOR GAS DEREGULATION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we enter into one of the coldest winters our Nation has experienced in recent years, Americans are becoming acutely aware of the need for a permanent supply of energy resources. Natural gas, the most efficient and cleanest of our fossil fuels, is the energy resource in greatest demand. Yet, this winter, an estimated 14 of our Nation's States are experiencing severe shortages of their natural gas supplies.

The demand for natural gas has increased steadily since World War II, rising from 18 percent of total U.S. energy consumption in 1950 to 30 percent in 1974. By 1975, natural gas had emerged as the primary heating source for 40 million homes, 3.4 million commercial establishments, and 200,000 industrial plants. Despite the growing demand, the production of natural gas remains minimal—a direct result of continued congressional regulatory price controls imposed on our Nation's oil and gas industries.

Clearly the natural gas shortage is the direct result of decreasing production and discouraged recovery efforts by our Nation's producers. The gas producers could not afford to initiate new exploration and recovery programs under the old FPC price control limits. Recent statistics show natural gas producers receiving \$0.39 per million Btu, while coal producers are receiving \$0.79 Btu, followed closely by domestic oil at \$1.30 Btu, and imported oil at \$2.40 Btu.

What is the answer to our dwindling gas reserves? Deregulation is the only logical solution. The supply availability of the intrastate gas market points vividly to the success of deregulation in the interstate market. Intrastate gas is in plentiful supply, because intrastate gas sells in the open market. Where producers are drilling for intrastate contracts, demand for rigs has been strong.

The Federal Power Commission's July 1976 decision to increase the base ceiling rate for new interstate gas was one of the most positive steps taken to date in alleviating the natural gas crisis. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share

the results of the FPC's July decision as it affected two gasfields in southern Texas and Louisiana owned by Conoco. In a recent article published by the company, Bob Lee, head of Conoco's Houston Natural Gas and Gas Products Division, summed up the present natural gas situation as follows:

The differential between prices for interstate (regulated) and intrastate (non-regulated) gas amounts in some instances to more than \$1.50 per thousand cubic feet. This sharp difference in price has two inevitable consequences. First, it means that producers put as much of their production as possible into intrastate markets. That's what happened at Conoco. Three years ago, two thirds of our gas was sold on interstate markets. Today, the percentage has dropped to about half.

Another consequence of the multitier pricing structure is that marginal fields—those with low reserves or that are particularly expensive to produce, simply won't be developed if the gas can't be sold within the State at free market prices.

Mr. Speaker, the FPC's July ruling was only the first step in the right direction. Complete deregulation is needed immediately if America is ever going to realize energy self-sufficiency. Many people do not seem to understand how deregulation would affect the price of gas to the consumer. Only 20 percent of the final price of gas to the consumer is the wellhead price; 80 percent of the price is involved in pipeline and distribution cost.

Second, only about 8 percent of the total production of natural gas would come up for deregulation every year. Deregulation applies to so-called new gas not covered by old existing gas contracts. Many contracts will be in effect for the next 15 years, so it will be a gradual process absorbed by the economy.

The answer to our dwindling natural gas reserves is clear, Mr. Speaker—deregulation. I have recently introduced a gas deregulation bill in the House, H.R. 1562. It is urgent that Congress take some positive action in the quest for energy self-sufficiency. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this bill for a free unregulated market so America can finally realize domestic energy independence.

ETHNIC SLURS IN PUBLIC LIFE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I was both shocked and dismayed to read recently of Federal Trade Commissioner Paul Rand Dixon's remarks directed toward Consumerist Ralph Nader. While I do not deny Mr. Dixon the right to disagree with Mr. Nader I do take very strong exception to his irresponsible and irrational language wherein he cast aspersions on Mr. Nader's ethnic origin.

It is truly a sad day when a man of Ralph Nader's unquestioned integrity should be assailed by a member of the executive branch whose very office would demand the utmost in balance and objectivity.

In my estimation it is intolerable that a person in such a responsible position as Mr. Dixon should be allowed to make derogatory statements with impunity.

Bigotry should not be countenanced in any public official; Mr. Dixon has regretted his remarks but he has not offered a public apology to Ralph Nader. I believe this is the least that should be expected. It would not surprise me to see a serious effort to force his resignation develop over the next few days.

His resignation would illustrate once and for all that racial and ethnic slurs have no place in our American public life.

A CASE OF BRAVERY WITH A GUN

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the American people possess an advantage over the citizens of almost every other nation, the right to defend ourselves. This is a right which is exercised many times, but rarely do we hear of the acts of bravery performed by the individuals who are protecting their own lives or the lives of others.

An editorial in the Wyoming State Tribune of Cheyenne praised the successful attempt of a hunter to stop a criminal who had just gunned down a highway patrolman in cold blood.

The editorial noted the "value of the armed, and concerned citizen." This story is just one example of many lives which are saved each year due to the presence of a gun.

It is my feeling that honest, law-abiding citizens should not be disarmed. Otherwise, everyone would be at the mercy of the criminals who will always be armed.

At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues the story of a brave man who risked his own life to shoot a killer so that other lives may be saved. The editorial follows:

THE ARMED CITIZEN IN ACTION

We hope you read the story in yesterday's issue of this newspaper about the deer hunter from San Angelo, Tex., and his son who were returning home from New Mexico and a hunting trip.

If you didn't we'll repeat it here. If you did maybe we can bore you again because it bears on some current thinking in this country concerning ownership of firearms and the law-abiding citizen.

The unidentified San Angelo man and his son according to the UPI account were driving along a highway in West Texas when they observed a pickup truck being pursued by a highway patrol cruiser.

The latter overtook the pickup and pulled it off to the side of the highway and the West Texas man and his son then saw the officer running toward the back of the vehicle. Then as they pulled into a roadside park to observe further they saw the patrolman lying on the ground with a man standing over him shooting the officer.

One of the pair, either the man or his son, the story did not say which, took a high-powered rifle and firing from 100 to 150 yards away, hit the gunman at least once killing him.

The officer was dead, slain by at least 10

bullets fired into his body by the gunman who was driving a vehicle stolen in San Francisco last week.

The district attorney of the jurisdiction where the shootings occurred says that the man who killed the gunman with the high-powered rifle ought to be given a medal; he made clear anyway he would not be prosecuted.

But more than that, it points up the value of the armed, and concerned citizen. Recently we noted arguments against a Massachusetts proposal involving handguns which would have been confiscated by the state, after due compensation. These firearms, admittedly, only involved handguns and not shoulder-fired weapons of 16 inches or more in length but nonetheless the moral seems clear. Because one spokesman for a police association pointed out that such a movement would disarm honest and lawabiding citizens whom law enforcement agencies need; the police, he pointed out, cannot do it all.

This would seem to have been amply proven in the Texas incident; what would have happened, we would like to ask, had this person, whoever he may be, not bestirred himself to act in behalf of law and order by killing this murderer in the act of taking the life of the patrolman? How many other innocent victims' lives, either other law enforcement officers or else civilians, might have been killed by this slayer had he not been shot down there.

In the words of the local district attorney who investigated the case, this unnamed hero does deserve a medal because he risked his own life to take gun in hand, stand out on that highway and dare to shoot that killer in the act of taking another man's life.

He deserves the thanks of all persons of good will who owe him a debt of gratitude if only for the great example he has provided of the law-abiding citizen in action in behalf of society where in too many instances, especially today, the individual simply does not want to get involved because it might mean some risk to himself. He'd rather let somebody else do it even if it means that person's death.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE
JOHN M. MURPHY ON THE OTA
REPORT AND THE PROPOSED OCS
BILL

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1976, the Office of Technology Assessment issued a report on the "Coastal Effects of Offshore Energy Systems." After a comprehensive review of the present problems and hopes for offshore development in the Mid-Atlantic Region off New Jersey and Delaware, OTA concludes that exploitation of our offshore resources can proceed, and should proceed, provided adequate safeguards are established and maintained.

The Ad Hoc Select Committee on Outer Continental Shelf, after its almost 2 years of work, agreed with these conclusions. The bill, S. 521, passed by both Houses but not enacted into law because of parliamentary maneuvers at the end of the 94th Congress, contained the necessary safeguards detailed in the OTA report.

I introduced on January 11, 1977, the OCS bill as outlined in the conference

report of the 2d session of the 94th Congress and I have asked the staff of the select committee to analyze the OTA report, and specifically its findings and suggestions to Congress for legislation. This comparison, which is attached, indicates that the proposed OCS bill will insure prompt and safe development of our offshore resources:

COMPARISON OF REORGANIZATIONS BY OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN THEIR 1976 REPORT "COASTAL EFFECTS OF OFFSHORE ENERGY SYSTEMS" WITH PROPOSED HOUSE BILL TO AMEND THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LAND ACT TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE AD HOC SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

OFFSHORE PRIORITIES AND PLANNING

OTA Report

Future deployment of ocean technologies on a large scale could create serious conflicts among users and impose excessive burdens on ocean and coastal environments unless a system for setting priorities of use and for zoning ocean areas, much as land areas now are zoned, is established.

Proposed House bill

In its findings, purposes, and policies, the proposed OCS bill notes the need for detailed planning by the Federal government, and affected states, to minimize conflicts and adverse impacts, and notes the possible conflicts among ocean users and the need for the Federal government to assume responsibility for the minimization or elimination of conflicts.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

Congress may wish to deal with problems arising from conflicting ocean uses on any of a number of policy levels. It could:

1. Mandate a detailed study of conflicting ocean uses to assemble a data base on present and future uses and suggest priorities for development and control. Such a study could also assess present Federal organizational capabilities to deal with such conflicts and, if appropriate, propose changes, if any, required in the Federal structure.

2. Provide one ocean-related agency with authority to resolve ocean-use conflicts that result from increased offshore activities. Any such delegation of authority probably would have to specify arbitration, public or private, as an avenue for resolving some conflicts.

3. Require joint planning for offshore uses by conflicting parties, public and private, domestic and foreign.

Proposed House bill

1. The proposed OCS bill requires the Secretary of Interior to prepare an exploration program to obtain necessary information to allow adequate evaluation of the value and risks of OCS development, the impacts on State and local governments; requires studies to be undertaken of the state of the environment and effects of OCS activities on the environment.

2-3. The proposed OCS bill requires a five year leasing program to be prepared by the Secretary of Interior, after consultation with states, other government agencies, and interested citizens; the leasing program must consider impact on other resources users, and the environment; must discuss location of leasing areas in relation to other uses of the sea and seabed; and must be based on a proper balance between oil and gas development, environment protection, and advance impact on coastal areas.

FEDERAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

OTA report

Federal management of the offshore oil and gas program is fragmented within the Department of the Interior and coordination with other Federal agencies which share jurisdiction is ineffective.

Proposed OCS bill

The proposed OCS bill finds that there are a number of administrative problems that retard development, and requires coordination and consultation of all Federal departments and agencies to assure the elimination of inconsistent or duplicative requirements.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

1. Assign a single policy-level office within the Department of the Interior the authority and responsibility for OCS policy coordination.

2. Assign to a single policy-level office within the Department of the Interior general responsibility for program coordination with all Federal agencies with OCS responsibilities and specific line authority and responsibility for operations of:

Those sections within the USGS which now draft and enforce technical regulations for offshore oil and natural gas activities;

Those sections within the Bureau of Land Management which now supervise offshore leasing and environmental studies programs; and

All land uses, ocean use, economic, geological, and other planning that is now carried on independently in various sections within the Interior Department that relate to OCS operations.

Proposed OCS bill

1. An Office of Assistant Secretary for OCS matters is established, with responsibility for all Interior Department OCS matters.

2. This Office of Assistant Secretary is statutorily given all the functions of the Secretary pursuant to the OCS Act, which includes—

Drafting, promulgation and enforcement of OCS regulations—except for surveying and preparing maps;

Preparation, use, and evaluation of various leasing systems; coordination of NEPA requirements; and cooperation with NOAA for environmental studies.

General planning and preparation of leasing program based on weighing of relevant factors, interests, and problems.

REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT

OTA report

Inadequate regulation and enforcement of offshore oil and gas technology could result in more accidents and more oil spills than would occur if a more effective system were implemented.

Proposed OCS bill

The proposed OCS bill finds that safety regulations need to be reviewed in light of new information, and demands; and makes it a purpose of the Act that OCS operations be safe, with well designated regulations and newest technology, precautions, and techniques.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTION

OTA report

The following options are available for making changes to the present system:

1. Require that OCS orders be completed prior to, and made part of, all lease sales. Such orders should include design standards for the complete system, along with test and inspection schedules. Require development plans to be complete and comprehensive, to utilize environmental data developed for the region, and to follow specified standards and practices for the system.

2. Transfer regulatory and enforcement authority from USGS to the U.S. Coast Guard for major OCS systems, and apply existing Coast Guard regulations on drill ships and floating platforms to other offshore technology.

3. Separate regulation and enforcement for daily OCS operations within the Federal Government by assigning these responsibilities to an agency, or department, other than

Interior, while preserving Interior's OCS development responsibilities.

Proposed OCS bill

1. A comprehensive set of safety regulations are to be prepared, requiring best available and safest technology; regulations are to be prepared for inspections, testings, and investigations. Development plans detailing all facilities and operations, and implementation of environmental and safety standards are required. Specified standards for requirements of such plans, as to safety standards, their details, and their implementation, are listed. Plans can be disapproved, modified, or altered so as to ensure safe operations.

2-3. Department of Labor and the Coast Guard are given specified regulators and enforcement authority; investigations by Labor and Coast Guard as to accidents, and spills, respectively are required; allegations as to safety violations must be investigated by Labor and Coast Guard; regulations by Labor are mandated for hazardous worker's activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

OTA report

Environmental research and baseline studies are not formally coordinated with the Interior Department's leasing schedule and there is no requirement that information gathered be used in the decisionmaking process for sale of offshore lands and subsequent operation.

Proposed OCS bill

The proposed OCS bill requires that the leasing program be based on adequate information about environmental hazards and ecological characteristics of region to be leased. Both exploration and development plans, submitted by lessees, require consistency with a balance of protections of ecology and development.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

The following options could be employed for making such changes in the present system as may be needed:

1. Require that environmental studies be made a formal part of the lease-management process by providing data for milestone decisions.

2. Require that environmental studies that would define baselines and identify sensitive or hazardous areas and conditions be completed prior to preparation of a development plan, and that the data be used in evaluating and approving development activities.

3. Separate the responsibility for environmental studies from the agency in charge of development (Interior) and put a scientific agency in charge (such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration).

Proposed OCS bill

1. Baseline studies are required for every lease area, to commence prior to a lease sale and be completed prior to authorization of development and such studies are to result in specified information as to the various elements of the existing status of the environment and predict changes resulting from OCS activities.

2. Studies are to be completed prior to approval of a development plan, and the Secretary can use this information in evaluating the sufficiency of a plan.

3. The Secretary of Commerce, using NOAA is made responsible for baseline studies and follow-up monitoring.

STATE ROLE

OTA report

The limited role of State governments in the decision-making process for OCS development under existing laws and practices may lead to unnecessary delays and improper planning for such development.

Proposed OCS bill

Findings, purposes, and policies, listed in the bill detail the need for additional state input into OCS decisions, the need of states for additional information, and the role of the states in planning.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

1. Congress could require the Department of the Interior to solicit State comments on proposed lease sales, State proposals for stipulations to be written into leases, and State comments on development plans to protect economic and environmental interests. The Department of the Interior could be required to explain in writing why any State proposal was rejected and States could have a right of appeal.

2. Congress could require enforcing agencies to submit to the States long-range and detailed plans for enforcing lessee compliance with operating orders, evaluate State comments on the plans, and modify the plans, or explain a failure to modify them, to accommodate State objections.

3. Congress could require that an impact statement be prepared to accompany each development plan and that major development plans include detailed descriptive, design, and procedural information on offshore and onshore facilities that industry wants to build.

Proposed OCS bill

1. State comments are to be solicited for the leasing program, lease sales, exploration plans, and development plans. Any comments by states must be responded to in writing, and recommendations by states as to lease sales and development plans are only to be overridden if necessary for national security or overriding national interests. Detailed procedures for review of Interior decisions by the courts, with standing to affected states, are provided.

2. Both exploration and development plans must include details as to compliance with safety regulations. All states are given the right to comment on plans and their comments must be responded to.

3. At least once in every frontier area, an EIS is required prior to approval of development. All development plans require a statement of information to be submitted as to on-shore impact, and detailed.

4. To insure state involvement, a Division of State and local liaison is established within the Department of Interior.

OIL SPILL LIABILITY AND COMPENSATION

OTA report

Existing laws are not adequate either to assign liability or to compensate individuals or institutions for damages from oil spills resulting from exploration, development, or production in the Baltimore Canyon Trough area.

Proposed OCS bill

Findings, policies, and purposes detail the need for adequate funds for prompt removal of oil spilled or discharged, and for damages caused by spilled or discharge oil.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

1. Congress could adopt legislation dealing with liability and compensation for damages associated with offshore oil and gas production that would be comprehensive enough to cover such problems as indirect damages, class actions, and unlimited liability.

2. Congress could adopt liability and compensation legislation that addresses only direct damages and let other issues evolve through case law.

Proposed OCS bill

1. The proposed OCS bill has a detailed title establishing strict liability for spills; provides for responsibility for spills; establishing procedures for removal; providing

compensation for spills by lessees and a fund; authorizing judicial remedies, including class actions.

2. If areas of definition or procedures are not sufficiently specified, detailed standards for administrative and court review so as to fill in gaps are provided.

OIL SPILL CONTAINMENT AND CLEANUP

OTA report

There is no assurance that the technology utilized in the Baltimore Canyon Trough or in any other OCS frontier region would be adequate for oil spill surveillance, containment, and cleanup.

Proposed OCS bill

Proposed OCS bill contains findings, purposes, and policies, calling for procedures for limiting possibility of spills and providing for prompt removal of spills.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

1. Provide authority and funding for the Coast Guard to patrol for oil spills and take charge immediately should a spill occur.

2. Prepare definitive regulations for industry to follow, including standards for equipment, minimum levels of manpower readiness, and responsibility for coverage on all OCS oil spills.

Other Options

Federal and State officials could develop a strong information program to advise local officials and the public of procedures that would be followed and parties who are responsible for actions in the event of a spill.

Proposed OCS bill

1. Coast Guard is given authority to assure adequate enforcement of oil spill protections; is to promptly act to remove discharges; and is to make report on spills, actions taken as to spills, and lessons learned.

2. Safety standards, required by the bill, are to ensure safe operations, so as to minimize the possibilities of spills. Lessees and permittees are made responsible for all clean-up costs.

3. The oil spill title details procedures for information as to spills, compensation, and removal procedures, to go to states, local communities, and affected citizens.

CONFLICTING OCEAN USES

OTA report

There are potential conflicts between OCS oil and gas activities and vessel traffic engaged in commercial shipping and fishing activities. However, there has been no comprehensive study and analysis to identify all conflicts and to find ways of resolving them.

Proposed OCS bill

Findings, purposes, and policies detail possible conflicts of OCS activities with other users of the sea and seabed. The leasing program, safety regulations, and exploration and development plans are to be prepared so as to minimize such conflicts.

Regulations as to all aspects of OCS activities are to be coordinated so as to eliminate conflicts avoid duplications, and insure resolutions of disputes. Studies, regulations, provisions, and plans, are to be based on the need to minimize conflicts.

CONGRESSIONAL OPTIONS

OTA report

Some of the options available to Congress for minimizing offshore conflicts are:

1. Congress could expand the authority of the U.S. Coast Guard to give it jurisdiction to establish an effective offshore traffic control system. Such authority already exists for Coast Guard jurisdiction over navigable waters and areas around deepwater ports.

2. Congress could authorize specific studies of conflicts in ocean uses and means to resolve them.

Other Options

1. Departments of Transportation and the Interior could draw up a memorandum of

understanding in which they agree to a system for resolving conflicts between vessel traffic and OCS oil and gas activities.

2. Industry, with or without Department of the Interior regulations, could deploy as many subsea completions on oil and gas wells as is practical and economically possible to reduce the number of surface structures required for OCS production.

3. Informal planning groups, with the industries and public involved, could be established to resolve conflicts.

TRIBUTE TO TOM TEAR

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1977

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join my colleagues in citing a hard-working member of the House staff, Minority Chief Page Tom Tear, who is retiring this month.

I know I express the sentiments of my fellow Members on this side of the aisle when I say a hearty thank you to Tom for all of his dedication and service over the many years that he has been an integral part of the mechanics of this branch of the Government. His work here has made our work proceed with greater ease. And, he has contributed immeasurably to the educational experience of the young pages over whom he has had supervisory authority.

At this time, I want to wish Tom a happy, healthy retirement and all of the good things he so richly deserves.

CONGRESS AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, during the 2d session of the 94th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on International Relations conducted hearings on the congressional role in the formulation of American foreign policy. A report based on those hearings, entitled "Congress and Foreign Policy," has just been issued. It examines the congressional role in foreign policymaking, the nature of executive-legislative relations, and ways improvements can be made in those relations and Congress performance in foreign policy matters.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 17 recommendations of the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Congressional committees:

1. Both Houses of Congress should reform committee structures, streamline jurisdictions and improve intercommittee coordination on foreign policy issues. The foreign affairs committees of both Houses should have overall responsibility in coordinating the foreign policy activities of Congress. The practice of using sequential or concurrent referral of the most important legislation affecting foreign relations to the foreign af-

fairs committees of both Houses should be established.

2. While the current practice of holding hearings in various committees on the same foreign policy issues provides checks and balances invaluable to the congressional oversight function, joint hearings among committees and subcommittees with overlapping jurisdictions and even joint hearings between House and Senate committees and subcommittees should be initiated.

3. To exercise Congress' oversight powers more effectively, the House International Relations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings more frequently, both at the committee and subcommittee levels, on subjects not directly related to legislation.

B. International Economic Policy:

4. Both the legislative and executive branches must organize themselves for handling the many pressing international economic issues confronting the Nation.

The executive branch should give primary responsibility for international economic policy to the Department of State, while Congress should have its foreign affairs committees in both Houses acquire primary jurisdiction over international trade policy, including tariffs.

C. Measures to improve consultation:

5. The current system of consultation between the Department of State, as the principal executive agency responsible for foreign policy, and the Congress is inadequate and must be improved, with the emphasis on prior consultation.

Consultation of Congress by the executive branch before decisions are made is essential for the equal participation of Congress in foreign policymaking and for the existence of a good working relationship between the two branches.

6. In the case of crises or special foreign policy problems, joint "ad hoc" groups should be instituted to serve as additional focal points for consultation with the executive branch. Their memberships would be chosen by the leadership of each House and would draw on the staffs of the relevant committees.

The membership of these "ad hoc" groups would be chosen by the congressional leadership and would be composed not only of chairmen and ranking minority members of committees having international concerns, but also of middle- and junior-ranking members with special interest or expertise in a crisis or problem at hand.

7. To enhance further the consultative process, the Department of State should provide: Regularly scheduled formal briefings before the foreign affairs committees by senior officials on U.S. foreign policy activities and international developments; special briefings before those committees on sudden and developing crises, without exception and as soon as they occur; and frequent informal briefings of members by senior and junior State Department officials, at the request of individual members and committees or at the initiative of the State Department itself, on other foreign policy concerns that may arise. Such briefings should be complemented by weekly, written "foreign policy bulletins" for Members of Congress from the regional and functional bureaus of the Department of State.

8. Early in the 95th Congress, the executive and legislative branches should agree to initiate a "question hour" period, during which the Secretary of State in particular, but also other Cabinet officers, answer questions from Members of Congress.

Such sessions would be open to the entire membership of the House and Senate, would be limited to foreign policy matters, and take the form of "question-and-answer" periods.

9. The legislative veto should continue to be used as a basic device for insuring effective prior consultation by the executive branch.

The legislative veto is a useful and essential device of last resort to check on the executive branch.

10. The office of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations should be upgraded to an Under Secretaryship and be made a major policymaking post.

D. Information:

11. Congress must legislate a statutory basis for information classification and develop new security procedures for handling classified information and dealing with sensitive intelligence reports.

Such a statute would guarantee a congressional role in an area now exclusively controlled by the executive branch.

12. To make better judgments on foreign policy issues confronting the United States, Congress must make better use of available information and acquire new sources of information.

Better information for Congress will involve more efficient use of the present research and investigative agencies of the legislative branch, increased use of outside "think-tanks," and the possible creation of a congressional "foreign policy assessment office," which would have access to a broad range of executive branch information, including intelligence analyses, policy options and alternatives, and field reporting.

E. Additional mechanisms to insure congressional oversight of and participation in foreign policy:

13. Although the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs should not be compelled to testify before congressional committees, he should be confirmed by the Senate. In addition, greater efforts should be made to develop closer contacts between the National Security Council (NSC) and Congress.

Some initial congressional scrutiny of appointees to this position has become necessary because of the growing tendency of that office-holder to play a key role in the formulation of foreign and national security policy.

14. It is in the national interest and in the interest of a coherent foreign policy for Congress to be represented at international conferences and for participating members to have a substantive voice in decisions made by the American delegation. Members should also participate in major international trips by senior American officials, including the President.

15. The Department of State should reinstitute the publication of the Secretary of State's "foreign policy report," which would provide a basic and comprehensive statement of our foreign policy.

16. The President should institutionalize the practice of delivering a "state of the world" report or message to Congress, which would outline broad foreign policy goals.

Such an address would not only outline American foreign policy goals, but also serve as a basis for a general debate, in Congress, on the tenets and objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

17. Without necessarily enlarging congressional staffs, except perhaps in the area of international economics, Congress should improve its foreign affairs staffs' effectiveness and oversight capabilities, and thereby the state of overall relations between the executive and legislative branches.

The increased effectiveness of congressional staffs would be accomplished by augmenting the number of informal and free-wheeling exchanges of views between Capitol Hill and the executive branch, instituting exchange programs for congressional aides with agencies of the executive branch, and allowing committee staffs to travel more, attend international conferences more often, and improve their oversight work abroad.

This report, which also contains "conclusions" and "findings," is available from the House International Relations

Committee. I hope my colleagues will find the report useful in the continuing discussions over foreign policy formulation in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO TOM TEAR

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1977

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join my Republican colleagues in the House in saying "Thank you and Godspeed" to Tom Tear, who is retiring after so many years as the Minority Chief Page.

All of us owe Tom a deep debt of gratitude for his assistance over the years, and we will certainly miss him.

I join my Republican colleagues in wishing him, and his wife Carol, every happiness in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO STEVEN TRIMBOLI— NEIGHBORHOOD LEADER AND FRIEND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1977, the Queens Tribune paid a tribute to one of the borough's most outstanding citizens, Steven Trimboli. It is my pleasure to insert the article into the RECORD and pay tribute to Steve.

Steven Trimboli epitomizes the image of the involved American citizen. Many years ago, Steve saw his role in his community as that of a participant rather than an observer. The results are now history. Steve has lent his considerable talents to numerous community activities and in each case he has brought a sense of dedication and commitment with him.

Steve has served for the past 2 years as chairman of Community Planning Board No. 4 in Queens which encompasses the communities of Elmhurst and Corona. He has provided the board with his unique brand of dynamic leadership which is based on his abilities to attack problems squarely and doggedly pursue solutions. In his capacity as chairman, Steve has much contact with myself and other elected officials from Queens County. In my dealings with Steve, I have always found him to be an articulate spokesman for his community.

Steve's other main activity is his work as executive director of the 5,700 member Italian Senior Citizens Center. Steve is deeply involved in the day-to-day operations of the center and under his leadership the center has become one of the best known and active senior citizens organizations in the city. The center is politically involved. I have had the pleasure of seeing hundreds of their members in attendance at several different congressional hearings I have held in New York. The article which follows provides

more detailed information on Steve's activities. I am most pleased to pay tribute to this outstanding community leader, humanitarian, and good friend. The article entitled "Steve Trimboli and His Family of 5,000" follows:

STEVE TRIMBOLI AND HIS FAMILY OF 5,000
(By Phyllis Cohen)

The building housing the Italian Charities of America at 83-20 Queens Boulevard is a rather unimpressive white brick edifice, when viewed from the outside. Just cross the threshold, however, and you enter an atmosphere bustling with life and joy.

These are the environs in which Steven R. Trimboli surrounds himself five days a week. And although married for 28 years with two daughters to his credit, he considers the 5,700 components of the Italian Senior Citizens Center his other "family." He is the Center's executive director. He is responsible for coordinating its activities—choral groups, dancing, band practice, exercise, classes, painting, sewing, drama workshops, and rap sessions—a job in which he takes great pleasure and pride.

"I love it. I really do. It's the least money I've ever made in my life, but it's given me perhaps the most enjoyment," Trimboli explained with a toothy grin.

He was born in Massachusetts but has lived in New York ever since he was nine years old. Corona and Elmhurst have been his homes for most of his adult life. Although extremely active in Italian civil affairs as well as in his church, St. Bartholomew's Parish, he is perhaps best known in the community as the chairman of Community Planning Board 4.

Board 4 (Corona-Elmhurst) includes all the area bounded by the Long Island Expressway, Queens Boulevard, 69th Street, Roosevelt Avenue, and Flushing Meadow Park. Trimboli has been at the helm for two years and a participant for six years, and in both capacities he has guided his neighborhood through a number of controversial issues.

One of the more fiery crises, which threatened the board's very existence, occurred this past year during the hearings for City Charter revision. Essentially, according to Trimboli, the city proposed eliminating Board 4 and dividing the district between Board 2 and Board 3 because it "did not meet the criteria for the creation and maintenance of a community planning board," (i.e., a population of no less than 100,000 and no more than 250,000 residents). Trimboli was able to keep the board intact by proving vis-a-vis studies from the post office and the Board of Education that there were at least 175,000 people living within the confines of Board 4, "taking into account the census figures for 1970 and the influx of illegal aliens into Corona, Elmhurst, and Jackson Heights."

"Now, at least, we will have a say in what happens in our community. Grass roots—that's where the power belongs. All these years we've been only an advisory force. We've won some and lost some. Naturally, there has to be a marriage between business and residential interests, and the community board will have to be responsible for the whole. But now, after the first of the year, we'll be able to be more responsive to the people because we'll have more clout," reflected the affable board head.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

This, of course, introduces another thorny situation with which the civic leader and his community have had to contend, and that is the infiltration of illegal aliens ("perhaps our biggest crusade"), and the problems they bring in their wake, affecting jobs, housing, schools, the crime rate, sanitation, and police protection.

Trimboli explained, "A lot of these people (illegal aliens) are not counted. They're not getting the money (due them) because

these people don't exist . . . they don't show up any place. So how can you get the per capita money based on population, and how are Queens and the city going to get paid for services (telephone, electricity, sanitation) that they give?"

He further pointed out that in some rent-controlled buildings and one- and two-family homes, "landlords are getting rid of senior citizens" (who are on fixed incomes) and are taking in "the illegals who put down \$100,000 in cash."

Trimboli also said that the unlawful "melting" of these people with the rest of the population has resulted in an increase in the number of children attending school, making for overcrowded classrooms and double sessions.

Trimboli has been quite instrumental in combatting this dilemma. He helped to organize a demonstration at Sunnyside Gardens recently, denouncing the presence of aliens. He reports to the Immigration Naturalization Service any incidence of activity by an illegal alien. Finally, he and other concerned citizens plan to go to Washington, D.C., to lobby for passage of Congressman Rodino's and Biaggi's bills. The bills state that "employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens will be penalized" and which asks that "additional funds be given to the INS to hire more agents to track down these offenders."

Other priorities on which Trimboli and his community have taken a definite stand include the alleged deterioration of Lefrak City, the completion of I.S. 227 on Northern and Junction Boulevards, and the transfer of Rescue Company 4 from the Woodside firehouse to Williamsburgh in Brooklyn, against which the chairman bore witness last week.

STABILIZATION

"We are being funded by the City Commission on Human Rights for the purpose of opening up an office in Sherwood Village to try to stabilize Corona Heights, namely Lefrak City and Sherwood Village, because the whole area has turned. We've had meetings with Lefrak management, businessmen, and the commission to stop the degeneration of that neighborhood—in other words, the occurrence of crime, vacancies, and vandalism—and make it a decent place to live, work, shop, and go to school again," mused Trimboli.

The chairmanship is a voluntary, non-salaried position for which Trimboli has devoted a large chunk of his time. He has been intensely involved in community affairs for ten years. His schedule has been so hectic that he laughingly remarked that "my kids call me uncle now."

The drab green walls of his somewhat cramped office bear testimony to the active role he has enjoyed within the community. He was very modest about his achievements and had to be prodded to discuss the many citations and awards that decorate his headquarters. Among them were plaques from New York Safety Alumni Association, Borough President Donald Manes for services rendered to Queens and his community, and the HRA for his work with senior citizens.

Yet, the tone of his voice went from matter-of-fact to excited when he began to describe the 100 or more pictures of his beloved seniors and their activities—entertaining in Central Park and Rockefeller Center, field trips all over the country and abroad, dinners, protesting at City Hall, and lobbying in Washington, D.C., a few years ago against the "Means Test," and "just plain having a good time."

The robust man broke into a warm smile when he told the story of a 74-year-old woman who had, a few days before, experienced her first hairset. "She never had one. She was like a queen," commented Trimboli. And of the light octogenarian who refused Trimboli's offer of aid when the former attempted to pick up a heavy 80-cup coffee pot.

"That man needed to feel needed and important despite his frailty," said the director.

But in the midst of recounting the anecdotes of these people of "all colors, shapes, and sizes, who get along like peas in a pod," there was a catch in his voice and a hint of tears in his eyes as he remembered a few close members who had recently died.

"You know, you kid around with these elderly people, you make friends with them, and then you lose them. Though useless, I try to tell myself and my staff, 'don't get too involved with them.' That's the only thing I dislike about my job," sighed Trimboll.

OPTIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, if it means to maintain positive relations with black Africa, and to promote international respect for itself as a nation of ideals, the United States sooner or later will have to address forthrightly the crisis not only in Rhodesia and Namibia, but in South Africa itself.

In seeking a solution to the crisis in that troubled area, the United States should avoid being thought to impose its will on another sovereign nation, and I do believe we must be sensitive even to appearances; but as President Carter put it in his inaugural address, being a nation of freedom, we cannot be indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere.

I have asked Susan Mowle, an analyst in international relations of the Congressional Reference Service, to outline a range of options from which our Government might choose in its efforts to induce a peaceful change in South Africa, and I reproduce her memo in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

U.S. POLICIES WHICH HAVE BEEN PROPOSED FOR MODIFYING SOUTH AFRICA'S SYSTEM OF APARTHEID

1. The United States could downgrade its representation in South Africa to the Charge Level to express its concern for self-determination and human rights.

2. The United States could officially and more forcefully condemn the violence and police tactics in recent racial disturbances, and the detention without trial of political activists.

3. The United States could cease condemnation of the efforts of blacks in South Africa to achieve their freedom by forceful means, and in reaffirmation of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, acknowledge their right to use whatever means are necessary to achieve self-determination.

4. The United States could make it clear to the present government of South Africa that the United States will not go to its defense or give aid in the suppression of internal revolt related to its apartheid policies, and that the United States would not seek to oppose support for such a revolt from neighboring black African states.

5. The United States could contribute substantially to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa. (The Fund is made up of voluntary contributions and is used for legal assistance, education, and refugee relief for refugees from South Africa. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 2397, December 1, 1968.)

6. The United States could support multilateral (via the Organization of African Unity or the United Nations) or bilateral programs of humanitarian support to the liberation movements through the provision of educational and medical supplies.

7. The United States could adopt a program of assistance to political refugees from South Africa. (For example, South African students now in exile in Botswana have reportedly requested U.S. aid for obtaining travel documents and scholarships in the United States.)

8. The United States could take a stand against business expansion in South Africa until such time as South Africa ends its racial policies, and implement an effective means of discouraging U.S. business involvement in South Africa.

9. The United States could advise U.S. businesses that, if they decide to stay in South Africa, they do so at their own risk, and, in the event of difficulties with liberation elements, the U.S. Government will not support them or afford protection.

10. The United States Government could actively and publicly use its power and influence to encourage U.S. firms in South Africa to establish fair employment practices in their South African enterprises.

11. Executive Order No. 10925 could be amended so that, with respect to those U.S. businesses in South Africa, fair employment practices in their South African enterprises be a condition for the eligibility for government contracts.

12. The U.S. arms embargo against South Africa could be expanded to include the provision of spare parts, componentry and repairs; all sales of light aircraft, including civilian, to South Africa; and training to South African military personnel, including correspondence courses and participation in conferences, and cooperation in the transfer of, research, development and/or military know-how, including the testing of military equipment.

13. The United States could support a United Nations mandatory arms embargo against South Africa.

14. The role of the U.S. military attaché in South Africa could be terminated.

15. The United States could institute an expanded educational and cultural program with South African blacks, coloureds and Asians, and those institutions and individuals working for change to majority rule.

16. The United States could end the sale of weapons-grade uranium to South Africa and end all nuclear collaboration.

17. U.S. policy in international financial organizations could be made consistent with a policy of supporting change in South Africa and not of economically undergirding the status quo.

18. U.S. banks and other financial institutions could be prohibited from providing financing to South Africa and/or to firms in South Africa.

19. U.S. visa policy toward South Africa could be based on quid pro quo considerations. (U.S. Congressman, academics, and journalists have been denied visas by South Africa.)

20. The United States could end all remaining Export-Import Bank facilities still available to South Africa. (Current policy permits insurance and guaranteed coverage in commercial sales. It normally limits the term of such coverage to two to five years, but can extend it if necessary.)

21. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) credits to South Africa, which have been extended to firms in South Africa making purchases from U.S. suppliers, could be ended.

22. The United States could forcefully make clear its opposition to the Bantustan program and plans for other independent "nations" such as the Transkei.

NO GAS SHORTAGE: LITTLE CAN BE DONE NOW

HON. THEODORE S. WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in stating my opposition to H.R. 2500 in the RECORD of February 1, I quoted from a front page Washington Post article. I would like at this time to share the entire article with my colleagues as I believe it presents helpful conclusions and an overview that can assist all of us in considering the emergency natural gas legislation:

STUDIES FIND NO SHORTAGE OF NATURAL GAS (By William H. Jones)

There is no shortage of natural gas in the United States.

A consensus of studies by federal and private groups is that more than 40 years of natural gas resources are available given current rates of production, current technology and current price control by the Federal Power Commission.

New technology and an end to interstate price controls might provide even more natural gas and the nation also can anticipate substantial quantities of synthetic gas in future years—particularly through conversion of coal to gas.

"The gas industry has reverses, proved and potential, to carry it well into the 21st century," according to Washington Gas Light Co. Chairman Paul E. Reichardt, whose distributing firm supplies natural gas throughout metropolitan Washington and other areas of Virginia, West Virginia and Maryland.

What the nation faces today, he said, "is a shortage of readily available supply."

Although some energy experts would quarrel with Reichardt's optimistic forecast about future natural gas resources, there is no question that adequate supplies exist today.

However, nothing can be done by Congress in the next few days or weeks to convert those supplies into natural gas readily available for shipment in the nation's 200,000-mile system of interstate pipelines.

And next winter could be a carbon copy, if the weather is just as cold. Even if all controls on the price of newly discovered natural gas are lifted this year, as proposed for many years by industry, the time involved in searching for new supplies will delay appreciably increases in available gas for at least a year, according to government and industry estimates.

In addition, most newly discovered natural gas in recent years has been channeled to markets within the state of discovery, where it has been sold at prices much higher than the federally regulated interstate market.

At best, emergency legislation proposed by President Carter will permit the use of some higher-priced intrastate gas to augment supplies in hardpressed regions over the next few months, as well as reallocation of gas from some regions where supplies are relatively plentiful to other parts of the country.

If there is a consensus about actual resources and an inability to increase dramatically the available natural gas for the next year or so, there is no such agreement on why supplies currently are inadequate.

In the simplest terms, the gas industry says it is not profitable enough to conduct extensive drilling for gas aimed at the interstate market when prices in the intrastate markets are much higher.

Critics have stated that the gas producers deliberately have reduced exploration and

kept their discovered natural gas out of the interstate market for the very purpose of forcing the government to change its pricing policies and to create greater profits if and when the price controls are ended.

Under a controversial decision by the Federal Power Commission last year, the price ceiling on newly discovered natural gas was tripled to \$1.42 a thousand cubic feet. Despite a challenge by consumer and labor organizations filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals here, the higher price now is in effect under bond—which means that refunds must be made if the rates are found to be illegal.

At the same time, natural gas is being sold today in intrastate markets at \$2.25 to \$2.50 per thousand cubic feet. The price differential has led to a reversal in the percentage of newly discovered gas going to intrastate markets over the past decade—from 68 per cent in 1966 to 13 per cent in 1975.

In planning for the current winter, many gas distribution firms expected to buy some of the higher-priced, intrastate gas on an "emergency" basis, with special permits from the FPC. And even though the FPC has been liberal in granting such permits, distributing firms are finding that extra gas is hard to buy at any price.

Producers in the key gas states—Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma—say they don't have enough gas to meet contractual obligations within their own states because of the cold weather.

"The producers are withholding gas from the market. There is absolutely no question about it," James C. Cotham, executive vice president of Nashville Gas Co., said last week.

But Reichardt, the Washington Gas chairman, said, "There is no hard evidence any gas is being withheld." It would be "criminal" if any producers are engaged in such an effort, he added.

Reichardt said that in instances where producers have been accused of withholding already discovered natural gas from the nation's marketplace, independent studies have found "good reasons" why the gas is not flowing.

A recent example was a charge presented to the FPC, alleging that Shell Oil Co. closed off wells with more than 2 trillion cubic feet of gas in 1974. The company provided evidence to the commission that showed the 2 trillion cubic feet figure to be accurate—but also that 31 per cent of that amount was awaiting new production plants, that 25 per cent was in reservoirs that couldn't be tapped until deeper supplies were first depleted, that 19 per cent was in newly discovered fields not drilled sufficiently for commercial sales and that 25 per cent was awaiting pipeline construction or final sales agreements.

According to the Federal Energy Administration, about 30 per cent of all energy in the United States comes from natural gas and 95 per cent of these gas supplies comes from this country, a percentage expected to decrease in the next decade with imports of liquefied gas from abroad. Gas heats 40 million residences and 3.4 million commercial buildings and is used in 193,000 factories—many of which must have gas for production.

The reason why these homes and factories fact a shortage today (aggravated by the weather) is a reduction in drilling for new gas over the last decade. John D. Moody, president of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, said exploratory drilling for new oil and natural gas fields declined from a high of 8,742 wells in 1956 to a low of 4,463 in 1971.

Large oil companies, who also are major producers of gas, often discovered gas while searching for oil. Since the oil firms have switched their search for new petroleum to other regions of the world, they are not find-

ing natural gas as an adjunct and do not find it profitable enough to search only for gas, industry officials said.

RANK-AND-FILE POSTAL WORKER EXPLAINS WHYS AND WHERE- FORES

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, when something goes seriously and persistently wrong with a business or industry almost never does anyone ever think of asking a rank-and-file employee what went wrong, why it went wrong, and what should be done to correct the operation and restore it to health.

Yet the long experience of American enterprise offers proof that lower-echelon employees quite frequently have a sharp understanding and insight that can rectify management errors and guide corporate operations along paths of improved efficiency.

Unhappily in the case of semiprivate, semipublic enterprise, like the U.S. Postal Service, employees are all-too-frequently discouraged either by legislation, such as the Hatch Act, or by management practices from offering advice and the benefit of their technical wisdom.

The U.S. post office may have had a sad modern history of inefficiency and fiscal failure prior to 1970 when President Nixon signed legislation converting the agency into a quasi-private corporation.

But it is incontrovertibly clear that the U.S. Postal Service in the past 6 years has chalked up just as sad a history of inefficiency and fiscal failure.

It could be argued that the Postal Service is Amtrak in reverse and the analogy is not too farfetched. But there is a vital distinction we never should lose sight of: The conveyance and delivery of mail was never intended by Benjamin Franklin or his successors, nor any of the Congresses down through 200 years, to be a profitmaking enterprise. Always it has been viewed as an indispensable public service, an obligatory function of Government.

And because the concept is that of public service rather than profitmaking, management should be more than ordinarily interested in utilizing the insight and practical experience of the Service's workers. It may well be that the counsel of these men and women can prove as useful and valuable as the counsel of outside consultants who are often paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for opinions of dubious validity.

We can find more than a little verification of that in a revealing interview with a rank-and-file letter carrier by columnist Jack Mabley published earlier this week in the Chicago Tribune. This postman's assessments of some of the Service's large problems and his recommendations might well be heeded by our top Postal Service executives. I have in

mind particularly those executives who have been warning Congress and the American people of late that under their stewardship new hikes in postage prices may be necessary combined with new reductions in the frequency of deliveries. I insert this interview in the RECORD:

FOOT SOLDIER'S POSTAL ADVICE

(By Jack Mabley)

If the postal service would let the letter carriers run the operation, instead of just sorting letters and then going on the street to put them in mail boxes, it might solve its troubles.

That's the impression I get after talking with a number of postmen, who are the bottom line as far as service is concerned.

Here's a visit with one of them who's been carrying a suburban residential route for 13 years. He chatted with a reporter in the study of his pleasant home. Protocol being what it is, he thought he could be more candid if his name weren't printed.

"It seems to me it would be a good idea to keep first and second class mail separate from third class, which is basically solicitation," he said.

"There's been talk of five-day weeks, and even three days of delivery. I think first class could be delivered five days, and third class separately. That would give you an extra man for every five routes, and if the carrier was delivering only first class, the route could be made longer."

A big tiger cat rubbed against the visitor's leg. The postman grinned.

"I opened a collection box in my neighborhood eight years ago and there was this kitten. Somebody didn't want him. I brought him home and named him Zip.

"Now I think 95 percent of people in the Post Office want to be proud of their job. But when some high-paid knucklehead does something like those bulk mail centers, well . . . We're the ones, you know, who have to deliver a busted package or try to explain why one hasn't arrived.

"Most carriers take it very personal how they take care of their patrons. The regular carrier isn't always happy with the guy who takes his route on his day off.

"I have just over 300 patrons. I get personable with 20 or 25 percent, and I get to know just about everyone. You get to know who's had a death in the family, who's got a child in college. Some people ask me if I'd bring them stamps. If it's a widow who can't drive or someone else who has a hard time getting out, sure, I'll buy stamps and leave them the next day.

"Part of my route is walking, but the last three hours are in a truck or jeep. I enjoy it. I like the exercise. One of the reasons I stay is for my health, getting the exercise and staying outside."

He complained about the difficulty of handling odd-sized envelopes. A requirement for uniform sizes would be an obvious and simple way to improve mail handling.

"But the Post Office isn't too interested in suggestions from us," he commented.

"Another thing is the cheap postage. The mix varies from day to day but I'd say less than half of my mail is first class.

"If the Post Office is going to be run like a business let's start collecting like business.

"Official mail from a bank is 7½ cents. That can include solicitation for loans. Charity mail goes for two cents. Here's a letter from the Paralyzed Veterans in Wilton, N.H. It contains 10 greeting cards and envelopes and solicitations, and weighs between two and three ounces. If you mailed that regularly it would cost about 52 cents. For them it's 2 cents. (It actually weighed 3.6 ounces, and was three-eighths of an inch thick.)

"It doesn't matter to the Post Office what's in the letter. I understand a lot of these people sending out solicitations for 2 cents as a charity keep half or more for themselves as expenses."

Why do postmasters usually get a cushy job in a related industry when they leave office, he wondered. Why don't the big shots study United Parcel Service and find why UPS can do such a good job and still make money. Why not uniform envelope sizes? Why not pay more attention to patrons' complaints and suggestions? Why not listen to the carriers?

"Management could profit from Plutarch," he said. "He wrote, 'Know how to listen, and you will profit even from those who talk badly.'"

FEDERAL INCOME TAX DEDUCTION CHECKLIST

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, each year at this time millions of Americans begin the chore of figuring out their Federal income taxes. Because of the many deductions, credits, exemptions, and allowances that exist, filing a personal income tax return can be a confusing and frustrating experience that often results in tax overpayments. Recent congressional studies have made it clear that many older Americans pay more income taxes than are legally due. Tax overpayments create a special burden for retirees on fixed incomes who could put this money to better use.

In an effort to help retired persons in preparing their Federal personal income tax returns, the Committee on Aging has developed a checklist of itemized deductions. This summary follows:

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3% of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3% limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3% rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule) but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3% limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Acupuncture hire.

Ambulance hire.

Anesthetist.

Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Artificial limbs and teeth.

Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Braces.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ail-

ment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. Taxpayer should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.

Cardiographs
Chiroprapist
Chiropractor
Christian Science practitioner, authorized
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only)

Crutches
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth)

Dentures
Dermatologist
Eyeglasses

Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed)

Gynecologist
Hearing aids and batteries
Home health services

Hospital expenses
Insulin treatment
Invalid chair

Lab tests
Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap)

Neurologist
Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you)

Occupational therapist
Ophthalmologist

Optician

Optometrist

Oral surgery

Osteopath, licensed

Pediatrician

Physical examinations

Physical therapist

Physician

Podiatrist

Psychiatrist

Psychoanalyst

Psychologist

Psychotherapy

Radium therapy

Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor)

Seeing-eye dog and maintenance

Speech therapist

Splints

Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under Medicare

Surgeon

Telephone/teletype special communication equipment for the deaf

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.)

Vaccines

Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health)

Wheelchairs

Whirlpool baths for medical purposes

X-rays

TAXES

Real estate

State and local gasoline

General sales

State and local income

Personal property

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables only the sales tax paid on the purchase of five classes of items: automobiles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital

gains, recovery of pension costs, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20% of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible). Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 7¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in taxpayer's home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.

Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the "finance charge" if the charges are based on your unpaid balance and computed monthly.

Other charge accounts for installment purchases—may deduct the lesser of (1) 6% of the average monthly balance (average monthly balance equals the total of the unpaid balances for all 12 months, divided by 12) or (2) the portion of the total fee or service charge allocable to the year.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses to nonbusiness property—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. You may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

CREDIT FOR CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES

Certain payments made for child and dependent care may now be claimed as a credit against tax instead of as an itemized deduction.

If a taxpayer maintained a household that included a child under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, a taxpayer may be allowed a 20% credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable the taxpayer to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions for Form 2441 on page 17.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alimony and separate maintenance (periodic payments).

Appraisal fees for casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return. Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box for income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by the taxpayer's employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if employment requires it.

Payments made by a teacher to a substitute.

Educational expenses required by your employer to maintain your position or for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions.—Taxpayers may now claim either a deduction (line 32, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 52, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is \$100 (\$200 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$25 ceiling (\$50 for couples filing jointly).

Presidential Election Campaign Fund.—Additionally, taxpayers may voluntarily earmark \$1 of their taxes (\$2 on joint returns) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES

Filing status	Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—
Single (under age 65).....	\$2,450
Single (age 65 or older).....	3,200
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child.....	2,850
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child.....	3,600
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly.....	3,600
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly.....	4,350
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly.....	5,100
Married filing separately.....	750

Additional Personal Exemption for Age.—Besides the regular \$750 exemption allowed a taxpayer, a husband and wife who are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year are each entitled to an additional exemption of \$750 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1977, you will be entitled to the additional \$750 personal exemption because of age for your 1978 Federal income tax return.

General Tax Credit.—A new general tax credit is available. For this credit, the taxpayer may claim the greater of (1) \$35 per exemption shown on line 6d, Form 1040A or Form 1040, or (2) 2 percent of taxable income (line 15, Form 1040A or line 47, Form 1040) but not more than \$180 (\$90, if married, filing separately).

Multiple Support Agreements.—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if they were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10% of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sales of Personal Residence by Elderly Taxpayers.—A taxpayer may elect to exclude from gross income part or, under certain circumstances, all of the gain from the sale of his personal residence, provided:

1. He was 65 or older before the date of the sale, and

2. He owned and occupied the property as his personal residence for a period totaling at least 5 years within the 8-year period ending on the date of the sale.

Taxpayers meeting these two requirements may elect to exclude the entire gain from gross income if the adjusted sales price of their residence is \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976) or less. (This election can only be made once during a taxpayer's lifetime.) If the adjusted sales price exceeds \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after

December 31, 1976), an election may be made to exclude part of the gain based on a ratio of \$20,000 (this amount will increase to \$35,000 for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976) over the adjusted sales price of the residence. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded by an elderly taxpayer when he sells his home.

Additionally, a taxpayer may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of his personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale he buys and occupies another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence or (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces, Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling Your Home) may also be helpful.

Credit for the Elderly.—A new, expanded, and simplified credit for the elderly has replaced the former more complex retirement income credit.

A taxpayer may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as \$375 (if single), or \$562.50 (if married filing jointly), if the taxpayer is:

(1) Age 65 or older, or

(2) Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

To be eligible for this credit, taxpayers no longer have to meet the income requirement of having received over \$600 of earned income during each of any 10 years before this year.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

Earned Income Credit.—A taxpayer who maintains a household for a child who is under age 19, or is a student, or is a disabled dependent, may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to \$400. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if a taxpayer reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 15c, Form 1040) of less than \$8,000 the taxpayer may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, other employee compensation, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (Form 1040) line 13).

A married couple must file a joint return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

NATIONAL MEALS ON WHEELS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to create a national meals-on-wheels program under the auspices of title VII of the Older Americans Act. The purpose of this program would be to provide nutritious meals to homebound senior citizens and, as an important benefit, reduce the level of institutionalization of elderly Americans. This legislation, which I originally introduced in the last Congress, is also being submitted today to the Senate by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN.

When I introduced this measure in the 94th Congress, over 40 of my colleagues

joined me in support of the legislation. Today, more than 80 Members have cosponsored this important piece of legislation, which hopefully will soon be the subject of committee hearings.

The elderly feeding programs under title VII predominantly offers meals for the elderly in congregate settings. Of the \$300 million expended for the program last year, just 13 percent went for home-delivered meals, equaling just 30,000 meals of a total 240,000. Considering that there are between 3 and 4 million homebound elderly Americans who could make great use of a meals-on-wheels program, the inadequacy of the present program is obvious.

This legislation would establish a separate funding under title VII for home-delivered meals at a level of \$80 million for the first year, and \$100 million for the second. Separate funding is required for two reasons. The present appropriation for elderly feeding is low considering the universe of senior citizens who could benefit from the program. Only about 1 percent of the elderly population is currently served, which means that there are some 7 million men and women unable to participate at present. Therefore, we do not want to take funds away from congregate programs which are already hard pressed in order to better provide for the homebound.

Second, we want the local meals-on-wheels programs, which have been struggling for years without adequate Federal support, to know that they will not have to compete with congregate programs for needed funds. The specific appropriation under title VII will achieve that goal. In addition, this legislation makes a special attempt to support those programs which have demonstrated their expertise in providing meals and operating a meals-on-wheel efforts.

A primary side benefit of providing the homebound elderly with nutritious meals is the probable reduction in the institutionalization of senior citizens. A lack of ability to purchase or prepare adequate meals is a primary reason for the elderly having to enter nursing and retirement homes, or institutions.

Some studies have concluded that as many as 40 percent of our institutionalized elderly have been placed in care solely because of their inability to provide themselves with meals. The price-tag for the institutionalization of our elderly is about \$5 billion annually. By comparison, the cost of the legislation I am introducing today would be minimal, and beyond its cost-effectiveness, would have the great social benefit of allowing the elderly to remain in their own home communities, living independently and with dignity in proximity to friends and family. By doing so, this legislation could have an important social impact not only on the elderly themselves, but on the American family.

The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs conducted hearings on this legislation last year, and has concluded that enactment of the national meals-on-wheels program could actually save between \$200 to \$400 million in institutionalization and medical costs in its first year of operation. The legislation contains provisions which will require the Commissioner on Aging to as-

sess the cost-effectiveness of this program, and to work with others in government to expand and coordinate preventive and community based service programs for the elderly, and for the blind and disabled who will also be served under the terms of this legislation.

Since first introducing this legislation last July, I have learned of successful pilot programs, underbudgeted local efforts, and demonstration projects around the country who need Federal support. I have received letters and project descriptions from groups in California, the State of Washington, New Jersey, Alabama, and Illinois, which are looking to this Congress for the assistance they require to maintain their operations.

The national meals-on-wheels program makes sound fiscal, medical, nutritional, and human sense, and can be supported by Members of all political persuasions, as the present list of cosponsors indicates. I invite all of my colleagues to join in sponsoring this vitally needed legislation and pressing for its enactment this year.

A brief description follows:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE NATIONAL MEALS-ON-WHEELS ACT

Provides support for a nutrition project which delivers, at a minimum, one home-delivered hot meal containing a minimum of one-third the daily recommended dietary allowances;

Provides that no more than 15 per cent of those served may be blind or disabled and not elderly;

Establishes an information and referral system to coordinate the program with other services to the home-bound elderly;

Establishes appropriations of \$80 million for fiscal 1978, and \$100 million for fiscal 1979, and sets a ceiling of 20 per cent of this amount for administrative costs, and 5 per cent for the administration of the State plan required under title VII;

Provides for a study of the effectiveness of the program and the identification of the areas with greatest need for the program, to include an evaluation of the impact on decreasing institutionalization, to be submitted within 18 months after enactment;

Provides for a three state demonstration project, in conjunction with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to develop innovative means of packaging and distributing meals to inaccessible locations, and provides \$500,000 for this project during fiscal 1978;

Mandates the Commissioner on Aging to work with others to identify and develop methods for serving the elderly, blind and disabled better;

Gives a priority to organizations able to demonstrate an ability to operate such services and which can show the need within the community for them;

Encourages the use of volunteers in operating the program in order to reduce costs.

TESTIMONY GIVEN AT PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD MEETING, JANUARY 13, 1977

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the opening of each schoolday with a prayer and the pledge of allegiance to the flag were very

splendid traditions in our country. When a tiny minority objected to prayer and took their case to the courts, prayer was withdrawn from the public schools. And now the pledge of allegiance to the flag may also vanish from our schools, because an extremely small minority objects.

I invite your attention to the testimony of Mrs. Patricia Dunlap to the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, Md. She is working to have the pledge of allegiance restored to the opening exercises to remind our children of the stirring ideals of our Nation.

TESTIMONY GIVEN AT PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD MEETING, JANUARY 13, 1977

My name is Patricia Dunlap and I represent two organizations, The Conservative Caucus and Guardians of Traditional Education.

Last Sunday evening I attended a political meeting in Bowie. During the question and answer period a young Prince Georges student asked why there was no flag flying outside his school, as required by State law. He also wanted to know why he could not obtain permission to have the Pledge of Allegiance recited on a daily basis in his classroom. The answer was that the salute to the flag had probably become as controversial as the Lord's Prayer.

As I sat and listened to this exchange, it brought to mind a similar occurrence a few years ago in an elementary school in Bowie. At that time a fifth grade teacher was asked by a delegation of parents why his students did not salute the flag or even have one in his classroom. They were told that this was a very controversial subject.

It would seem that the symbols of patriotism have not only become very controversial, but are definitely on their way out. Therefore, citizens should thank God for nationally televised sports events. Here, at least, our children are given the opportunity to recognize by sight their national banner, and by sound their national anthem; otherwise they could grow up and never become familiar with the outward symbols of a nation for which scores of thousands of young men have given their lives. We suggest to you that this is a national disgrace.

We also suggest to you that H.E.W. regulations, which say that children now have the right NOT to recite the Pledge of Allegiance in the classroom if to do so would violate their convictions, DOES NOT MEAN that the flags have to be removed from the classrooms and that NO ONE has to say the Pledge of Allegiance. This is just another example of local education officials' overreaction to the federal bureaucracy's pronouncements. Surely the removal of the flag and the ending of the salute to the flag is as much a violation of the rights of those children who desire to practice these outward symbols of Americanism, as it is to make the other group be forced to do something that might bruise their tender anti-American convictions.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, we ask you to introduce a resolution that would make it a policy to require all public schools in Prince George's County to fly the American flag, and that each class not only contain an American flag, but have a daily salute to the flag. If the purchase of these flags works a hardship on the county's finances, we further suggest that each school contact a local veterans' organization in its area and ask that group to donate the missing flags.

Ending our thoughts, we ask you to remember that we are privileged to live in the most blessed and most glorious nation ever conceived in the history of the world, and to pay symbolic tribute to it seems a small price to ask for the freedoms and material benefits it has given us.

WHAT KIND OF STIMULUS?

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, since it seems that the economy is in store for additional stimulus, the important question becomes, what kind of stimulus? The alternatives that are being considered—a permanent tax rate reduction, a tax rebate, an increase in Federal spending, and a rapid increase in the money supply—do not have the same stimulus effect on the economy.

Some of the policy alternatives being discussed would stimulate spending, deficits, and inflation. Others would stimulate work, investment, and real output. It is obvious that in our stimulus policy we must avoid the former and attain the latter.

The January 1977 "World Report" of the First National Bank of Chicago explains the effect of the different policy alternatives on the economy. This informative report is of great relevance to the budget process that is now underway. The report follows:

WHAT KIND OF STIMULUS?

Certain tax cuts would indeed stimulate long-run real growth if they were explicitly designed for that purpose. But two different types of tax reductions which might seem to yield the same loss of revenues (at least on paper) could nonetheless cause radically different effects on long-run real growth. A tax cut should be targeted toward providing permanent incentives for workers to work, for employers to employ and for investors to invest.

In the case of individual income taxes, the most serious drag on additional labor effort is probably the steep tax rates on added income among average and high income families. The top five percent of all families—those earning over \$32,000 a year in 1974—have, on the average, about two and a half family members working. With joint returns, income from secondary workers (housewives and older children) is taxed at very high rates—up to 50%.

The capital gains tax and corporate income tax also depress capital investment. The combined effect of such taxes is to make it necessary for additional investments to earn a very high pre-tax return in order to provide sufficient after-tax income to induce the required investments. A permanent reduction in tax rates on capital would make expansion of the economy's productive capacity more attractive to investors, and would promote the increased supply of products to keep ahead of demand at stable prices.

The precise form of a tax cut matters much. A temporary stimulus cannot produce more than a temporary improvement, and even that would be trading a short-term benefit for a long-term headache. A tax rebate, for example, is simply a one-shot transfer payment, unrelated to future productive effort or an assurance of continued income. It is rightly viewed as a windfall, and therefore of little effect on long-term consumer expenditure.

More important, a temporary stimulus can have little, if any, effect on business investment decisions. Such decisions require confidence in future market demand to validate large scale commitments to expand and modernize plant capacity. Yet it is such plant and equipment spending that has become identified as both the weakest link in the

global recovery and, at the same time the key to increasing productivity, employment and real income in the future.

BIG SPENDING MEANS TROUBLE

Increased federal spending could provide only a temporary stimulus at best, since the financing of that spending must eventually preempt private claims to real resources. Not only will expanded federal borrowing make more difficult the immediate task of assembling investment in the private sector, but it also ultimately will require higher taxes to service the added national debt. Moreover, new government spending programs are slow to start and virtually impossible to reduce or eliminate after they have outlived their countercyclical rationale.

Because inflation has pushed more and more families into higher tax brackets in recent years, the progressive marginal tax structure affects incomes well below the top 5%. In the early 1960s, only about 3% of all tax returns were subject to marginal tax rates of over 30%. Today, nearly a third of all tax returns are in these higher brackets.

DISINCENTIVE TO WORK

Evidence from the earlier period suggested that high marginal tax rates already reduced the supply of labor of housewives and teenagers—now about 45% of the labor force. But effort is not easily measured. The disincentive to work can take many forms—a preference for shorter hours, early retirement, and less time devoted to improving skills.

Lower marginal tax rates would not only provide incentives that encourage additional work effort, but to the extent that these tax reductions also reduce the cost of labor to employers, they would encourage additional employment.

MORE INCOME, LESS DEFICIT

If lower marginal tax rates increase the long-run supply of jobs, they may generate more taxable income, more tax revenues, and lower deficits than would be implied by static arithmetic. The apparent reduction of tax revenues caused by a rate cut would also be limited by the diminished incentive to escape taxation.

Real savings are needed to channel resources from immediate consumption into augmenting our productive capacity. Yet earnings from savings are heavily taxed, thus shrinking the major noninflationary source of investment capital.

While there may have been a case for a brief acceleration of the money supply to counteract the monetary stringency of late 1974, a sustained period of rapid money growth would fuel an accelerating inflation (partly by depressing the dollar on foreign exchange markets) that would soon push interest rates up—not down.

Since houses and factories are not bought with three-month loans, the nation needs a policy of lowering long-term interest rates. But long-term interest rates are dominated by expectations of inflation, and rapid expansion of the money supply would inspire fears of more inflation ahead. It is therefore important that any temporary increase in the deficit resulting from tax cuts should not be financed by printing money.

Finally, the specific problems of the older cities, with their pockets of high unemployment, require equally specific remedies. Policies that affect the overall economy are too broad to deal effectively with specific structural problems.

Any policy that is simply geared to promoting spending, without providing a tax and regulatory climate that encourages additions to real output and income, will simply end in inflation. Demand does not create its own supply.

Unfortunately, what makes sense in economics rarely makes sense in politics. So if the past is prologue, the sore of stimulus

likely to emerge is apt to be weighted in favor of consumption rather than investment, and in favor of spending rather than producing.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 59TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, as America enters her third century of independence, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that there are other nations around the world who have fought for their own freedoms, but were not as successful as we.

Last Saturday, millions of Americans celebrated the 59th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukraine. But the celebration of liberty within that country was short-lived, as by 1922 the Ukraine had been annexed by the Soviet Union. Subsequent forced collectivization of the agricultural community in the Ukraine resulted directly in the starvation of approximately 4 million Ukrainians; and along with physical torment came the psychological and political persecution that was designed to erase the rich heritage of Ukrainian culture and language.

Despite Soviet terrorism and genocide, the Ukrainian people have retained their sense of national heritage, and still strive for freedom. With a population now of almost 50 million people, the Ukraine is the largest captive nation in Europe, and the second largest State in the Soviet Union.

Despite the Helsinki agreements to which the Soviet Union was a signatory, human rights and freedom of movement have not been pursued in the Ukraine. Persecution for ideological reasons has tightened, and such esteemed persons as the Ukrainian historian Valentyn Moroz languished in prison for daring to criticize the oppressive Communist regime in power in his native land.

We in America are truly blessed with the God-given gift of freedom, and it is thus our solemn duty to defend this most precious of riches against such deliberate and wanton oppression as is felt today in the Ukraine. I am therefore introducing legislation first, to appeal to the Soviet Union to adhere to the Helsinki accords in dealing with human rights in the Ukraine, and second, to urge the Ukrainian government to allow Valentyn Moroz to be released from prison to accept the offer of Harvard University to come to the United States and be a visiting lecturer in Ukrainian affairs.

In this time of international change, when new leaders are assessing the relative influence and power of the three superpowers, the United States must stand up and be counted against tyranny, oppression, and inhumanity—in strong support of the twin pursuits of personal dignity and individual liberty.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, I introduced two bills which would assist a group to whom we owe much, but whom we too often neglect, namely, our veterans. At a time when the United States is not actively engaged in hostilities, it is very easy to allow the problems of the veteran to slip by unnoticed and unsolved.

The first of the two bills, H.R. 476, would amend title 38 of the United States Code to eliminate the time period in which a veteran must use his educational benefits, and extend the months of eligibility from 36 to 45 months—or the equivalent thereof in part-time educational assistance.

Under the current law, a veteran may not use his educational benefits after more than 10 years after his last discharge or release from active duty. My bill would permit veterans to use their educational benefits at any time. This provision is particularly timely when there are so many veterans of the Vietnam era who were not able to take advantage of the educational benefits because of family responsibilities or the fear of hostile feelings from other members of the student body. We must not forget those turbulent days of the sixties when many veterans would have felt unwelcome to our Nation's college campuses.

Veterans' educational benefits are one way in which we can show our gratitude to those who gave up part of their youth in order to serve their country. Let us not be stingy in giving our thanks to these men and women by placing an arbitrary date on this otherwise excellent program.

The second bill, H.R. 474, is directed at our older veterans, but will eventually benefit all veterans. This legislation would amend title 38 of the U.S. Code to make certain that recipients of veterans' pensions and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of cost-of-living increases in monthly social security benefits.

We all know that the first victims of inflation are those on fixed incomes. Most of these persons are elderly and, for the most part, pay their rent, buy food and medicine and other necessities out of their pensions, social security benefits, and life savings. Social security benefits are structured to offset unavoidable increases in the cost-of-living. It is most unfair to reduce the pension of the veteran, who legally is entitled to both the veteran's pension and social security benefits, because of inflationary pressures.

As prices continue to climb, it is appropriate and necessary that Congress enact measures which will insure that the veteran who gave so much of himself

to his country will be able to take care of himself and his family.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of these bills would alleviate some of the difficulties now facing our veterans. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to give this legislation speedy consideration and approval.

**ROSEDALE BLUE PREDICTS
WINTER WILL CONTINUE****HON. JOHN T. MYERS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, having just checked with officials in Indiana, I can report that reliable Old Blue, the Rosedale, Ind., groundhog did in fact see his shadow early this morning, darted back into his burrow, thus setting the stage for 6 more weeks of winter. In view of the disastrous winter Indiana and much of the rest of the Nation has suffered to date, I know this news does not exactly thrill you.

Those of us who have lived in and around Rosedale in Parke County, Ind., have always had complete faith in the weather forecasting expertise of Old Blue whose record of accuracy deserves a place in the "Guinness Book of Records." To be sure we have never had the publicity that has been showered on Punxsutawney. We chose to keep Old Blue's professional touch to ourselves, at least until now, for fear that it might provide some advantage to the non-Hoosier. But, alas, the secret is out and I wish to share with you the story of Old Blue as told in the Indianapolis Star by Ben Cole, native of western Indiana, chief of the Star's Washington bureau, and professional groundhog watcher:

**ROSEDALE BLUE PREDICTS WINTER
WILL CONTINUE**
(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Next Wednesday is Groundhog Day, the best of all our national celebrations. You needn't send out Groundhog Day greetings, there's no shopping for Groundhog Day gifts. Just let the Groundhog do the work.

And again, it is hoped that Old Blue (or his descendant) in his lair near Rosedale in Parke County, Ind., will perceive that winter is over and will avoid seeing his shadow.

Word from Rosedale is that the weather this year has been so cold that Old Blue might not even leave his burrow at all and might just go right on snoozing away until St. Patrick's Day, another of the better holidays on the calendar.

You can bet on it: Up in Punxsutawney, Pa., they will be advertising their groundhog as the one, the only, the sole harbinger of what is to come weatherwise. But don't believe it.

It's all right if folks in Punxsutawney, Pa., want to believe in their local rodent; but the last word on whether we're to have six more weeks of winter will eventually come from that old pasture at Rosedale.

THE FUTURE OF EGYPTIAN AID

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Egypt experienced its worst civil disorder in 25 years. Over 70 people were killed, 700 injured, and close to 1,000 people were arrested and jailed. The causes of this unrest were not dealt with. The disorders are likely to erupt again at any time. This unrest threatens not only the political and economic stability of Egypt, but of the Middle East and thus the world.

The catalyst for the civil disorders was the government-sponsored increase in the price of food and other necessary commodities. This provoked widespread rioting and looting. Faced with \$12 billion in unpaid foreign debts, Egypt could no longer borrow sufficient income to purchase its growing imports of food and fuel. The price rises were an attempt to generate some of the needed income.

Egypt finds itself in a cruel dilemma. The price increases were required by its international debtors. The price rise caused the food riots. The riots caused the government to withdraw the proposed price increases. This retrenching action raises a doubt in Egypt's creditors: should they provide additional assistance? For, without additional funds to purchase needed imports of fuel and food, Egypt faces the probability of even more widespread riots and economic chaos.

Writing in the Christian Science Monitor of January 21, 1977, John Cooley noted from Cairo:

Though the population of 41 million grows by 1 million a year, less food is grown on the narrow strip of green land around the Nile, which is growing increasingly salty due to the effects of the Aswan High Dam."

Thus, as the number of people to feed grows, the domestic food supply and ability to produce it shrinks, making it necessary to borrow more and more (the debt burden now exceeds \$12 billion) to buy imported food, fuel, and other necessities."

This cycle cannot, of course, continue forever. In fact, it probably cannot continue for even a very short period of time. Less than a month ago, the Washington Post reported that the Great Western Desert in Egypt was moving toward the Nile River farmland at a fantastic rate of speed, devouring 8 miles a year and threatening to destroy the great bulk of Egypt's food-producing capacity in less than 20 years.

Egypt, however, has not always been a chronic food importing nation. About 2,000 years ago Egypt and North Africa supplied the Roman Empire with most of its grain. It was why Caesar met Cleopatra—she held the key to the granaries of the world at the time. Without a friendly sovereign in Alexandria, the Roman Army would have collapsed—and the Empire soon after. Like many developing countries, Egypt's glory was in her past. The key to the long decline is often found in the population figures.

In her glory, Egypt supplied Rome with 13 million bushels of wheat every year. The grain supplied by the Nile valley farms brought yields equal to those of today.

Yet, today, Egypt is hungry and in desperate economic condition. Why is this?

Mr. Speaker, it stems from Egypt's rapidly growing population. This is her real problem—overpopulation.

At the beginning of the 19th century, Egypt's population was estimated to be about 2.5 million people. Fifty years later, it had doubled to 5 million. The first modern census in 1897 gave a figure of 9.75 million people. By 1950, the population had reached 19 million. Every 50 years, Egypt's population doubled.

But, in 1960, Egypt's population reached 26 million and by 1976 had reached 38 million, doubling the 1950 population in less than 26 years.

Growing numbers of people have placed greater and greater stress upon the food producing system of Egypt. Land is overgrazed and farm crop land is abused. Widespread irrigation leads to widespread salinity in the soil. The soil thus loses its fertility and is simply unable to support its present population, to say nothing of future, guaranteed larger populations.

However, according to the Scientific Director of the International Biological Programme, overpopulation is not new to Egypt:

In the ancient past and until the present century, control of the Nile was the concern of only one country, Egypt, whose population has always been almost completely dependent on the river. We are accustomed to think of overpopulation as a modern problem, but Egypt, which has been from time immemorial one of the richest and at the same time one of the smallest countries—the area inhabited even today is only the size of a large English county—has been through it before. Indeed, the history of ancient Egypt shows cycles of prosperity followed by disaster, and there is not much doubt that they were accompanied by and caused by, big increases in population.

Though overpopulation in Egypt is not new, the dimensions of the impending tragedy are. We are no longer dealing with a few million people. We are dealing with the 40 million people of Egypt, the 130 million people of the Middle East and, ultimately, in the nuclear age, the 4.2 billion people on this planet.

The Egyptian Government hopes to solve its economic and food problems by borrowing billions more in assistance funds from its Arab and Western friends.

This will not deal with Egypt's fundamental problem. The environmental carrying capacity of Egypt has long since been exceeded. She is overpopulated. Development efforts as proposed will do nothing to help alleviate her plight. They simply will prolong the agony and insure that more millions of people will be starving and gripped by misery in the future.

Raymond Dassmann of the International Union for Conservation in Switzerland spoke about Egypt and her development programs nearly 5 years ago. His words are still true today:

We have had about 150 years of development aimed at improving the productivity of the Nile. However, if you take the average

lot of the average Egyptian today and compare it with the average Egyptian lot of 150 years ago, I think you might seriously question whether the effort has been worthwhile. Perhaps we might just as well have spent the money in building a big pyramid, bigger than anything built before. In so doing, we might have forced the population of the Nile Basin to come to grips earlier with the realities of its environment.

Instead of holding up the illusory hope that the carrying capacity of the environment can be increased indefinitely to accommodate an expanding population, Egypt should face its population problem.

Mr. Speaker, if Egypt explodes into chaos, we must consider what will happen to her neighbors—where terrorism and government by assassination are still fighting against the bonds of 20th century governments.

We must think of the Suez Canal and the future of Europe.

We must think of the oldest democracy in that part of the world—Israel—and all that they have fought for.

We must think of the mischief nations outside of the area could foment when chaos reigns.

We must think of the petroleum supplies in the area and what their interruption means for a global economic stability.

It is frightening that, in this day and age, man continually looks to explanations of his problems which make the minimal of sense. Simply stated, more borrowing by Egypt, and more indebtedness will not miraculously produce prosperity.

We must face the hard fact that a nation with limited resources cannot endure a population which doubles every 30 years. If Egypt will tackle her population problem in earnest, perhaps then the assistance we render will be worth it. But if she will not, then we might as well help build them bigger and bigger pyramids.

COMMENTS ON SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, taken together the report of the Rules Committee is a fair and decent approach to establishing the Select Committee on Assassinations.

Removal of authority to dabble with wire taps, bugs, lie detectors and stress analyzers is certainly necessary to a fair and just investigation.

There is, however, another area equally important to the credibility of the select committee's work that has not been dealt with in the Rules Committee's report, namely the matter of what constitutes a quorum for the select committee and its subcommittees.

The Warren commission has been frequently and fairly criticized because more than half the members never heard more than half the witnesses. One Warren commission member heard only 6 of the 94 witnesses. Fairly, then, it has been written—

They were part-time investigators of the (Kennedy) assassination thus leaving themselves open to charges that they were serving as "front men."

To prevent this devastating criticism from being used to undermine the efforts of the select committee, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the requirements that only two members need to be present to hear testimony needs to be strengthened.

It is absolutely essential that these investigations be carried out by the House, not by Philadelphia lawyers in the employ of the House.

I therefore support the requirement that at least one-half the members of the select committee or the subcommittees must be present to take testimony.

TAXES MUST BE EQUALIZED FOR SINGLES AND WORKING MARRIED COUPLES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2451, which would extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns and would also remove the rate inequities which occur when married persons are both employed.

Under the present law four sets of tax rates apply: First, one to married individuals filing joint returns and surviving spouses; second, one to single persons who qualify as heads of households; third, one to single individuals—who do not qualify as heads of households or surviving spouses, for tax purposes; and fourth, one to married individuals filing separate returns and for estates and trusts. All four sets of rates range from 14 to 70 percent. However, they vary in the steepness, or graduation, at which they rise for increasing levels of taxable income.

The schedule of rates applicable to married couples filing joint returns and surviving spouses is the least progressive. The schedule applicable to single persons provides a tax that may be as much as 20 percent in excess of that paid on a joint return with the same amount of taxable income. The head of household rate schedule is halfway between the schedule applicable to joint returns and the schedule applicable to single persons. The rate schedule for married couples filing separate returns and for estates and trusts is the most progressive.

The present difference in the tax treatment of single persons and married couples may be traced back to 1948 when Congress enacted the so-called split income provision. This provision was designed to eliminate objectionable differences between the tax treatment of married couples living in community property and noncommunity property States. The courts had upheld the right of married couples living in community property States to divide their income between the two spouses for purposes of computing Federal income tax. Thus,

they could take advantage of the lower marginal rates applicable to each of their incomes. Married couples in noncommunity property States had to pay taxes on the basis of their total income. The Revenue Act of 1948 permitted all married couples to take advantage of income splitting.

The irony is that in an effort to end one tax discrimination, Congress created another—discrimination between the married and unmarried in all States.

In 1951 Congress attempted to right this wrong by adding the head-of-household provision to the Internal Revenue Code. This provision gave half the benefits of income splitting to taxpayers who supported their parents or other dependent relatives who lived with them. In 1954 Congress enacted legislation which permitted widows and widowers with dependent children to have the full benefits of income splitting for 2 years after the death of the spouse.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 continued legislative efforts toward increasing equity for the unmarried by providing new rate schedules for single persons and heads of households which narrowed the gap between the tax liabilities on the same amount of taxable income for these single persons as compared to married couples filing joint returns. However, a gap still remains. In addition, the 1969 act introduced a new inequity.

The new tax rate schedules included in this act require working married couples at most income levels to pay a higher tax rate than two single people with comparable incomes who are living together. This situation prevails whether the married individuals file jointly or separately. This so-called "marriage penalty" was noted by the tax writing committees at the time, but it was justified on the grounds that a couple's living expenses are likely to be less than those of two single persons. I do not think Congress intended to reward "living together," but this has been the inadvertent fallout from these separate rate schedules.

These efforts by Congress to remedy the basic inequities of the different tax rate schedules not only fell short of accomplishing that goal but also contributed great complexity in the application of these schedules. Very complicated definitions and very restrictive rules accompany the categories of head-of-household and surviving spouse.

The proposal I am supporting will not only eliminate the discrimination among individuals because of marital status in the tax rate schedules, but it will contribute greatly toward simplification of our tax laws. Under this proposal all individuals would be permitted to use the same tax rate schedule. This schedule is the one presently available only to married persons who file joint returns and surviving spouses. Estates and trusts would continue to use the same tax rate schedule they use under present law. The tax filing status of "surviving spouse" and "head-of-household" would be eliminated. Married individuals would be permitted the option of either filing jointly or separately. In the case of separate returns, income received for services performed would be taxable to the spouse who performed the service.

Congress should act now to eliminate the discrimination against single people and working married couples and I urge the support of my colleagues for this proposal.

SOME IMPRESSIONS FROM THE INAUGURATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for February 2, 1977, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOME IMPRESSIONS FROM THE INAUGURATION

Numerous impressions from the inaugural ceremonies remain vivid . . . the sea of faces, estimated by crowd experts at 150,000, stretching from the east steps of the Capitol across Capitol Hill to the steps of the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court . . . the proud high school bands strutting along Pennsylvania Avenue for the parade . . . the delight of the crowd of 350,000 as the Carter family walked the entire route of the parade . . . the optimism and good spirits of the people attending the inaugural functions . . . the striking rendition of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" by the Atlanta University Center Chorus . . . the particular jubilation of the Georgians celebrating the inauguration of a native son . . . the elaborate plans of the Army to destroy the snow with shovels, trucks, wedges and even flame-throwers . . . the peddlers with their Jimmy Carter T-shirts, buttons, banners, caps, and peanut key chains and necklaces . . . the crush of people at the inaugural ball at the Mayflower Hotel trying to catch a glimpse of President and Mrs. Carter dancing for a few seconds.

I kept thinking during the inaugural ceremony what a marvelous thing it is that power can pass peacefully from an old to a new President in this country with such a simple and dignified ceremony. For the first time in sixteen years a new President took office without the pain of rejection, resignation or assassination.

The brief inaugural address by the first President from the deep south in more than a century was not a political program or even a rallying cry, but a sermon, a call to the American spirit, an appeal for decency and unity. President Carter spoke of his own mistakes, preached of the limitations of the Presidency rather than its powers and rejected offering a new dream, but urged fresh faith in the old dream.

I liked what I heard in his address about fighting wars against poverty and injustice, being aware of the limits of our own resources, being strong but peaceful, strengthening the family, restoring respect for law and government, and seeking arms control.

The theme of his address was that the future of the nation lies in the principles of the past. One senses that his religion is at the center of his life. He wears it naturally. One wonders, however, how these noble principles he announced in the address will be applied to specific problems that await him. I suppose it was not among the more eloquent inaugural addresses, but there were a few phrases that we may remember: "a fresh faith in the old dream", "if we despise our own government we have no future", and, "a new spirit among us all."

During the inaugural ceremony, I also thought about President Carter's path to the Presidency. For two years prior to Inauguration Day he had crisscrossed the country speaking of competent government, outmaneuvering an army of Washington poli-

ticians who sought the same job, recognizing better than all of the others the distrust and disillusionment with government which he made a central issue of his campaign, and emphasizing everywhere he went that it was time for healing and the restoration of faith in the simple virtues, the old values and the basic goodness of the American people.

It was a bittersweet day for President Ford and his family. He had to bite his lip to hold back the tears as President Carter thanked him for all he had done to heal America. He also had to fight his emotions on his last visits to the Oval Office in the White House and to Capitol Hill where he had spent twenty-eight years of his life, and during the brief farewell ceremonies as he departed from Andrews Air Force Base for California. He must also have known that the American people appreciated what he had achieved during the two and a half years of his Presidency.

The walk by the Carter family down Pennsylvania Avenue was clearly the highlight of the day. You could just feel the pleasure of the crowd at seeing a President walk among the people and all the world seemed to stop when the Carters buttoned up Amy's coat. Everywhere people talked about the walk. It was a symbol of the new spirit, a feeling that there was nothing to fear, and that a troubled period in the Nation's history had been closed.

But easily the most memorable recollection of the day for me will be the feeling of reconciliation and the extraordinary good humor of the people on Inauguration Day 1977.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to the current pay raise for Members of Congress going forward without a vote. I have a lawsuit which has wended its way to the Supreme Court over the past 15 months. It argues that the Constitution requires a vote insofar as the salaries of Members of Congress are concerned. I believe the American people want Members of Congress to be well paid, but the current scheme of automatic raises—and there are two automatic raises being proposed for this year, the next being in October—are unconstitutional as well as unwise public policy.

The importance of Congress voting on its pay is further illustrated by the fact that Congress has had a rollcall vote on every increase or decrease in its pay until the increase of December 16, 1967. That was shortly after Public Law 90-204, or the first automatic pay raise law, came into effect. I believe that this long tradition of Congress voting on its pay should be continued and I urge that the Speaker bring to the floor on the suspension calendar this matter for a vote. As a Member of Congress, I believe I have a constitutional duty to vote on my pay—at least James Madison emphasized at the Constitutional Convention that there would always be a rollcall vote on congressional pay so that Members would be individually responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a record of the history of congressional

pay raises and pay decreases. Up until 1967, there was a rollcall vote on each change. I submit the following:

APPENDIX: TABLE OF STATUTES ALTERING CONGRESSIONAL SALARY

STATUTE, DATE, AND SUBSTANCE

- 1 Stat. 70-71: September 22, 1789: \$6 per diem during attendance prior to March 4, 1795. \$7 per diem after March 4, 1795 for Senators during special sessions; for Representatives, \$6 per diem during attendance.
- 1 Stat. 448: March 10, 1796: Previous Act repealed; \$6 a day for both during attendance.
- 3 Stat. 257: March 19, 1816 and 3 Stat. 345: February 6, 1817: \$1,500 annually; repealed by Act of February 6, 1817, 3 Stat. 345.
- 3 Stat. 404: January 22, 1818: \$8 a day during attendance after March 3, 1817.
- 11 Stat. 48: August 16, 1856: \$3,000 annually.
- 11 Stat. 367: December 23, 1857: \$250 monthly.
- 14 Stat. 323: July 28, 1866: \$5,000 annually.
- 17 Stat. 486: March 3, 1873: \$7,500 annually.
- 18 Stat. 4: January 20, 1874: Previous Act repealed and \$5,000 annually restored.
- 34 Stat. 993: February 26, 1907: \$7,500 annually.
- 43 Stat. 1301: March 4, 1925: \$10,000 annually.
- 47 Stat. 401: June 30, 1932: Decreased from \$10,000 to \$9,000 by Economy Act of 1932 (10% reduction), effective July 1, 1932.
- 48 Stat. 14: March 20, 1933: Decreased from \$9,000 to \$8,500 by Economy Act of 1933 (15% reduction), effective April 1, 1933.
- 48 Stat. 521: March 28, 1934: Increased from \$8,500 to \$9,000; partial restoration, effective February 1, 1934.
- 48 Stat. 521: March 28, 1934: Increased from \$9,000 to \$9,500; partial restoration, effective July 1, 1934.
- 49 Stat. 24: February 13, 1935: Increased from \$9,500 to \$10,000; final restoration effective April 1, 1935.
- 59 Stat. 318: July 3, 1945: \$2,500 annual expense allowance (tax free), retroactive to January 3, 1945.
- 60 Stat. 850: August 2, 1946: \$10,000 to \$12,500 annually, effective January 3, 1947.
- 69 Stat. 11: March 2, 1955: \$12,500 to \$22,500 annually, effective March 1, 1955 (\$2,500 annual expense allowance repealed).
- 78 Stat. 415: August 14, 1964: \$22,500 to \$30,000 annually, effective January 3, 1965.
- 81 Stat. 614: December 16, 1967: \$30,000 to \$42,500 annually; Salary Commission, established by Public Law 90-206, recommended a salary to the President who, under authority of the Act, recommended \$42,500 in his 1970 Budget, which, under the law, became effective March 1, 1969.
- 89 Stat. 419: August 9, 1975: \$42,500 to \$44,600 annually; pursuant to Public Law 94-82, President in Exec. Order No. 11883, recommended 5% increase in General Schedule salaries, Congressional salaries were increased in like percentage by Exec. Order on Oct. 6, 1975.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PRESIDENT CARTER'S NUCLEAR ARMS STATEMENTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, 219 Members have now joined in cosponsoring a resolution expressing the sense of the House in support of President Carter's recent statements regarding nego-

tiating a comprehensive nuclear test ban and nuclear disarmament, Congressmen BINGHAM, FISH, LONG, SEIBERLING, JEFFORDS, REUSS, UDALL, and ZABLOCKI worked with me on crafting and getting support for this resolution.

Nuclear weapons proliferation and the potential growth of the "nuclear club" are, I believe, the most important problems confronting the human race at the present time. President Carter's announced intentions "to proceed quickly and aggressively with a comprehensive test ban treaty eliminating the testing of all nuclear devices," to seek "a fairly rapid ratification of the SALT II agreement," and "to move very quickly toward an agreement with the Soviet Union for major reductions in atomic weapons" deserve the support of the entire Congress and of all the American people.

It is my hope that this huge show of congressional support for the President's declared objectives will strengthen his hand in proceeding to negotiate on these most vital of subjects.

DIXON'S RACIAL SLURS MUST NOT BE TOLERATED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before a trade association, a member of the Federal Trade Commission called consumer advocate Ralph Nader "a dirty Arab" and "a son of a bitch," according to published reports.

Commissioner Paul Rand Dixon does not deny making the statements, reports today's Washington Post, which quoted him as saying he has no intention to apologize to Nader.

His refusal to apologize is further evidence of Mr. Dixon's poor taste and judgment. But even an apology cannot dispel the cloud which has been cast over his independence and discretion in the many proceedings before his agency in which Mr. Nader participates.

Accordingly, 15 of our colleagues have joined me today in calling on President Carter to remove Mr. Dixon from office on grounds of malfeasance in office as provided for in Federal statute. We also have written directly to Mr. Dixon asking him to step down.

Little can be done to cure the numerous decisions made by the Federal Trade Commission since the 1960's which may have been colored by Mr. Dixon's bias. But his resignation can at least assure that further decisions will not suffer from the same disability.

Mr. Dixon's comments display the basest form of prejudice and offend not only Americans of Arab descent but all citizens who expect the highest level of decency and integrity from their public officials.

Members signing the two letters are: HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, HON. JIM GUY TUCKER, HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, HON. PHILLIP BURTON, HON. FORTNEY H.

STARK, HON. ABNER J. MIKVA, HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN, HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT, HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, HON. EDWARD I. KOCH, HON. JOHN E. MOSS, HON. GEORGE MILLER, HON. JOHN KREBS, HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER, HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER.

Text of the letters follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 1, 1977.

HON. JAMES EARL CARTER, Jr.,
President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We urge you to use your statutory authority to remove for cause Commissioner Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Dixon's widely-reported comments directed at Mr. Ralph Nader display the basest form of prejudice. They offend not only Americans of Arab descent but all citizens who expect the highest level of decency and integrity from their public officials.

Mr. Dixon's refusal to apologize further evidences his poor taste and judgment.

But even his apology cannot dispel the cloud which has been cast over his independence and discretion in the many proceedings before his agency in which Mr. Nader participates.

Little can be done to cure the numerous decisions made by the Federal Trade Commission since the 1960's which may have been colored by Mr. Dixon's bias. But his removal can at least assure that future decisions will not suffer from the same disability.

His removal would also preserve our citizens' trust in the decency and fairness of our government officials without which our system cannot function.

A similar letter is being sent to Mr. Dixon to urge him to resign. Only Mr. Dixon's removal or resignation, we feel, can correct the injustice to Mr. Nader and others of similar heritage, and clear the black mark on the Federal Trade Commission.

Sincerely,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 1, 1977.

HON. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIXON: Once again our nation has witnessed the spectacle of a high government official giving vent to vicious racial slurs.

Your comments directed at Mr. Ralph Nader display the basest form of prejudice. They offend not only Americans of Arab descent but all citizens who expect the highest level of decency and integrity from their public officials.

Your refusal to apologize further evidences your poor taste and judgment.

But even an apology cannot dispel the cloud which has been cast over your independence and discretion in the many proceedings before your agency in which Mr. Nader participates.

Little can be done to cure the numerous decisions made by the Federal Trade Commission since the 1960's which may have been colored by your bias. But your resignation can at least assure that future decisions will not suffer from the same disability.

Your resignation might also preserve the trust in the decency and fairness of our government officials without which our system cannot function.

Accordingly, we call upon you to resign your appointment as a Commissioner as the only way to correct the injustice to Mr. Nader and others of similar heritage, and clear the black mark on the Federal Trade Commission.

Sincerely,

THE Pervasiveness of Federal Regulation

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, the Council on Wage and Price Stability initiated a path-breaking study of the Federal Government's regulations affecting the steel industry. The Council has now released the first volume of its study, which catalogs and details all Federal regulations and policies affecting manufacturers of steel. The results of the study are truly astounding. The steel industry's operating and investment decisions are circumscribed by more than 5,300 Federal regulations initiated by 27 different Federal agencies. It is small wonder that the steel industry is "having an increasingly difficult time accomplishing its most socially beneficial objective—that of producing iron and steel."

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my distinguished colleagues a summary of the main points of the study identified by the Council on Wage and Price Stability. This summary, prepared under date of January 18, 1977, by the Council makes it clear that manufacturers of iron and steel can hardly make even routine decisions without taking into account the directives of some Federal agency.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY

1. VOLUME OF REGULATION

The regulatory programs of the seventies have produced substantially more voluminous and extensive regulatory requirements than earlier programs. This is in part the result of greater specificity. For example, each of OSHA's approximately 4,000 health and safety standards is a specific rule with which a steel company must comply. And of the 27 agencies noted in this study, more than one third have come into existence since the beginning of 1970. Additionally, of the approximately 5,600 regulations noted in the catalog, approximately 4,000 are in OSHA (discussed in Chapter 3), over 100 are in Environmental (discussed in Chapter 2) and almost 100 are Pension regulations (discussed in Chapter 5). All of these regulations have only recently come into existence.

The extent of the current volume of federal regulations can be illustrated by the numbers of proposed regulations published by the various federal agencies in the *Federal Register*, the official publication for such agency actions. According to the Office of the Librarian, Federal Register, the numbers of proposed and final regulations that were published in 1974 and 1975 are shown in the accompanying chart.

The catalog actually understates the number of regulations because the study adopts some very strict limiting definitions.

The study concentrated on federal regulations. Hence, it does not consider zoning or land use planning regulations which are in the purview of state and local governments. Additionally, the study defines the iron and steel industry in terms of the direct manufacturing process—"from loading dock to loading dock". This excludes consideration of transportation regulations that directly affect the shipping of ore and coal from the mines to the plants. It also excludes regulations affecting the mining of iron and coal. As noted at the beginning of Chapter 9, the definition does not include the "inputs" to

the steelmaking process of oil and natural gas; both of these commodities are regulated as to price and supply.

	1974	1975
Proposed new agency regulations	156	177
Proposed amendments to existing regulations	2,525 ¹	2,865
Subtotal	2,680	3,042
Final agency regulations	272	309
Final amendments to existing regulations	6,164	6,996
Subtotal	6,436	7,305
Total	9,116	10,347

Regulations or amendments are respectively defined as an addendum or amendment to a volume of the Code of Federal Regulations at the part level.

The specific definitions adopted in the study are discussed at pp. 4-7.

2. GROWTH OF REGULATIONS

The most obvious observation is that the number of regulations and regulatory programs has increased substantially over time. Most of the growth, however, has come in the last six years, during which time Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. In addition, during this period, several amendments to previously enacted federal regulatory statutes were also enacted.

Figure 11.1 (at p. 214) lists the federal regulatory agencies that affect steel and the dates of their establishment. From the number of agencies or new regulatory programs created in recent years, the accelerating pace of regulation is obvious. The impact of this growth is discussed in subsequent sections.

From Figure 11.1, one can also infer basic changes in Congressional focus between the last century and the present. The first laws enacted to regulate the steel industry (and, of course, other industries) addressed the general economic performance of these industries. Those were the initial foreign trade and federal antitrust laws. In marked contrast, the legislation of the late 1960's and 1970's addressed each industry's performance in social, health, and environmental areas. The principal examples are the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, and the Federal Environmental laws.

3. THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS

The situation is made more complex by the fact that many of these agencies administer more than one legislative program. The 27 agencies listed in the catalog administer approximately 57 programs. And in general, the more recently created agencies administer the largest number of programs. EPA, for example, administers some 26 different programs, six of which affect the steel manufacturing process.

And, some programs are administered by more than one agency. Civil rights, for example, are the concern of EEOC, the Justice Department and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

Of the 57 major regulatory programs mentioned in the catalog, over two-thirds have come into existence since 1970; and, some of the earlier programs have been amended and strengthened since that time.

4. THE Pervasiveness and Specificity of the Regulations

Regulatory statutes enacted recently have tend to create programs that mandate conduct in the steel industry much more spe-

cifically than the regulatory programs enacted at earlier times. The earlier federal antitrust laws, for example, contained only general statutory prohibitions against anti-competitive behavior. (See Chapter 6.) They did not require a specific course of action or conduct. By contrast, regulations issued by OSHA contain very specific requirements for virtually every piece of equipment used in the production of steel, ranging across such major items as coke ovens all the way down to such mechanical minutiae as the ladders used in plants and the mandatory 42-inch height from the floor of portable fire extinguishers.

The tables beginning on page 26 detail the degree to which EPA regulations dictate technical details of each of the 29 stages of the steel manufacturing process. The text beginning at page 54 is illustrative of this same sort of minutiae on the part of OSHA regulations, as is the specificity of the variances listed on page 62, and the list of the most frequently violated OSHA standards beginning at page 67.

5. CONFLICTS AND LACK OF COORDINATION

Another problem is that often regulations promulgated by different agencies conflict. This study has not specifically focused upon this issue, though several examples are noted. The classic example in the steel industry of conflict is between regulatory programs regarding emissions from coke ovens. EPA, which is interested in reducing emissions into the ambient air, has favored placing hoods over coke ovens to gather and treat these emissions. On the other hand, OSHA, which is concerned with worker health, opposes hoods on coke ovens because they would increase the concentration of coke oven emissions breathed by the workers. Here, the application of a particular technology creates the conflict between regulatory programs. But conflicts between regulatory programs can result from other reasons as well. For example, FEA's goal of promoting the use of coal in boilers may conflict with EPA's goal of reducing sulfur oxide emissions from point sources, including boilers. Another example: FEA's goal of promoting energy conservation may conflict with OSHA's regulations requiring the workplace to be brightly lit. And, whereas antitrust regulation promotes competition, tariffs may tend to diminish it.

List of number of regulations by chapter¹

Environmental regulation	129
Occupational Safety and Health Administration	4,000 ²
Discrimination regulation	38
Antitrust regulation	71
Foreign trade regulation	161
Tax regulation	64
Energy regulation	7
Industrial relations regulation	86
Miscellaneous regulation	752
Total	5,308

¹ Not all of these numbers are based upon the same definition of regulation.

² OSHA numbers are approximate.

LET US SUPPORT SOLAR ENERGY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the 95th Congress addresses the problem of formulating an effective energy policy, it will face many difficult decisions. Perhaps the most difficult will be whether to

shift our emphasis from nuclear to solar power.

Back in the Truman administration, the Paley Commission was set up to look into the country's future energy needs. It recognized the Sun's potential and called for "aggressive research in the field of solar energy—an effort in which the United States could make an immense contribution to the welfare of the free world."

Most unfortunately, the Paley Commission's recommendation for "aggressive research" went unheeded. As a result, the commission's optimistic prediction for solar energy to account for 10 percent of the national energy consumption by 1975 is unrealized.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRED RICHMOND of New York has recently introduced a legislative package entitled "Incentives for the Promotion of Energy Conserving Technology." Through the development of solar energy, this package would bring us a step closer to energy self-reliance.

The Federal Government must take the lead in realizing the potential of our most abundant resource, the Sun, as an efficient, practical energy resource.

SUPPORT BUILDS FOR MANDATORY SENTENCING BILL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I reintroduced legislation to set mandatory minimum prison sentences for anyone convicted of using a firearm in the commission of a Federal crime. Today I am happy to report that 94 of our colleagues have joined with me in this realistic attempt to do something about the increasing levels of crime in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks here today the response received from several sheriffs and local prosecutors throughout the State of California. I hope that those Members who have not yet joined with those listed below and cosigned this legislation will do so. The listing of present cosponsors and statements of the sheriffs follow:

A LISTING OF THE COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1559

Anderson of California.
Andrews of North Dakota.
Andrews of North Carolina.
AuCoin of Oregon.
Bonior of Michigan.
Breaux of Louisiana.
Blanchard of Michigan.
Brown of Ohio.
Baucus of Montana.
Bourke of Florida.
Brown of Michigan.
Coughlin of Pennsylvania.
Carney of Ohio.
Corrada of Puerto Rico.
Conte of Massachusetts.
Cederberg of Michigan.
Dan Daniel of Virginia.
Robert Daniel of Virginia.
Duncan of Tennessee.
De Lugo of the Virgin Islands.
Downey of New York.

Devine of Ohio.
Davis of South Carolina.
Duncan of Oregon.
English of Oklahoma.
Edgar of Pennsylvania.
Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma.
Ertel of Pennsylvania.
Fountain of North Carolina.
Fisher of Virginia.
Fary of Illinois.
Flowers of Alabama.
Gibbons of Florida.
Gephardt of Missouri.
Ginn of Georgia.
Glickman of Kansas.
Hawkins of California.
Hannaford of California.
Huckaby of Louisiana.
Hefel of Hawaii.
Ichord of Missouri.
Jacobs of Indiana.
Jones of Tennessee.
Jones of Oklahoma.
Ketchum of California.
Keys of Kansas.
Krebs of California.
Krueger of Texas.
LaFalce of New York.
Leach of Iowa.
Lehman of Florida.
Lent of New York.
Levitas of Georgia.
Long of Louisiana.
Lott of Mississippi.
McHugh of New York.
Madigan of Illinois.
Martin of North Carolina.
Mathis of Georgia.
Mazzoli of Kentucky.
Meyner of New Jersey.
Mineta of California.
Mitchell of New York.
Moakley of Massachusetts.
Mollohan of West Virginia.
Mottl of Ohio.
Gary Myers of Pennsylvania.
Neal of North Carolina.
Patterson of California.
Pattison of New York.
Pritchard of Washington.
Pursell of Michigan.
Quie of Minnesota.
Rahall of West Virginia.
Rangel of New York.
Robinson of Virginia.
Roe of New Jersey.
Roncallo of Wyoming.
Rose of North Carolina.
Scheuer of New York.
Simon of Illinois.
Spence of South Carolina.
Staggers of West Virginia.
Stratton of New York.
Studds of Massachusetts.
Treen of Louisiana.
Trible of Virginia.
Walsh of New York.
Charles Wilson of Texas.
Charles H. Wilson of California.
Won Pat of Guam.
Young of Florida.
Zeferetl of New York.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,
January 24, 1977.

Congressman GLENN M. ANDERSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Your proposed bill that would provide for a mandatory five-year penalty for anyone convicted of using a firearm during the commission of a federal crime would undoubtedly have an added deterrent effect upon commission of federal crimes where handguns are predominately used, provided that the penalty would be imposed, in addition to the sentence received for the crime itself.

It seems that the trend today is for judges to impose minimum sentences for serious crimes where force is used, and the added mandatory requirement might at least ensure that the criminal offender receives a five year

sentence for federal crimes where firearms are used.

The proposed legislation would probably have more meaning if a provision were added that the five year mandatory sentence could not be reduced by probation or parole. I appreciate the opportunity to express my views on important legislation in the criminal field. Your efforts to improve the criminal justice system are to be commended.

DONALD E. NASH,
Chief of Police.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,
January 24, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I am extremely grateful to see that you are sponsoring H.R. 1559. While I do not personally favor gun control of law-abiding citizens, I believe it is imperative that there should be strict and severe punishment for those who do use a gun in the commission of a crime.

I am impressed with your bill because it does require a mandatory sentence of at least five years that cannot run concurrent with other violations. I believe mandatory sentences are the only way to get around bleeding heart judges and let the criminal element of our society know that it must pay for its conduct. I would support any bill requiring a mandatory sentence, especially with respect to guns used in criminal activity.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM G. WILLETT,
City Prosecutor.

MONTEREY COUNTY, SALINAS, CALIF.,
January 20, 1977.

Congressman GLENN M. ANDERSON,
32d District, California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I am sure that all of us who are daily involved in the enforcement of laws and apprehension of criminals appreciate your efforts to assist us in this very big job.

I support your proposed legislation, H.R. 1559, creating mandatory penalty for using firearms in the commission of crimes.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM A. DAVENPORT,
Sheriff.

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY,
SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
January 20, 1977.

Representative GLENN M. ANDERSON,
32nd District, California, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I would like to commend you for once again introducing your bill on mandatory penalties for anyone convicted of using a firearm during the commission of a crime.

As you know, here in California we now have some legislation requiring mandatory sentences for certain crimes committed with a firearm. It's still too early to tell the effects of that legislation. However, in my conversations with my constituents, the overwhelming majority stress that laws should be enacted to penalize those who use firearms illegally rather than introduce unenforceable legislation that only the law abiding citizens would comply with.

Now that we once again have hope for use of the death penalty, it's time to get tougher with those who use firearms in the commission of crimes. Your bill, as far as federal violations is concerned, certainly adequately addresses that issue. Hopefully, your bill will be successful this time around.

Very sincerely,
JOHN W. CARPENTER,
Sheriff.

COUNTY OF PLUMAS,
QUINCY, CALIF.,
January 25, 1977.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I am in receipt of your letter, dated January 12, 1977, to former Sheriff W. C. Abernethy, Jr. Since Sheriff Abernethy left office in July of 1976, I would like to take this opportunity to express my views on your proposed H.R. 1559.

As we have seen by past and present experiments at various forms of gun control in this county, these programs have been completely unsuccessful and have done nothing more than harass the law abiding citizens.

Under the present laws there is too much discretion allowed in the sentencing of offenders. The mandatory penalty, that you propose, for the use of a firearm in the commission of a crime is a much needed piece of legislation that would have a definite impact upon the criminal element where the impact belongs.

I wish you every success in the passage of this bill as it is definitely a step in the right direction, and if I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

S. DOUGLAS THOMAS,
Sheriff.

THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT: RUSSIA'S SHAMEFUL RECORD

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is a year and a half since the United States and the Soviet Union, together with other nations, concluded the Helsinki accord. In that agreement, we made some very real political concessions in return for certain Russian promises. Those promises did not concern specific advantages or gains for the United States, but instead were of a humanitarian nature, such as the granting of greater freedom of travel to Soviet citizens themselves. Now there is mounting evidence that the Russian authorities regard their Helsinki obligations with even more contempt than the most pessimistic of us had anticipated. Our only consolation is that we are learning of genuinely heroic human stories taking place behind the iron curtain. It is in that spirit that I recommend to my colleagues this outstanding article by Ralph Bennett in the January 1977 Reader's Digest:

THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT: RUSSIA'S SHAMEFUL RECORD

(By Ralph Kinney Bennett)

(NOTE.—On August 1, 1975, the United States, the Soviet Union and 33 other nations signed accords at Helsinki, Finland, that "legitimized" the Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe established at the end of World War II. This was a diplomatic triumph for the Kremlin. But, as a *quid pro quo*, the accords also detailed agreements designed to "open up" the closed societies of Russia and the countries under Soviet domination—greater freedom of thought and religion, freer travel and "human contacts," freer flow of information. Seventeen months have passed since the "spirit of Helsinki" was invoked. Are the Russians living up to the agreement? Here is a report.)

In Kokchetav, a Baptist is arrested for holding a prayer meeting in his home, while in Kirovograd, a Jehovah's Witness is sentenced to five years in a "corrective labor" camp for "religious activities."

In Kustanai, the art director of a technical school is given two years in a labor camp for listening to and taping foreign radio broadcasts.

In Derbent, the mother of an eight-year-old girl asks to emigrate. Suddenly she is indicted for "speculating" in household utensils (worth about \$78), threatened with loss of her child unless she signs an interrogation record that she cannot read, and sent to a labor camp for 18 months.

In Moscow, an artist is locked out of his studio, and his sculptures are smashed, because he asked to tour Western art museums.

These are not isolated examples. They are the enduring reality of Soviet life—a reality unchanged in the 17 months after Helsinki.

Indeed, just two weeks after the Helsinki signing, Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev made clear that there would be no change in Kremlin policy. In a conversation with visiting U.S. Congressmen, Brezhnev said that while those parts of the accords dealing with the "security" of Eastern Europe were "binding," the human-rights provisions were not "of a binding nature." Thus, the true meaning of Helsinki has been written not in diplomatic headlines but in the lives of people for whom the accords have become one more broken promise.

BASIC RIGHTS

The Helsinki signatories agreed to respect "human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief."

Four months after Helsinki, biologist Sergei Kovalev went on trial for "subverting" the Soviet government. His crime: supporting the stand of Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov against government infringement of civil liberties, and circulating accounts of the treatment of dissident countrymen. Kovalev argued that he was merely seeking to further the cause of basic freedoms guaranteed in the Soviet constitution. Replied the prosecutor: "Our state forbids acts which are foreign to its nature."

Sakharov himself was refused admittance to Kovalev's trial, but he maintained a vigil outside the courtroom in Vilnius, Lithuania. Even as he waited for news of Kovalev's fate, the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to Sakharov *in absentia*. Soviet authorities would not allow him to go to Norway to accept it. When Kovalev was finally sentenced to seven years' hard labor and three years' "internal exile," Sakharov commented: "After Helsinki, the authorities plainly wanted to demonstrate their firmness and their power, which permits them to ignore even their own laws."

They have done so repeatedly in the months since. Vyacheslav Igrunov, son of a high Communist Party official, was committed to a psychiatric hospital as an "especially dangerous schizophrenic" because he circulated dissident writings. Anatoly Ponomarev, an engineer from Leningrad, was confined to a psychiatric ward because he wrote letters criticizing government policy. Prominent scholar Igor Melchuk, author of more than 150 published works, was dismissed from the Institute of Linguistics because he made the "ideological error" of writing a letter to the *New York Times* defending Sakharov.

Or consider the case of Andrei Amalrik, whose writings like *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* won him accolades abroad and prison sentences at home. After exile in Siberia, he returned to Moscow in 1975 to join his wife Gyusel. Police ordered him out. In September 1975, while he lay sick in bed, KGB agents burst in and took him away for a night of interrogation. Just before Christmas he was detained again.

Constantly harassed, unable to do any work, Amalrik finally asked for an exit visa. "I did not want to emigrate," he said. "When a man is born in a country and is a writer, he does not want to leave—not ever." But Amalrik left Russia last June. "The bastards won," he said.

It often appears to Westerners that only a handful of Soviet intellectuals and scientists are involved in dissent. This is because average citizens are punished quietly. Often, they are not able to leave their hometowns, are afraid to use the mails, and are prevented from contacting foreign embassies. Their cries are seldom heard.* They are from the man in Tbilisi who was told by KGB officers to stop seeing an old friend because "his days are numbered"; the Baptist girl in Shchuchinsk who was seized and searched by police on her way home from a religious service; the assembly-line worker whose inadvertent anti-regime remark consigned him to one of the more than 1,000 Russian labor camps, where perhaps two million people languish.

HUMAN CONTACTS

The Helsinki signatories agreed to aid international marriages and the reuniting of families; to ease travel restrictions in order to promote person-to-person contact as "an important element in strengthening friendly relations and trust among peoples."

In late August 1975, just weeks after the Helsinki signing, Uri Podriachik pleaded with Russian authorities for an exit visa to see his dying mother, actress Dina Roitkop Podriachik, who had emigrated to Israel in 1971. The part of the Helsinki document that deals with exit visas specifies that "cases of urgent necessity—such as a serious illness or death—will be given priority treatment." But Uri was refused, and on August 28 his mother died in Israel while he remained helpless in Moscow.

Woodford McClellan, a professor of Russian and East European history at the University of Virginia, married Irina, a Russian interpreter, while teaching in Moscow in May 1974. The Soviets refused to let her return to America with him. Falsely assured that she could leave early in 1975, she quit her job and has since been refused work. McClellan has not been permitted to visit her. State Department intercession and the Helsinki signing brought no change. Says her husband, "We cannot see the end of Irina's suffering." More than 200 other cases of appeals for Russian-American family reunion remain in similar post-Helsinki limbo.

Soviet citizens still find themselves caught in a byzantine web of regulations and arbitrary reprisals that discourage travel and human contact. Journeys from even one village to another often require government permission. Scientists and intellectuals cannot attend seminars or institutes in the West unless they are "ideologically sound." When Gari Abelev won a prize on October 20, 1975, from New York's Cancer Research Institute for his "landmark" work in cancer immunology research, his government refused him permission to go to the United States and accept the award. Similarly, physicist Valentin Turchin was denied an exit visa in December 1975 when Columbia University invited him as a visiting scholar.

But nowhere is there more shocking evidence of the Soviet Union's opposition to freedom of movement than in its emigration policy. Prospective emigrants routinely face the loss of jobs and homes, social ostracism and, very likely, induction into the army or imprisonment in a labor camp. "In every known case," Elizabeth Pond of *The Christian Science Monitor* reports from Moscow, "the

*To keep the West informed on conditions inside the Soviet Union, *Khronika* Press, 505 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10018, publishes a bimonthly magazine of letters, reports and other materials smuggled out of Russia.

numerous Soviet Jews who have applied to leave but have been refused permission have been fired from their jobs."

Moreover, a potential emigrant must pay an exit fee of 300 rubles (about \$400), two months' pay for the typical worker. Then he may find that Israel is the only country to which he can get permission to go—and emigration to Israel costs an additional 500 rubles.

Early in 1976, the Soviets introduced still another economic barrier. Many would-be emigrants—especially Jews—live off foreign donations after they have been fired from their jobs and are still waiting for their exit visas. Under the new regulation, financial gifts from abroad are subject to a 30-percent tax—on top of a 35-percent "bank charge." The remaining money is then significantly devalued. A Soviet emigrant who receives a 400-ruble gift takes home about 50 rubles.

PRESS FREEDOM

The Helsinki signatories agreed to the free dissemination of information—books, newspapers, broadcasts—for an ever wider knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of life in the other participating states."

The notion that the Soviets would honor these provisions was dispelled almost at once. An issue of *Zhurnalist*, official magazine of the Soviet Union of Journalists, published shortly after the Helsinki signing, carried the explanation that most Western publications could not be circulated in East Bloc nations because they contradicted "the morality of socialist society." Western newspapers and magazines that do come into the Soviet Union are earmarked for government officials and a few approved scholars. Moscow boasted it would put 18 Western newspapers on general sale after Helsinki, but Western correspondents have had a hard time finding them. So far, non-communist Western papers are still to be found only in a few selected airports and hotels—points not accessible to the average citizen.

Despite Helsinki, the jamming of Radio Liberty, which began broadcasting into the Soviet Union in 19 languages back in 1953, has not ceased. Jamming of Radio Free Europe has continued in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. Last winter the Soviets successfully bullied the International Olympic Committee into denying accreditation to Radio Free Europe correspondents to cover the Winter Olympics at Innsbruck, Austria, which they had done previously since 1952.

Though the U.S.S.R. promised to ease restrictions on foreign correspondents there, this has proved illusory. Reporters continue to be screened from the realities of Soviet life, says David K. Shieler of the *New York Times*. "They are toasted by officials and vilified by the Soviet press, escorted graciously around factories and denied interviews, entertained at receptions and deprived of facts." Reporters who have tried to break through the smiling, courteous barrier that prevents real newsgathering are watched closely by Soviet secret police.

The Soviets are particularly concerned with reporters who speak Russian. A concerted attempt is made to discredit them or strike fear in those who would talk to them. Christopher Wren of the *Times*, George Krinsky of Associated Press and Alfred Friendly, Jr., formerly of *Newsweek*—all fluent in Russian and known for their enterprising stories—have been painted in the Soviet press as CIA agents. People they interview have been picked up and questioned by the KGB. Other reporters have found themselves accused of drug dealing, homosexuality and espionage. "All this," says Shieler, "combined with close surveillance and bugging of correspondents, takes place beneath the government's pose of open cooperation with the foreign press as mandated by the Helsinki declaration."

Thus, since the signing at Helsinki, since the high-minded language about respect for human rights and dignity, little has changed. The Iron Curtain has been accorded a kind of diplomatic recognition, and what happens to the people behind it remains in the hands of a government intent on repression. Yet Alexander Sukharev, Soviet First Deputy Minister of Justice, glibly tells an interviewer that "our country long ago reached a level in the matter of tangible guarantees and defense of human rights that the average citizen in the so-called 'free world' can only dream of."

As with other agreements in the past, it would appear that Soviet compliance with Helsinki is something the West can only dream of, unless the governments of the free world will use the accords incessantly to prod the Kremlin toward some semblance of humanity.

A CREATURE OF CAPITALISM?

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system that supports the country is sometimes berated on university campuses, in private foundations and in certain circles that frequently are the beneficiaries of our economic system. I know that our economic system is mixed to some extent, but I was very impressed with the statement of Henry Ford II, in resigning from the Ford Foundation. Mr. Ford pointed out that the foundation exists and thrives on the fruits of our economic system. He went on to say that in effect the foundation is a creature of capitalism, a statement I am sure would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. He went on to say that it is very difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities that are beneficiaries of the foundation's grant programs.

I think it is well for us to pause and recall that it is business and entrepreneurial activity that produces the basic wealth in our society. At this point I wish to insert Mr. Ford's statement which appeared in the January 14, 1977, issue of the *Wall Street Journal*:

A CREATURE OF CAPITALISM

(NOTE.—Earlier this week, Henry Ford II, chairman of Ford Motor Co., disclosed that he had resigned as a trustee of the Ford Foundation. The move left the tax-exempt foundation's board without a representative of the family that founded it. In a letter to the board, Mr. Ford said he wanted to "step aside" because "after 33 years I have . . . pretty much done all there is to do as a Trustee. . . ." He also offered the following thoughts. An editorial on this subject appears on this page today.)

In leaving the Board, I have a few thoughts that I would like to pass along to you. The first of these is that, to a great extent, effectiveness in a large institution comes from an understanding and appreciation of its goals and actions by the constituency it serves. In the case of the Foundation, the constituency is society at large; I suggest to you that society's view of the Foundation is quite blurred these days. The diffuse array of enterprises upon which the Foundation has embarked in recent years is almost a

guarantee that few people anywhere will share a common perception of what the Foundation is all about, how it sees its mission and how it serves society. I think this weakens the Foundation's capacity to be effective in terms commensurate with its potential.

Another consideration that I believe requires more attention is the need to scale down activities to a level that reflects diminished resources. It seems to me that with half of the income, we still are addressing as many different problem areas as we did 10 or 15 years ago. I suspect that we are tackling some of these rather thinly and thus not too effectively.

The Foundation always has prided itself on its emphasis on funding the experimental kind of effort—the new way that might lead to a significant breakthrough. Yet we stick with some programs for years and years—Office of the Arts being a prime example. Are we an on-going funding agency or are we courageous backers of innovation in the huge field of human problems?

The Foundation exists and thrives on the fruits of our economic system. The dividends of competitive enterprise make it all possible. A significant portion of the abundance created by U.S. business enables the Foundation and like institutions to carry on their work. In effect, the Foundation is a creature of capitalism—a statement that, I'm sure, would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the Foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities, that are the beneficiaries of the Foundation's grant programs.

I'm not playing the role of the hard-headed tycoon who thinks all philanthropists are socialists and all university professors are communists. I'm just suggesting to the Trustees and the staff that the system that makes the Foundation possible very probably is worth preserving. Perhaps it is time for the Trustees and staff to examine the question of our obligations to our economic system and to consider how the Foundation as one of the system's most prominent offspring, might act most wisely to strengthen and improve its progenitor.

One final note: it may be the fate of any large institution over the time to turn more and more inward in its thinking processes and gradually to foreclose itself from outside influences. I detect this to some degree in the Foundation, particularly among staff people. It's a danger sign. The "not invented here" attitude robs an organization of the benefits of new thinking and should be fought at every turn. All wisdom does not repose at 320 East 43rd Street nor may it be found solely at The American Road, Dearborn, Michigan, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or any other power center in the world. We have a lot to learn from many sources. We shouldn't tolerate a fortress mentality.

TRIBUTE TO TOM TEAR

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1977

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in saluting Thomas H. Tear in his well-deserved retirement from this body as chief minority page.

Tom's cheerful and courteous manner is also reflected in all of the Republican pages, with a dedicated and sincere desire to be helpful to the minority Mem-

bers of Congress. The help of Tom and his team of pages are a vital part of our performing our duties here in the House of Representatives.

We will miss Tom's friendliness and good humor, both of which have lightened our burdens tremendously. We wish him and his wife, Carolyn, much happiness as they join the "carefree group."

MISPLACED EMPHASIS IN HELPING THE CITIES

HON. THEODORE S. WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the following article by I. D. Robbins appeared in the January 23, New York News. Mr. Robbins makes the critical point that the Nation must "recognize its responsibility for the hard-core poverty problem" so that recovery of the economy may then begin. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to reflect on where our legislative emphasis should lie. This article can help shape our reasoning in setting the foundation for the rebuilding of our urban centers:

OF ALL THE CITIES, NEW YORK CAN SURVIVE
(By I. D. Robbins)

The city of New York is franker about its economic situation than most cities. It has admitted in its proposed economic redevelopment program, "Economic Recovery 1977-1981," published recently, that it's in bad shape. New York confesses that its unemployment rate is 10.6%, that since 1969 it has lost 650,000 jobs: one out of three jobs in construction, one out of five in transportation, one out of six in wholesale and retail businesses and even one out of ten in finance. The biggest loss has been in manufacturing. Manufacturing in New York is half as big as it was at the end of World War II. Even since 1970, 238,400 manufacturing jobs have disappeared. The needle trades went to Hong Kong, Seoul and Taipei.

But I have long had a strong feeling that New York is not alone among the big cities. So I called Herbert Bienstock, the quick and able regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and asked him to give me a similar rundown on other major cities.

Metropolitan area	Number of jobs lost	Percent of jobs lost
Chicago	161,000	16
Los Angeles	106,000	12
Detroit	102,000	17
Cleveland	59,000	19
St. Louis	53,000	18
Newark	52,000	18
Pittsburgh	38,000	13
Boston	34,000	12
Dallas-Fort Worth (the sun belt, even)	27,000	10

Unfortunately, Washington doesn't think in terms of cities. It thinks metropolitan areas. Exact city figures are kept only for New York and Philadelphia. Still the figures for metropolitan areas tell a depressing story of the decline of manufacturing employment from 1969 to 1975. Here they are:

These area figures are bad enough, but the Bienstock office thinks the figures from Philadelphia need special attention. That city lost 89,000 jobs, 35% of its manufacturing employment. The whole Philadelphia metropolitan area lost 128,000, but the per-

centage dropped from 35% to 22%. This probably happened everywhere. The suburbs were not so badly hit, so we have a false picture of what happened in the cities. Many big cities probably have lost 25% or more of their manufacturing jobs.

What does it all mean? Simply that the cities are today the sick soft cures of metropolitan areas. The rich move to the suburbs, the poor to the big cities. Investment is no longer being made in the big cities. Costs and taxes go up, the ability to collect taxes down.

Recently, the City of New York put together a task force from its planning, budgeting and economic development offices, recruited a group of economists from the banks and prepared a plan for its own economic salvation, using its own resources. The new plan is designed to, at best, add 130,000 jobs by 1981 with an unemployment rate of 5.9% instead of today's 10.6%. It is not even expected that in the next five years we will be able to get back to where we were five years ago.

The Carter administration shows signs of thinking in generalities, of assuming that if it can somehow take care of the big national economic picture, the little problems like the cities and poverty will take care of themselves. This is madness. Urban poverty and blight are a reaction to national policies and will be ameliorated only by national programs specifically designed to correct urban poverty and blight.

Strangely, I think New York has the best chance, better than Chicago, Detroit or even Atlanta, to help itself. New York City has certain built-in advantages. It is perfectly situated to take advantage of world peace, increased world trade and travel and increased foreign investment in the United States. It is the world center of communications, has the finest educational, cultural and health services "plant" anywhere. If the nation as a whole will recognize its responsibility for the hard-core poverty problem, we can go to work on the job of rebuilding our economy.

IS DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP UNFAIR?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been given a foretaste by the Democratic leadership of what the 95th Congress may well be like. If the pattern continues, apparently fairness toward the minority Members will be of little concern.

On January 4, Democratic Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS introduced H.R. 50, his radical proposal which would serve as a blueprint for a Government-controlled economy. Despite its infringement of the jurisdiction of numerous standing committees, including specific amendments to the Budget Act, H.R. 50 was referred to only one committee, that of Education and Labor.

On January 6, I introduced H.R. 171, the Economic Recovery and Sustained Growth Act. In my opinion this bill is a much better way to get our economy moving and to solve the economic problems facing our country. It was referred jointly, however, to no less than four different committees. These include the Committee on Ways and Means, Rules, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Educa-

tion and Labor. This will certainly make it difficult to get my bill on to the House floor within the next 2 years.

As we all know, the referral of bills is a matter entirely within the prerogative of the majority leadership. One can only ponder on this double standard.

This incident raises the issue of basic fairness to Members. Furthermore, I think the American people deserve a more thoughtful approach to legislation than has been exhibited in this instance.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF AMNER B. ZAVUROV

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 14, the New York Times reported the 3-year sentencing of Amner B. Zavurov, a Soviet Jew, by the provincial court of Uzbekistan, U.S.S.R., because of his desire to emigrate to Israel.

Since August 1975, when Mr. Zavurov was first granted permission to emigrate, he has been subjected to a bizarre series of judicial and administrative procedures which ended on January 13, in a trial without counsel. The charges brought against Mr. Zavurov were failure to possess an internal passport—which was taken by Soviet authorities when he received his exit visa—and failure to have a job—which one cannot get in the Soviet Union without a passport.

Soviet authorities promised to return Mr. Zavurov's passport if he withdrew his application for an exit visa. He rejected their offer, and continued to pursue the visa application. He is now facing 3 years in prison because of his decision.

In response to the sentencing, I initiated a letter to General Secretary Brezhnev protesting the decision of the Uzbekistan court, and the U.S.S.R.'s violation of the agreed provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. On January 21, 28 of my colleagues joined me in sending the letter to Mr. Brezhnev—a copy of which follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1977.
His Excellency LEONID I. BREZHNEV,
General Secretary, Central Committee of the
Communist Party, Soviet Union.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to protest the recent three-year prison sentence delivered to Amner B. Zavurov because of his desire to emigrate to Israel.

We do not understand, nor do we sanction, the arbitrary judicial and administrative processes which culminated in his sentence. The U.S.S.R.'s harsh reaction to Mr. Zavurov's visa request comes as a disappointment to those of us who had hoped that some progress had been made to relax Soviet emigration policies.

We trust you will consider our thoughts as you continue to deliberate on the important issue of international human rights.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Ottinger, Christopher J. Dodd, Robert A. Roe, Robert F. Drinan, John Krebs, Joshua Ellberg, Jerome A. Ambro, Edward W. Pattison, Newton I. Steers, Jr., Robert J. Lagomarsino,

Norman F. Lent, Richard A. Tonry, Joe Moakley, Elizabeth Holtzman, Stephen J. Solarz, Harold C. Hollenbeck.
 James J. Blanchard, William R. Cotter, Donald M. Fraser, Thomas J. Downey, Parren J. Mitchell, Berkley Bedell, Theodore S. Weiss, Raymond F. Lederer, Marjorie S. Holt, William Lehman, Henry A. Waxman, William M. Brodhead, Herbert E. Harris II.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND CHARTER 77

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Ms. FENWICK and I wrote to the Czechoslovak ambassador to protest that country's harassment of dissidents who signed the "Charter 77" statement calling for the human rights guaranteed by the Helsinki agreement.

On January 31, 1977, I received a reply from the ambassador, Dr. Jaromir Johanes, enclosing a press release from the Czechoslovak embassy. The release included statements from a number of Czechoslovak citizens denouncing the "Charter 77" statement and referring to it as "slanderous" and "right-wing" in character.

In order that those of my colleagues who are interested in this matter may judge the document for themselves, I am including it in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1977]
 MANIFESTO CHARGING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN
 CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(NOTE.—Following is the text of Charter 77, a Czechoslovak human-rights manifesto cited by the State Department yesterday as evidence of rights violations. It was translated by and published in the current issue of *The New Leader*, dated Jan. 31.)

Law No. 120 of the Czechoslovak Collection of Laws, published October 13, 1976, includes the text of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, both signed in behalf of our Republic in 1968 and confirmed at the 1975 Helsinki Conference. These pacts went into effect in our country on March 23, 1976; since that date our citizens have had the right, and the State has had the duty, to abide by them.

The freedoms guaranteed to individuals by the two documents are important assets of civilization. They have been the goals of campaigns by many progressive people in the past, and their enactment can significantly contribute to a humane development of our society. We welcome the fact that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has agreed to enter into these covenants.

Their publication, however, is at the same time an urgent reminder of the many fundamental human rights that, regrettably, exist in our country only on paper. The right of free expression guaranteed by Article 19 of the first pact, for example, is quite illusory. Tens of thousands of citizens have been prevented from working in their professions for the sole reason that their views differ from the official ones. They have been the frequent targets of various forms of discrimination and chicanery on the part of the authorities or social organization; they have been denied any opportunity to defend them-

selves and are practically the victims of apartheid. Hundreds of thousands of other citizens have been denied the "freedom from fear" cited in the Preamble to the first pact; they live in constant peril of losing their jobs or other benefits if they express their opinions.

EDUCATIONAL CURBS ARE CITED

Contrary to Article 13 of the second pact, guaranteeing the right to education, many young people are prevented from pursuing higher education because of their views or even because of their parents' views. Countless citizens worry that if they declare their convictions, they themselves or their children will be deprived of an education.

Exercising the right to "seek, receive and impart information regardless of frontiers and of whether it is oral, written or printed," or "imparted through art,"—Point 2, Article 13 of the first pact—can result in persecution not only outside the court but also inside. Frequently this occurs under the pretext of a criminal indictment (as evidenced, among other instances, by the recent trial of young musicians).

Freedom of speech is suppressed by the government's management of all mass media, including the publishing and cultural institutions. No political, philosophical, scientific, or artistic work that deviates in the slightest from the narrow framework of official ideology or esthetics is permitted to be produced. Public criticism of social conditions is prohibited. Public defense against false and defamatory charges by official propaganda organs is impossible, despite the legal protection against attacks on one's reputation and honor unequivocally afforded by Article 17 of the first pact. False accusations cannot be refused, and it is futile to attempt rectification or to seek legal redress. Open discussion of intellectual and cultural matters is out of the question. Many scientific and cultural workers, as well as other citizens, have been discriminated against simply because some years ago they legally published or openly articulated views condemned by the current political power.

Religious freedom, emphatically guaranteed by Article 18 of the first pact, is systematically curbed with a despotic arbitrariness: Limits are imposed on the activities of priests, who are constantly threatened with the revocation of government permission to perform their function; persons who manifest their religious faith either by word or action lose their jobs or are made to suffer other repressions; religious instruction in schools is suppressed, et cetera.

A whole range of civil rights is severely restricted or completely suppressed by the effective method of subordinating all institutions and organizations in the State to the political directives of the ruling Party's apparatuses and the pronouncements of highly influential individuals. Neither the Constitution of the CSSR nor any of the country's other legal procedures regulate the contents, form or application of such pronouncements, which are frequently issued orally, unbeknown to and beyond the control of the average citizen. Their authors are responsible only to themselves and their own hierarchy, yet they have a decisive influence on the activity of the legislative as well as executive bodies of the State administration, on the courts, trade unions, social organizations, other political parties, business, factories, schools and similar installations, and their orders take precedence over the laws.

POLICE ACCUSED OF SURVEILLANCE

If some organizations or citizens in the interpretation of their rights and duties, become involved in a conflict with the directives, they cannot turn to a neutral authority, for none exists. Consequently, the right

of assembly and the prohibition of its restraint, stemming from Articles 21 and 22 of the first pact; the right to participate in public affairs, in Article 25; and the right to equality before the law, in Article 26—all have been seriously curtailed.

These conditions prevent working people from freely establishing labor and other organizations for the protection of their economic and social interests, and from freely using their right to strike as provided in Point 1, Article 8 of the second pact.

Other civil rights, including the virtual banning of "willful interference with private life, the family, home, and correspondence" in Article 17 of the first pact, are gravely circumscribed by the fact that the Interior Ministry employs various practices to control the daily existence of citizens—such as telephone tapping and the surveillance of private homes, watching mail, shadowing individuals, searching apartments, and recruiting a net work of informers from the ranks of the population (often by illegal intimidation or, sometimes, promises), etc.

RIGHT TO TRAVEL IS VIOLATED

The Ministry frequently interferes in the decisions of employers, inspires discrimination by authorities and organizations, influences the organs of justice, and even supervises the propaganda campaigns of the mass media. This activity is not regulated by laws, it is covert, so the citizen is unable to protect himself against it.

In the cases of politically motivated persecution, the organs of interrogation and justice violate the rights of the defendants and their counsel contrary to Article 14 of the first pact as well as Czechoslovakia's own laws. People thus sentenced to jail are being treated in a manner that violates their human dignity, impairs their health, and attempts to break them morally.

Point 2, Article 12 of the first pact, guaranteeing the right to freely leave one's country, is generally violated. Under the pretext of "protecting the State security," contained in Point 3, departure is tied to various illegal conditions. Just as arbitrary are the procedures for issuing visas to foreign nationals, many of whom are prevented from visiting Czechoslovakia because they had some official or friendly contact with persons who had been discriminated against in our country.

Some citizens—privately at their places of work, or through the media abroad (the only public forum available to them) have drawn attention to these systematic violations of human rights and democratic freedoms and have demanded a remedy in specific cases. But they have received no response, or have themselves become the objects of investigation.

The responsibility for the preservation of civil rights naturally rests with the State power. But not on it alone. Every individual bears a share of responsibility for the general conditions in the country, and therefore also for compliance with the enacted pacts, which are as binding for the people as for the government.

The feeling of this coresponsibility, the belief in the value of civic engagement and the readiness to be engaged together with the need to seek a new and more effective expression, gave us the idea of creating Charter 77, whose existence we publicly announce.

Charter 77 is a free and informal and open association of people of various convictions, religions and professions, linked by the desire to work individually and collectively for respect for human and civil rights in Czechoslovakia and the world—the rights provided for in the enacted international pacts, in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, and in numerous other international documents against wars, violence and social and mental oppression. It represents a general declaration of human rights.

FOUNDED ON A COMMON CONCERN

Charter 77 is founded on the concepts of solidarity and friendship of people who share a concern for the fate of ideals to which they have linked their lives and work.

Charter 77 is not an organization; it has no statutes, permanent organs or registered membership. Everyone who agrees with its idea and participates in its work and supports it, belongs to it.

Charter 77 is not intended to be a basis for opposition political activity. Its desire is to serve the common interest, as have numerous similar organizations of civic initiative East and West. It has no intention of initiating its own programs for political or social reforms or changes, but it wants to lead in the sphere of its activity by means of a constructive dialogue with the political and State authorities—and particularly by drawing attention to various specific violations of civil and human rights, by preparing their documentation, by suggesting solutions, by submitting various more general proposals aimed at furthering these rights and their guarantees, by acting as a mediator in the event of conflict situations which might result in wrongdoings, etc.

CHARTER 77 LOOKS TO BELGRADE

By its symbolic name, Charter 77 stresses that it has been established on the threshold of what has been declared the year of political prisoners, in the course of which a meeting in Belgrade is to review the progress—or lack of it—achieved since the Helsinki Conference.

As signatories of this declaration, we designate Dr. Jan Patočka, Dr. Vaclav Havel and Professor Jiri Hajek to act as spokesmen for Charter 77. These spokesmen are authorized to represent Charter 77 before the State and other organizations, as well as before the public at home and throughout the world, and they guarantee the authenticity of its documents by their signatures. In us and other citizens who will join Charter 77, they will find their collaborators who will participate in the necessary negotiations, who will accept partial tasks, and will share the entire responsibility.

We trust that Charter 77 will contribute to making it possible for all citizens of Czechoslovakia to live and work as free people.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH SCHECHTER

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, at an honorary luncheon on February 15, the Westside Jewish Community Center will commemorate Mr. Joseph Schechter's many years of devoted service. The occasion will mark the initiation of the 1977 United Jewish Welfare Fund Campaign, Mr. Schechter's favorite charity.

Now in his eighties, Joseph Schechter arrived in the United States from Bessarabia, Russia, in 1898. He founded and successfully developed a metals and aluminum business. Since retiring in 1955, he has worked tirelessly to help and raise funds for community organizations. He has served as a member of the board of directors of the Westside Jewish Community Center, president of the center's senior adults board of directors, and on the Area Council on Aging for Los

Angeles City and County. As a volunteer staff worker, Joseph Schechter has worked on almost all standing committees of the center. He is a zealous fundraiser for community services to young and old.

For Joseph Schechter's present and past value to us as a most exemplary citizen, I am proud to commend him to you. It is a privilege to do him honor, and to look forward to having the benefit of his help for many years to come.

PERHAPS NOW, POST CARD REGISTRATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in our last election over 80 million Americans participated in the exercise of democratic freedom by casting their ballots. While that is a record number, there still remain approximately 70 million people who, while eligible to vote, do not do so because of various bureaucratic barriers placed there by the States.

A short while ago, I introduced H.R. 2347, a bill which would establish through the Postal Service a system of post card voter registration. This legislation would make it easier and more convenient for Americans to exercise this most basic of rights. It is my belief that if this bill or the concept embodied therein, were to become law, the result would be a much stronger Republic as more Americans would participate in the process of selecting their elected representatives.

Organized labor has been one of the principal supporters of a universal registration system. They have been instrumental in bringing about registration by mail systems in several States throughout the country. From the research that I have been able to ascertain, the 16 States that have adopted registration by mail statutes in the last 2 years, the experience has laid to rest many of the arguments employed by those who argue against a universal post card registration law. This is not to say that my bill or any legislation similar to it would be completely free of any fraud. However, I maintain that if we are to achieve the goals that our Founding Fathers envisioned for us, then it is up to us as the people's representatives to work tirelessly to make the system fraud-free and thus insuring the validity of the results.

In the January 24 issue of Newsweek, Alexander Barkan, the national director of the political arm of the AFL-CIO, sets out the reasons why the Congress must enact a universal registration statute. I believe that the arguments put forth by Barkan are indeed worth sharing with my colleagues, as this Congress will most certainly take up the issue of post card registration. In that regard, I would hope that you would read the following article, and study my legislation on the subject. Mr. Barkan's comments follow:

THE MYTH OF VOTER APATHY

(By Alexander E. Barkan)

We've just come through a national election. Many concerned with it were preoccupied not so much with the question of who would win but whether anybody would show up. "What if we held the election," they asked, "and nobody comes?" As many bets were placed on the come-out as on the outcome. Newspaper headlines and other media comments on "apathy" in the Presidential race were so common some thought it must be a third-party candidate.

That's a joke. Apathy, voter frustration and mistrust are quadrennial stories, dusted off in Presidential-election years. I'm convinced they're inflated. Almost always in an election year, voter interest is slow to generate. While the media and the candidates are all in a dither and immersed in political matters, voters—many of them—keep one eye on the pennant races, the World Series, other concerns. In the last few weeks, their interest picks up perceptibly, then peaks in the final days of a campaign.

One problem is that by then registration in all but a few states has closed out—and millions of citizens have not registered. Meanwhile, millions of others have been discouraged from registering by archaic laws that make registration at least inconvenient and often a challenge to one's ingenuity and perseverance. A postelection New York Times poll found large numbers failed to register because "it was too hard for them."

PERFORMANCE

It's been too hard for too many too long, and the labor movement believes it's high time to erase the pointless laws that limit voter participation. It is time to enact a universal voter-registration law. The Federal government should take on the responsibility of registering voters. Our people will vote if it's made easier for them.

This year, approximately 150 million Americans were of voting age and eligible. About 70 per cent, or 105 million of them, were registered. On Nov. 2, more than 80 million voted—which was a record number, if not percentage.

So, almost 80 per cent of those who were registered voted. Not so bad, and good enough to suggest that millions more would have turned out had they been able simply to get in line Election Day and make their choice known.

Strong evidence undergirds this belief. In Wisconsin, a recently enacted state law permits voters to forget about registration entirely, just walk up on Election Day, provide a driver's license or other proof of age and residence and go into the booth and pull the levers. About 200,000 unregistered Wisconsinites voted Nov. 2, creating an actual increase in voting participation over 1972. Voter participation was 10 points above the national average of 54.4.

In Minnesota, the case was made as compellingly. Under a similar state law, more than 22 per cent of the 1.9 million persons who voted had not registered beforehand. Minnesota's voting performance of 75 per cent-plus was 7 points up from 1972 and more than 20 points over the national average. Walter Mondale's presence on the national ticket surely helped, but not that much.

REGISTRATION BY MAIL

In neither Wisconsin nor Minnesota was there fraudulent voting. Administrative headaches, if any, were minor. It cost nothing extra.

As an interim step to universal registration, the trade-union movement has supported enactment of registration-by-mail laws. In the past two years, sixteen states have adopted them. In most, experience with the law supports the belief that they're a step in the right direction. In Texas, Ten-

nessee, Maryland, Oregon and Kentucky, new registrations in 1976 alone approached or exceeded the number of citizens who had become newly eligible to vote in the 1972-76 period.

It is conceded the experience was less impressive in other states. But the program is recent, and logistical problems, particularly in big industrial states, are enormous even for the simplified procedure of mail registration.

The labor movement was the only organization fully promoting use of this new tool, and we registered some 6 million of our members for an over-all AFL-CIO member-registration rate of 80 per cent, 10 points higher than the electorate at large. The political parties and other interest groups almost uniformly ignored the availability of mail registration, and election officials with few exceptions failed to stimulate its use adequately.

But the labor movement seeks a quantum leap beyond registration by mail. We look at Canada and other nations where the government says to the citizen, "Don't worry about registration, we'll handle that—all you have to do is show up at the polls and vote Election Day." We look at the fact that citizens in these nations do show up Election Day in percentage far higher than our own. We think this is exactly how it should, and would, work here.

Argument has raged unremittingly throughout our 200 years over voting rights and voting performance. At first, voting was restricted to property owners. For nearly a century and a half, it was a club for men only, and white men, at that. Women—white women—finally got the vote, but for nearly 50 years beyond that, minorities were effectively barred from voting by poll taxes, literacy tests and, often, violence. Now, with the Voting Rights Act—for which the labor movement fought—that has changed.

OPENING THE POLLS

Some argue we have come as far as we should in opening up the process. They lament that further efforts will only encourage more voting by the poor and the undereducated, who, they seem to think, are incapable of making wise political decisions. Personally, I find their political judgment as sound as that of lawyers, bankers, corporate leaders, professors and—yes—even media commentators.

However, I'm willing to leave the debate to those who pontificate regularly in this and similar journals. With or without their counsel, I am convinced the more citizen participation we have the healthier and stronger our democracy will be, and that all reasonable steps should be taken to increase it.

We need a universal voter-registration law. Any eligible citizen should be entitled to enter the voting booth on Election Day, his or her registration having been duly handled, without aggravation or inconvenience, by the government. The trade-union movement looks forward to the day when the question will be not, "What if we hold an election and no one shows up?" but, "What if we hold an election and practically everyone does?"

EMERGENCY NATURAL GAS ACT OF 1977

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of the Emergency Natural Gas Act of 1977, I voted for it be-

cause its emergency provisions will allow the shipment of direly needed natural gas to homes, business and industrial firms, and schools of the Midwest, North, and East which are suffering great hardship caused by the unusually severe winter conditions. I think it would not be untoward of me to remind my many colleagues who have in the past successfully opposed efforts by me and other Members of gas-producing States to achieve deregulation that shortages of natural gas would be one of the consequences. I should like to hope, now that this prediction has materialized, that we may receive more favorable consideration when we present to the Congress again this session legislation to deregulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead permanently. In this vein, I should like to present for the record a copy of a letter sent to President Carter by Mr. Evern R. Wall, president of El Paso Electric Co. I would particularly call attention to his observations indicating that his firm is willing to help by allowing the intrastate gas it has under contract to be transferred to other sections of the country under emergency deregulation; but that it is unfair to deregulate only temporarily for this emergency and for the convenience of those who have insisted upon regulated low prices. This is an overwhelmingly pertinent point which I hope all of us may keep in mind as we consider permanent deregulation legislation later in this session of Congress.

Following is the complete text of Mr. Wall's letter to President Carter:

EL PASO ELECTRIC CO.,
El Paso, Tex., January 28, 1977.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The energy emergency caused by present weather conditions, although unfortunate, should come as no surprise. The industry has been warning the country for years that such a condition would exist unless changes were made in national regulation to promote exploration and energy development.

In Texas we are fortunate enough to have supplies of intrastate natural gas. Companies such as El Paso Electric have made special arrangements for customers to benefit from this fuel and even though it has been expensive we have had an assured supply. We recognize that many people in other parts of the country are under an emergency situation because of the severe weather. We understand that over 500,000 people are out of work and at least 40,000 schools have been closed because of lack of fuel.

For a number of years our customers have paid much higher prices for the gas we have used from the intrastate market. This gas is not regulated by the Federal Power Commission, and the extra cost paid by our customers has provided incentives for continued exploration, research and expensive off-shore drilling by the fuel supply companies. During this time other parts of the country have received Texas interstate natural gas, under regulations and price limitations by the Federal Power Commission, at a lower cost than that paid by customers in Texas, served from the intrastate market.

El Paso Electric is willing to help the North and East, as long as there is no extra cost to our customers, by allowing the intrastate natural gas we have under contract to be transferred to other sections of the country under emergency deregulation. However, it is unfair to only temporarily deregulate natural gas for this emergency and for the con-

venience of those who have insisted upon regulated low prices. Total and permanent deregulation must be accomplished so that prices in a free market can provide the financial incentives necessary for continuous exploration and development of sufficient energy for our growing nation. We believe that deregulation will increase the reserves of natural gas and in the long run decrease cost to our customers.

A copy of this letter will appear in newspapers throughout our service area on February 1, 1977.

Respectfully yours,

EVERN R. WALL,
President.

WARD PHILOSOPHY: IT SELLS BUSES

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, foreign trade has, for the past several years, been a pillar of the economy of Arkansas with industrial and agricultural exports contributing well over \$1 billion annually to the State's economy. I wish to share with my colleagues a recent article in the Arkansas Gazette about Ward Industries of Conway, Ark., which reflects one of the reasons why:

WARD PHILOSOPHY: IT SELLS BUSES
(By Tom Hamburger)

CONWAY.—Charles D. Ward of Conway, 37, chairman of the Board of Ward Industries, traveled more miles last year trying to sell buses than Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger did in trying to bring about world peace.

Ward probably received more tangible results for his efforts than did Kissinger.

Last week, Ward announced that the second phase of an agreement to sell 1,600 intercity buses to the Egyptian government had been completed. The announcement came less than a year after Ward completed the final shipment of 700 buses to Saudi Arabia for use in carrying pilgrims to Mecca.

The Egyptian contracts are the largest in the company's history and will mean an addition of 200 persons to the plant's work force of 700. But the company, which began as a blacksmith's shop in 1933, is accustomed to success and growth.

HE'S "PRACTICAL"

Ward describes himself as "practical" and the philosophy is evident in the development of the company, the formation of his political beliefs and in his operations in the politically tense Middle East.

In the 10 years since Charles Ward assumed the presidency of the company from his father, Ward's annual sales figures have grown from \$7 million in 1967 to an expected \$55 million in 1977. The firm manufactures about 5,000 buses a year and is one of six major school bus builders in the country. Although Ward says it is difficult to tell which is the largest, he contends to have cornered at least 20 per cent of the country's school bus market.

Ward notes proudly that the family owned school bus company has grown even in recent years when the number of school age children in the United States has declined. He insists that the growth is not related to court ordered busing, which he says accounts for less than 1 per cent of the company's business.

EXPLAINS GROWTH

The growth can be explained, Ward says, by the company's overseas expansion, the nationwide trend towards consolidation of small schools and a sense of practicality and efficiency that has been a hallmark of the Ward operation since the beginning of the business. In the early days, in order to meet production demands with limited capital, the company manufactured its own parts and factory equipment.

"Father found that by making his own parts he could get a steady supply. He invented and patented many of the things we use here * * *. We manufacture our own automatic assembly lines, our own automatic welders, our own automatic drill machine. We are more self-sufficient than any other manufacturer in the United States. We, for instance, laminate our own safety glass and make windows, seats and heaters."

DESIGNS "SAFETY BUS"

All of the Wards have designed improvements for their buses. Charles developed the basic design for a "safety bus" that was first displayed in 1973. The standards employed in the safety bus will be required of all buses manufactured in the United States after April 1, 1977, he said.

The Ward philosophy of self-sufficiency was employed in 1968 when the growing company required a computer system. Rather than relying on an outside computer firm, Charles and his brother, Stephen Ward, formed their own computer company, Demographics, Inc., of Conway.

The ever-practical Wards realized the company could also provide services for the state Democratic Party, in which he was becoming increasingly active.

"At that time, Winthrop Rockefeller was governor," Ward recalled, "and in becoming governor he developed one of the most sophisticated computer political operations in the United States and the Democrats had nothing to combat that sort of thing. I went into business, offered it to the Democrats here and the business grew and prospered."

ROOM IN MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East has provided the largest single sales area for the company and the boom in Middle East sales began with the friendship of Ward and Ghaith Pharaon, a prominent Saudi businessman and a member of the Board of Regents of Harvard University's School of Business.

The friendship began when a Pharaon associate contracted Ward about the possibility of supplying school buses for Saudi pilgrims. Ward and Pharaon met in the course of negotiations and became fast friends. Their relationship resulted in the development of a jointly owned Saudi Arabian computer firm called Demographics Services, Ltd. The company was the first major computer company in the country.

Ward said that unlike many other businessmen dealing with Arab countries, he has not been asked to sign a boycott agreement stating that he will not trade with Israel. He said the Saudis did require his company to agree not to send the buses on ships that called at Israeli ports. He agreed. Would he sign a boycott agreement if it were necessary to maintain his trade in the Arab world?

"That's a decision I'd have to make at that time," he says. "I've always prided myself on not being prejudiced about race, income or that sort of thing. I would really have to do some soul-searching before I would sign such a thing. Hopefully, I will never be faced with the unhappy choice."

Ward speaks often of the family nature of the business. His father, D. H. Ward, got his start in the bus business in 1933 when, as an impoverished blacksmith, he was asked to build a bus body on the back of a Ford truck.

"My father liked the business and went

out and tried to sell," Charles Ward recalled last week. The elder Ward is now called "chairman emeritus" of the company but he is still active. He spent last week in San Salvador arranging a sale of bus parts.

The company has often increased its sales by trading in underdeveloped countries—particularly in South America. But Ward said that in the early 1960s he decided to concentrate more on the domestic market and the company pushed for more sales in California and the Northeast.

"We sold a lot in San Salvador and South America and the political upheavals there created problems * * * and we made a decision then that the United States market should receive priority," Ward said.

Ward said that as American school age population declined some he felt his Middle East deal "looks really fantastic."

NO BRIBES

Ward said that he has never paid a bribe in any of his dealings with Third World countries but he said, with characteristic frankness, that political influence is often required to obtain government contracts.

He believed that United States companies competing with Ward Industries for the Egyptian contract (financed by the United States Agency for International Development) were using political influence to convince officials that Ward was not capable of handling the deal.

"To me there is a place for political influence," Ward says, "and that is if a contract will add tax revenues to a congressman's district or state, anything he can do to help a contract within the legal confines of his job is, I think, proper."

Ward said that he has found it necessary to use political connections on "three or four occasions." One was a contract to build buses for employes of White Sands Missile Range.

"We were less than half a per cent below General Motors in bidding for buses at White Sands Missile Range," Ward said, "and they tried to get us kicked out. We called [Senator John L.] McClellan who went to bat for us by saying that we can do the job and by saying it would add jobs to [his] district."

Not surprisingly, Ward is very active in state and national politics.

He was something of a newcomer to national politics until 1972 when he was chairman of the Draft Mills for President Committee (he left the Mills campaign after the New Hampshire primary because he was "disillusioned").

Ward's close friend, Senator Dale Bumpers (Dem., Ark.), assisted him in 1972 in attaining a position as a Democratic national committeeman—one of two positions the state has on the 303-member National Democratic Committee.

Ward has become increasingly active in national politics since his appointment to the 25-member executive committee of the Democratic National Committee.

SPEAKS FRANKLY

Ward speaks frankly and informally about his high business and political dealings. His manner is relaxed. He showed up for an interview in his favorite attire, an open sport-shirt, slacks and loafers with no socks. When he discovered a photographer was present he ran home to put on a three-piece suit.

His office walls are decorated with two stuffed blue marlins, a plastic world time zone clock, a certificate of appreciation for his "outstanding efforts to maintain a Democratic Congress" and pictures of his wife and four children.

Ward attended the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville for two years before dropping out "because I really didn't enjoy it all that much * * * it's probably the greatest regret of my life." After dropping out, he went to Texas to manage a company plant that since has closed.

Ward's hobby, in addition to politics, is

boating. He keeps a 44-foot sport fisherman boat at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and enjoys frequent trips to the Bahamas and the Florida keys.

Ward takes frequent vacations (often merging them with business trips) but it is plain that he greatly enjoys his work. "It affords me practically all the opportunities, almost everything anyone could want: Travel, I get to meet interesting people and our business allows me to be creative. I do a great deal of design work on our buses and I'm a designer-inventor and I design major product changes. The job is flexible and I get time off when I need it and I wouldn't trade it for anything."

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the World Wildlife Fund to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following list of rare, vulnerable, or endangered marine animals, compiled by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and the U.S. Department of the Interior. I hope this information will be helpful to my colleagues:

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

The seas, which cover two-thirds of our world, give life to this planet. They are vital to man's existence, producing oxygen, acting as a global thermostat, and providing a major source of food.

Today, pollution and unguided exploitation threaten the world's seas. Man's actions are damaging areas of great value and threatening a vast range of animals and plants.

To help stop this trend, World Wildlife Fund is undertaking an extensive program to conserve marine life and establish protected marine parks and reserves.

Following is a list of rare, vulnerable or endangered marine animals, compiled from the Red Data Books of the IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) and the U.S. Department of the Interior's List of Threatened and Endangered Wildlife.

No list exists for the smaller life forms that abound in the seas, although many suffer or are even endangered in polluted or over-exploited areas. World Wildlife Fund's concern for all marine life is great, for its condition is an indication of the health of the seas on which we too depend.

RARE, VULNERABLE, AND ENDANGERED MARINE

ANIMALS

Mammals

Cetacea

Black right whale
Bowhead whale
Sei whale
Fin whale
Blue whale
Humpback whale
Grey whale
Indus susu (dolphin)
Ganges susu (dolphin)
Sarawak dolphin
Pygmy killer whale
Cochito
Spectacled porpoise
Dall's porpoise
Sperm whale
Pygmy sperm whale
Dwarf sperm whale
Tasman beaked whale
Northern bottlenose whale

	Carnivora
Polar bear	
Marine otter	
Southern sea otter	
	Pinnipedia
Galapagos fur seal	
Juan Fernandez fur seal	
Guadalupe fur seal	
Japanese sea lion	
Saima seal	
Mediterranean monk seal	
Caribbean monk seal	
Hawaiian monk seal	
	Sirenia
Dugong	
Caribbean manatee	
Amazonian manatee	
West African manatee	
	Birds
	Sphenisciformes
Galapagos penguin	
	Procellariiformes
Short-tailed albatross	
Black petrel	
Westland black petrel	
Dark-rumped petrel	
Black-capped petrel	
Cahow	
Reunion petrel	
Chatham Island petrel	
New Zealand Cook's petrel	
Gould's petrel	
Macgillivray's petrel	
Heinroth's shearwater	
Hutton's shearwater	
Newell's shearwater	
	Pelecaniformes
Galapagos flightless cormorant	
King shag	
Christmas Island frigate bird	
Abbott's booby	
Eastern brown pelican	
California brown pelican	
	Charadriiformes
Chatham Island oystercatcher	
New Zealand shore plover	
Tuamotu sandpiper	
Eskimo curlew	
New Zealand snipe	
Hawaiian stilt	
Black stilt	
Audouin's gull	
Chinese crested tern	
California least tern	
Asian dowitcher	
Nordmann's greenshank	
	Fish
	Acipenseriformes
Shortnose sturgeon	
	Perciformes
* Totoaba (MacDonald weakfish)	
	Reptiles
	Testudines
Loggerhead turtle	
Flatback green turtle	
Green turtle	
Hawksbill turtle	
Atlantic ridley turtle	
Pacific ridley turtle	
Leathery turtle	
	Crocodylia
American crocodile	
Estuarine crocodile	
Research is urgently needed to determine the condition of the following marine mammals, considered by the IUCN to be of "indeterminate" status. Many may be endangered.	
	INDETERMINATE STATUS
	Cetacea
Pygmy white whale	
Minke whale	

* Proposed for listing: U.S. Department of the Interior.

	Boutu
	White fin dolphin
	Franciscana
	Indopacific humpbacked dolphin
	Atlantic humpbacked dolphin
	Tucuxi
	Black-chinned dolphin
	Spinner dolphin
	Striped dolphin
	Spotted dolphin
	Common dolphin
	Heaviside's dolphin
	Black dolphin
	Hector's dolphin
	Commerson's dolphin
	Short-finned pilot whale
	Irawaddy dolphin
	Harbor porpoise
	Black porpoise
	Finless porpoise
	Narwhal
	Longman's beaked whale
	North Sea beaked whale
	Dense-beaked whale
	Antillean beaked whale
	Strap-toothed whale
	Hector's beaked whale
	Scamperdown whale
	Bering Sea beaked whale
	Andrew's beaked whale
	True's beaked whale
	Ginkgo-toothed whale
	Arch-beaked whale
	Baird's beaked whale
	Pinnipedia
	Laptev walrus
	Kurile harbor seal
	These marine mammals and birds are known to be extinct:
	Atlantic gray whale
	Steller's sea cow
	Jamaican diabolite
	Guadalupe storm petrel
	Spectacled cormorant
	Chatham Island tiako
	Auckland Island merganser
	Little Barrier Island snipe
	Tahiti sandpiper
	Cooper's sandpiper
	Great auk
	They are gone; nothing we do can bring them back. There remains an incredible variety of life in the seas today. But, as you can see from this long list, many are in danger.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE HOME SELLERS TAX RELIEF BILL

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the home sellers tax relief bill with bipartisan support from 15 of my colleagues. Since there will be major tax reforms needed in the 95th Congress, I am hopeful that this proposal will be included in the legislation that the Ways and Means Committee reports to the House.

Basically this bill expands the tax exclusion currently allowed to those over 65 who have sold their principal residence at a profit. First, this exclusion would be extended to any taxpayer who satisfies the other existing provisions without any age restriction. Second, there would no longer be a limitation on the amount of the sales price that could be excluded. I emphasize, however, that any taxpayer who elects to use this provi-

sion will be allowed to use it only once in his lifetime. This is expressly stated in the language of the bill. This provision is included to insure that the tax exclusion would be limited to those bona fide taxpayers for whose benefit it is intended and not abused or usurped by speculators or developers.

When I introduced the home sellers tax relief bill last year, the proposal generated considerable interest among the public. My office received a large number of telephone calls and letters from all parts of the country expressing support and gratitude that some Members of Congress were finally trying to reduce the tax burden for the average taxpayer. From the people who have taken the trouble to contact me I have learned that the need to save a few tax dollars and the variety of uses for these tax savings are as numerous as the families involved.

Last year I requested an analysis of this proposal from the Economics Division of the Library of Congress as well as views from a number of offices in the executive branch. These reports are available to any Members who would like to have that information. The Office of Management and Budget endorsed the attempt to remove the age limitation. However, the total elimination of the sale price ceiling was rejected by OMB as a potential windfall to upper income taxpayers. The IRS argued that present law provides adequately for younger taxpayers changing homes, but that older persons need some assistance.

Originally, section 121 of the tax code which is amended by this bill was intended to provide relief for low- and middle-income taxpayers from a complex rollover provision while providing no undue benefits to wealthy homeowners. Another major purpose—which has been ignored until this legislation—was to provide for equity between those who can purchase a new residence and those who, for whatever reason, cannot do so. Section 121 was adopted in recognition of the fact that those over 65 often do not want to remain in a large house or wish to rent and therefore could not benefit from the rollover treatment. This bill extends these benefits to all because we recognize that a variety of reasons exist why a taxpayer may not wish to, or be able to, purchase a new residence. For example, the family size may be reduced well before age 65; economic circumstances may change due to loss of a job or disability; or, a family may have to accept a temporary transfer without the desire to invest in a residence for that short a period. In view of these possible constraints on rollover it seems inequitable to impose a limitation in the case of a sale and not one in the case of a deferral.

The arguments that have been voiced in opposition to this proposal fall into three general categories: Speculators stand to benefit from this bill, the wealthy will benefit most, and the revenue loss to the Treasury is too great. Speculators already are able to avoid the capital gain tax by using the deferral method and trading up in value. If a person elected to use this new section, and assuming that he could meet the quali-

fications for the exemption, it would be his only opportunity to do so. The potential benefits that would be derived by millions of families using this exclusion would far outweigh the occasional speculative profit taker. Also, it should be remembered that this bill does not ease the qualifications for those who would use the exemption.

Wealthy individuals as a category will not receive a windfall under this proposal. In most cases they already make use of a variety of tax shelters and other investment instruments to avoid paying taxes. In addition, the wealthy person has a tendency to buy comparably priced or more expensive homes. They have already avoided the capital gains tax by employing the existing deferral provision of the tax code. Once again, it is a case of the ordinary taxpayer who shoulders most of the tax burden having the least opportunity to benefit from the current tax laws.

In answering the Treasury Department's argument that the Government might lose an estimated \$150 to \$250 million in tax revenues, I would suggest that consideration be given to the additional tax dollars that would be generated by the infusion of these tax savings to the economy. The only way that the money saved by home sellers under this proposal would not benefit the economy and not generate taxes from other sources is for the person who used this exemption to hide the money under a mattress or bury it in the backyard. We cannot make an estimate of taxes generated, but we can use our imaginations to see how widespread would be the potential benefits.

The home sellers tax relief bill is not a revolutionary proposal. It represents a realistic approach to some of our social and economic problems. It could lead to a more liquid market for existing housing and possibly help to slow the inflationary price spiral. This is a time for innovation in our economic thinking. I hope that the 95th Congress will recognize this need by giving speedy passage to the home sellers tax relief bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the following Members join me today in sponsoring this proposal: JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois; JAMES COLLINS, of Texas; JOHN DUNCAN, of Tennessee; MICHAEL HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts; JAMES HOWARD, of New Jersey; HENRY HYDE, of Illinois; JOHN LAFALCE, of New York; ROBERT LAGOMARSINO, of California; WILLIAM LEHMAN, of Florida; JAMES MARTIN, of North Carolina; DAWSON MATHIS, of Georgia; ROBERT MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia; RONALD SARASIN, of Connecticut; FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey.

ASSISTANCE FOR SAFETY IN PUBLIC HOUSING SERIOUSLY NEEDED

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, the high rate of crime in this country is one

of the most serious problems facing our Nation today. It is the prime concern of the 3½ million residents of the Nation's public housing facilities, and threatens the existence of this severely needed housing which is already burdened by difficult living conditions.

In New York City, where there are approximately 596,000 people living in public housing, the rate of crime rose more than three times as sharply in public housing from 1973 to 1974 as it did for the rest of the city as a whole. In 1976, the 27,687 crimes in public housing reflected one-fourth of the city's total number of crimes.

But this is not a problem which only affects New York City. William Brill Associates in Maryland, which under contract to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has completed studies on the crime problems in three housing projects across the Nation—Wm. Nickerson, Jr., Gardens in Los Angeles, Capper Dwellings in Washington, D.C., and the Murphy Homes, in Baltimore—found that the rate of victimization for public housing residents is often as high as 55.6 percent. Brill Associates also found that there is a very high rate of multiple victimizations.

The incidents reported to local police authorities include all categories of serious crimes against person and property. The threat of homicide, rape, assault, larceny, burglary, and the dangers inherent in high levels of narcotics traffic are primary concerns for these tenants.

Though many of us stand in awe of the huge brick structures which constitute public housing facilities, these apartment buildings are not as inviolable as they appear. Statistics show that the great number, well over half, of the crimes occur within the apartment building. Particularly dangerous are entrance lobbies and elevators. Stairwells, hallways, roofs, and landings are also danger areas. During 1976, over 1,300 of the robberies reported in New York City occurred in the lobbies of public housing facilities.

Aside from the obvious injuries, this high level of crime has produced grave levels of fear and entrapment which have led to tragically altered patterns of behavior. Residents of projects feel that there is more than a 50/50 chance of being hurt sometime in the near future. Parents fear that their children will become the victims of extortion, robbery, and assault, and most residents fear the danger of moving alone through the project.

People restrict their visits to friends and neighbors, rarely go out, and almost never go shopping at night. A high percentage of people leave lights, televisions, and radios on to deceive potential thieves. Some have gone so far as to purchase weapons such as guns, knives, and tear gas as a means of protecting themselves and their property. The result of these fears is a population hidden behind doors, and an increasing sense of the lack of community which is necessary for keeping areas livable. Consequently, the deterioration of these large complexes is

aggravated, and tragedies such as the Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis are produced.

It is obvious that conditions cannot remain as they are. Though the people who live in public housing do not have the means for providing the extra security that the presence of doormen can bring, it is apparent that we must begin to make use of some of the suggestions for making these buildings more secure.

One major suggestion, referred to by Brill Associates, is the controlled entranceway—an entranceway that by virtue of its design, the use of electronic fixtures, and the presence of guards, limits access to residents, their guests or others with a legitimate presence. Closed circuit television is a possible means of providing surveillance of elevators, and two-way audio systems in inner and outer lobbies would also screen incoming guests.

Other elements for greater safety could include strengthening of existing locks, and some means of detecting intruders in hallways and incinerators which have been cited as danger areas. It is interesting to note that the designs of many public housing projects were made without regard to the effect that design may have on potential criminal activities. Incinerators were placed in dimly lit areas, and numerous entrances directly from the street were made available. All such existing deficiencies should have some type of monitoring system in order to prevent unwarranted intrusions.

The most important aspect of security in public housing is the strength of the social cohesion among the residents. Tenant patrols and organizations are very effective because the tenants are familiar with other residents, and can recognize possible intruders. Tenant escorts armed with walkie-talkies can possibly reduce the number of incidents that occur in elevators and stairwells. Tenant patrols in New York City have had other beneficial results. Residents working together in some projects have developed buildings and grounds beautification projects.

But none of these improvements can be made with the current financial condition of the Nation's public housing authorities. Tenants themselves do not have the money. In my own city, which has a separate housing authority police force, 10 percent of the force was laid off because of the financial crisis faced by the city.

To alleviate this problem, I have introduced legislation to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to enable local public housing agencies to enter into security arrangements designed to prevent crimes and to insure the safety and well-being of public housing tenants. The bill would authorize \$70 million for this purpose, and would provide for two stages of safety arrangements—first, the necessary mechanical installations, and second, the important involvement of tenants of these dwellings to protect their homes.

I believe this bill is important in resolving one of the serious problems confronting the country's housing authorities, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

PARADE MAGAZINE ARTICLE CONFIRMS NEED FOR EXTENDED HOME HEALTH CARE

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that a large proportion of our elderly citizens, because of the inadequacy of long term living alternatives, are confined to nursing homes,

Officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimate that up to 260,000 elderly patients are unnecessarily institutionalized today. The Subcommittee on Health and Long Term Care of the Select Committee on Aging, which it is my privilege to chair, has recommended that vigorous efforts be undertaken to expand health services which are available in the home under medicare.

In an article entitled, "You Don't Have To Put Your Parents in a Nursing Home," which appears in the January 23 issue of Parade magazine, the author, Donald Robinson, discusses two hospitals in Albuquerque which have established a home health care organization, Hospital-Home Health Care. According to the author, "Specially trained discharge coordinators evaluate all patients at five hospitals in the Albuquerque area and refer those in need of care to H-HHC, whose experts prepare an individualized plan for each patient. They schedule regular visits by a nurse to examine the patient, give needed medical treatments and make sure the patient is taking medications correctly." Moreover, the home health care services train families whose sick or elderly parents live with them in the home. They teach these families how to care for their parents without altering their daily routines.

Not only have the home health care services in Albuquerque helped to nurture a sense of self-reliance in the elderly and to provide an alternative to institutionalization, but there have been cost benefits as well. According to Parade, "H-HHC saves U.S. taxpayers a fortune." Judy Walden, a registered nurse, points out that the cost involved in nursing homes in Albuquerque ranges from \$21 to \$35 a day. These home health services generally are about \$18 per visit and usually continue for only a few months.

Legislation I have introduced, H.R. 1116, proposes extensive revisions in the medicare law to liberalize coverage for more home health care visits, expansion of the kinds of services included in home health care, and provision for outpatient medical services.

Home health care services represent a feasible alternative to unnecessary institutionalization, and they enable the elderly to maintain their independence and to be productive members of society.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

YOU DON'T HAVE TO PUT YOUR PARENTS IN A NURSING HOME

(By Donald Robinson)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.—Mrs. Stella Nelson, a lively, 86-year-old widow who lives all alone in a tiny house here, had a serious accident last June. She spilled hot grease on herself while cooking dinner. She suffered a bad burn that necessitated immediate hospitalization.

Mrs. Nelson had no one to take care of her upon release from Presbyterian Hospital. In most cities, she would have been stuck in a nursing home. But Albuquerque has a remarkable non-profit organization called Hospital-Home Health Care (HHHC) that helps sick, old people live at home safely, with dignity and comfort.

NEW APPROACH

HHHC experts were waiting for Mrs. Nelson at her home. Faye Jones, a nurse, taught her how to change her dressings and came regularly to make sure that she was convalescing well. Other HHHC people got Meals on Wheels, a volunteer group, to bring Mrs. Nelson hot food daily. They arranged with neighbors to keep an eye on her and run her errands. She was in fine spirits when I visited her home recently.

A brave crusade is in progress throughout the country today to end one of the ugliest scandals in American life: the consignment to nursing homes of old people who don't want and don't need to be in them.

Alexander McMahon, president of the American Hospital Association, declares:

"We've found that in most cases you don't have to place your aged parents in a nursing home. With a little skilled assistance from a local hospital or some other community organization, the chances are excellent that most sick, old people can remain safely and happily at home."

About one million people aged 65 and over are now confined to nursing homes. Many of these homes are in shocking condition. In fact, after a nationwide investigation, a U.S. Senate committee reported that more than half of the country's 23,000 homes are frighteningly substandard, "with life-threatening violations."

Many of these old people don't even belong in a nursing home. Officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) estimate that up to 260,000 elderly patients are being "unnecessarily maintained in an institutional environment" today.

The trust is that most old persons dread the thought of a nursing home. It means "the end of the road" to them. Not long ago, a cross section of old people in Florida was questioned, and 80 percent wanted to pass the rest of their lives in their own homes.

VAST SAVING

U.S. Senate experts say that the development of adequate home health care programs could prevent or postpone the institutionalization of as many as 2.5 million old people. It could save the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Two top hospitals in Albuquerque have responded boldly to this challenge. St. Joseph's Hospital and the Presbyterian Hospital Center have teamed up to establish an exceptional home health care organization which goes anywhere within a 40-mile radius of the city. It has a staff of 27 registered nurses, practical nurses, nurses' aides, physical therapists, medical social workers and home health technicians. The organization, the HHHC, is headed by Judy Walden, a warm-hearted R.N.

The vast majority of HHHC patients are old people who have been hospitalized for heart disease, strokes, diabetes and other conditions that will probably plague them for the rest of their lives. They have nobody at home able or willing to care for them.

"Most of them don't need to be in a nursing home," Mrs. Walden says. "Usually, all that's necessary is for someone to come in and teach them how to take care of themselves. Take an old woman with congestive heart failure. Often, recurrence of a heart attack can be prevented just by explaining what her medicines and diet should be. Most elderly, ill people have never learned how to care for themselves. Their doctors try to tell them, but they get tense in a doctor's office. They don't hear everything the doctor says. The hospital may try to teach them, but it's a strange environment and the information doesn't sink in. It's different when someone comes right into your home and tells you what to do. It makes sense to you there."

Specially trained discharge coordinators evaluate all patients at five hospitals in the Albuquerque area and refer those in need of home care to HHHC, whose experts prepare an individualized plan for each patient. They schedule regular visits by a nurse to examine the patient, give needed medical treatments and make sure the patient is taking medications correctly. They arrange for physical, respiratory or other therapy at home. They assist the patient to his doctor's office. They handle laboratory tests. Most important, HHHC sees to it that every patient has hot meals and someone to help with the household chores.

SELF-INJECTIONS

Recently a 75-year-old woman was discharged from St. Joseph's Hospital, where she had been diagnosed as having a serious case of diabetes. She was very frightened. She had no one to administer the injections of insulin.

An HHHC nurse went to the woman's house and showed her how to give herself insulin injections. She watched for hours as the old woman practiced injecting a hypodermic syringe into an orange. Then she visited the woman daily until she was confident that she could inject the insulin into herself properly. She made sure that the woman thoroughly understood her new sugar-free diet and the special care she had to give her feet and skin.

When I saw the woman last fall, her diabetes was under control and she was living happily in her own home.

Unlike hospitals, which have rigid schedules, HHHC is very flexible with its patients. "Suppose an old man likes to sleep late in the morning. Why on earth should we barge into his home at 7 a.m.?" Mrs. Walden says.

HHHC puts great effort into training families who have sick, old parents living with them. Many of these families don't realize that home care services are available. In desperation, they send their parents to nursing homes.

FIT INTO ROUTINE

HHHC teaches them how to care for a parent without disrupting their own family life. "You shouldn't have to spend all your waking hours with a sick parent," Mrs. Walden declares. "We teach families how to fit an old person's schedule into their ordinary routine."

To date, HHHC has seen 3000 patients. Most of the visits were paid for by Medicare or Medicaid. Under government regulations, HHHC can make 200 home care visits to any patient who qualifies under Medicare.

According to Mrs. Walden, HHHC saves U.S. taxpayers a fortune. She points out that Albuquerque nursing homes cost from \$21 to \$35 a day, whereas HHHC charges \$18 a visit and averages no more than one or two a week for only a few months.

St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City has an outstanding home care program for the elderly, too. It concentrates on the "hidden people" in the seedy sections of Greenwich Village and Chelsea. These are the

thousands of impoverished old people who live alone in grubby tenements and welfare hotels. They have outlived or been abandoned by their families and friends. Most of them are near starvation and very sick, but they are too disabled, frightened and confused to seek help.

CV PROGRAM

Dr. Philip W. Brickner, director of community medicine at St. Vincent's, has organized several skilled teams to search out these people. It is known as the Chelsea-Village Program (CV).

The CV staff is in close contact with police stationhouses, churches, community agencies and political clubhouses in its area. It is in touch with welfare hotel managers and building superintendents. As soon as it hears of an old person in need of home care, it dispatches a physician, a nurse, a social worker and a driver who is a trained electrocardiograph technician.

It's a tough assignment. Most "hidden people" are suspicious. They fear that the visit by a CV team is a ruse to shanghai them into a nursing home.

One 82-year-old woman was found in a shabby welfare hotel in a cell-like cubicle. Her only furniture was a bed and a chair. The CV team determined that she had congestive heart failure, anemia and scurvy. She was lice-ridden and suffering badly from malnutrition. All she got to eat was some rice pudding and coffee purchased for her by another resident of the hotel.

The CV team had to visit the woman 12 times before she would agree to go into St. Vincent's Hospital for treatment. She was discharged after her condition was stabilized, but she insisted on returning to her lice infested room. It was a year before the CV team could move her to a YWCA where she could get hot food and companionship.

"It's like that most of the time," Dr. Brickner says.

The CV teams provide the "hidden people" with a full range of health services, from electrocardiographs to blood tests. If need be, they call in specialists at St. Vincent's for consultations.

CV doesn't charge its old patients a penny, nor does it bill Medicare or Medicaid. Its activities are largely underwritten by the United Hospital Fund of New York City. During its first 3½ years, 2900 home visits were made.

70 WHO STAYED HOME

CV statisticians analyzed the cases of 70 sick, old people who were sure candidates for a nursing home. It was estimated that CV saved the taxpayers \$500,000 a year by maintaining them in their own homes.

A number of other impressive programs for helping sick, old people are underway today. The Los Angeles County-University of Southern California Medical Center has assigned 80 physicians to make house calls on a 24-hour-a-day basis to 500 chronically ill patients. St. Anthony Hospital in Chicago has rented one-room apartments in two low-income housing projects and opened mini-clinics for their aged residents. No patient sees a bill.

In Baltimore, the Levindale Hebrew Geriatric Center and Hospital has an excellent day-care program. The center provides old people with meals, baths, group counseling, arts and crafts and physical therapy.

The Minneapolis Age and Opportunity Center has the biggest and one of the most innovative programs in the country. With the cooperation of Abbott-Northwestern Hospital, it gives senior citizens medical care at their homes, its central clinic and 10 mini-clinics. It also provides meals, handyman services, legal services and personal counseling. At any one time, it has as many as 33,000 people on its rolls.

CXXIII—219—Part 3

PROBLEM FOR CARTER

The question of home care for old people is likely to be a hot issue for the Carter Administration. A bitter controversy raging across the United States today over how extensive home health care services should be, should pay for them.

In the past, the federal government has neglected the field. In 1975, barely one percent of Medicare's \$14.1 billion expenditure went for home health care.

Federal laws covering home health care are a crazy quilt. "The home health care system is a non-system," says Michael Rappaport, an HEW expert. "We have all sorts of laws dealing with home health care and they don't fit into any kind of integrated whole."

Blue Cross regulations can be as bewildering. Fifty-four Blue Cross plans offer some home health care benefits, but 23 give none at all.

Complicating the situation is the invasion of the field by commercial companies that provide home health care at a profit. Many experts fear a repetition of the nursing home scandals. A federal law requires that these companies be licensed, but an intensive drive has been launched to get its provisions repealed.

A variety of new legislation has been suggested to implement some of the superb new programs. One bill would provide funds for unlimited home visits by doctors, nurses and homemakers.

NEW HEW ATTITUDE

After years of indifference, HEW is now strongly in favor of home health care. "No matter how good it is, a nursing home cannot substitute for a home environment," Dr. Faye G. Abdellah, director of HEW's Office of Long Term Care, declares.

What can you do if you are in need of home health care services for yourself or a member of your family? Inquire of HEW. It can tell you what benefits you're entitled to and where to turn for help in your community. Write: Dr. Faye G. Abdellah, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Room 17B07, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852.

A TASK FORCE TO STUDY REAL PROPERTY TAXES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced H.R. 1485, a measure cosponsored by 19 of my colleagues that would establish a task force on the taxation of real property by State and local governments to study and evaluate ways to help State and local governments reduce their dependence on real property taxation, to find alternative revenues to support schools, social service programs, public work projects, fire and police protection and other costly governmental programs demanded by the public, and to help alleviate the crushing real property tax burdens on low, middle, and fixed income taxpayers who are more than paying their fair share of taxes for these services.

Subsequent to the introduction of H.R. 1485, many colleagues expressed an interest in this proposal. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing this measure which is cosponsored by 30 colleagues.

To date, the following 49 members have cosponsored this bill to establish a task force on real property taxation:

Mr. Baucus of Montana.
Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky.
Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. John L. Burton of California.
Mr. Byron of Maryland.
Mr. Cederberg of Michigan.
Mr. Conte of Massachusetts.
Mr. de Lugo of the Virgin Islands.
Mr. Derwinski of Illinois.
Mr. Dodd of Connecticut.
Mr. Downey of New York.
Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.
Mr. Ellberg of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Fenwick of New Jersey.
Mr. Fish of New York.
Mr. Hannaford of California.
Mr. Harrington of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hawkins of California.
Mr. LaFalce of New York.
Mr. Lagomarsino of California.
Mr. Lent of New York.
Mr. McHugh of New York.
Mr. Mann of South Carolina.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia.
Mrs. Meyner of New Jersey.
Ms. Milkulski of Maryland.
Mr. Murtha of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Nix of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Ottinger of New York.
Mr. Pattison of New York.
Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Purcell of Michigan.
Mr. Rinaldo of New Jersey.
Mr. Rodino of New Jersey.
Mr. Roe of New Jersey.
Mr. Scheuer of New York.
Mr. Simon of Illinois.
Mrs. Spellman of Maryland.
Mr. Steers of Maryland.
Mr. Stokes of Ohio.
Mr. Walgren of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Walsh of New York.
Mr. Weaver of Oregon.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
Mr. Wolf of New York.
Mr. Won Pat of Guam.
Mr. Zeferetti of New York.

A complete text of this legislation, together with my remarks, is located in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1977, on pages 392-393. I welcome the support of all my colleagues on this legislation that so vitally affects all of our congressional districts.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious shortcomings of public works programs as an antidote to unemployment is the difficulty of determining where aid should go. In my view, this is a particularly serious objection to measures such as those proposed in H.R. 11, the Public Works Acceleration Act.

There are many good claims for aid from widely differing communities; how can we decide which claim is the strongest? Are we to put the need of a community with a high unemployment rate above that with a community with a declining industrial base, such that it faces

almost total unemployment in the near future? Is a small community with a high unemployment rate deserving of the same aid as a large community with a lower unemployment rate? Questions such as these abound.

The operation of the present public works impact program has suffered from these problems. The Department of Commerce, in its "Final Report: An Evaluation of the Public Works Impact Program," estimated that fully 18 percent of the areas designated for assistance in fiscal year 1973 had unemployment rates less than the national average. In 1972, 25 percent of the areas given aid were better off than the average for the Nation.

It is only natural that when communities are faced with this kind of discrepancy—which is unavoidable because of the magnitude of the task—they air their grievances in the media and in the courts. I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article on this subject which appeared on January 30 in the Washington Post, and which I think reveals only the tip of the iceberg as far as these complaints are concerned:

MUNICIPAL "HAVE-NOTS" WAGING LOSING BATTLE AGAINST AID PLAN

(By Edward Schumacher)

QUINCY, MASS.—Ever since the Economic Development Administration unveiled its experimental formula in awarding \$2 billion in public works funds to lucky communities two days before Christmas, the EDA has been weathering suits from some of the unlucky communities.

The EDA at the moment is winning, or has

won, in the six suits filed in four states to date. The most recent victory was the refusal of a federal judge in Boston Thursday to grant a restraining order requested by 13 Massachusetts cities to block the disbursement of \$52 million to 33 other communities in the state.

In complaints similar to those filed in New York, New Jersey, and Michigan, the Massachusetts cities left out of the program charge that the formula used by the EDA favors small towns where unemployment rates are technically high but the number of persons out of work is low. They say this goes against the congressional mandate to create jobs in economically hard-hit areas.

"It looked like a Utopia in the beginning and ended up as a disaster," said Quincy Mayor Joseph A. LaRaja, a leader in the suit.

"It started out as a political decision and ended as a political decision," he charged, referring first to the congressional override of President Ford's veto of the jobs bill last summer, and then to the predominantly Republican nature of many of the small towns in Massachusetts that won the public works awards.

Quincy, for instance, is an industrial city of 80,000 that suffers 8.6 per cent unemployment, or 3,560 people out of work, according to city officials. It received nothing from EDA.

The population of Upton is only about 3,500, but it has a 19 per cent unemployment rate. It received \$1.6 million.

Perhaps the most unusual case concerns the Mississippi village of Mound Bayou, population 2,400, which received \$4.9 million, or almost half of that state's total allotment. John Eden, outgoing assistant secretary of commerce and head of the EDA, said the grant was an error and that the EDA is negotiating with the town fathers to reduce the grant.

Other than that case, however, Eden said

that he is "entirely satisfied that what we have accomplished in an absolutely fair and objective system."

The formula weighs unemployment rates, number of unemployed, per capita income and other factors in ranking communities to receive grants. "Benchmarks" were added to the formula to limit the amount awarded to large cities such as Boston and to metropolitan regions.

Eden claimed that the unemployment in the communities receiving the grants averaged 12.3 per cent. The national rate for December, 1976, was 7.8 per cent.

The formula was an experimental one created on a tight time schedule. The money was appropriated by Congress Oct. 1, more than 25,000 applications were received by Dec. 9, and almost 2,000 grants were awarded Dec. 23, all of which are scheduled to begin construction by April.

The EDA opened itself to the suits by ranking the applications by how much the communities deserved the money, Eden said, putting little weight on what kind of project the money was going for.

In denying the restraining order, U.S. District Court Judge Frank J. Murray ruled that it was not warranted because the suit had little chance to succeed and because blocking the funds would cause "monumental harm" to unemployed persons, regardless of where they live.

The U.S. District Court in Grand Rapids, Mich., had granted a similar requested restraining order earlier this month, but Monday canceled the order and denied a motion for a preliminary injunction. A restraining order usually lasts a matter of days until an injunction hearing, while the preliminary injunction usually lasts until after the suit is decided.

Here and in four of the other cases, the requests for preliminary injunctions are still pending.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 3, 1977

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 3, 1977.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Moses Javis, pastor, Westside Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, we thank Thee for this day of our lives, we come this hour beseeching Thy benedictions upon our Nation and this assembly.

May Thy spirit of human sensitivity rest upon each of these representative minds. Guide them into the awareness that in the presentation of daily crises there lie the options of defeat and victory. There is the resounding challenge of the Galilean being busy bringing about the good news to the poor. We confess our faults: We have exalted wealth above humanity; our possessions and profits have been more valuable than people.

With this gratitude and confession, make out of these assembled persons statesmen of constructive wisdom shaping the policies of our Nation.

May righteousness be victorious. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TERENCE TODMAN NATIVE VIRGIN ISLANDER

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, with the greatest personal pride I bring to your attention the nomination of a native Virgin Islander to one of the highest Federal positions ever held by someone born in one of our Nation's territories.

Upon confirmation by the Senate, Terence Todman, presently our Ambassador to Costa Rica, will become Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America.

Ambassador Todman's 24 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Foreign

Service, and this most recent confidence placed in him by President Carter, serves to demonstrate the outstanding quality of his contributions to our country. He has broken down many of the barriers of prejudice and discrimination that could have hindered his effectiveness, around the world and in his own Government. This black pioneer has reaped innumerable personal honors simply because of his competence and professionalism. Ambassador Todman is a source of pride and admiration to all Virgin Islanders and on their behalf, I wish him continued success in his new position of responsibility.

I am inserting into the RECORD the January 22, 1977, editorial from the Virgin Islands Daily News in tribute to our new Assistant Secretary of State:

MAN OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

The appointment of Terence Todman as assistant secretary of state for Inter-America is something that all of Inter-American relations is—it is a significant achievement and a signal honor for a fellow Virgin Islander. However, it is also a great deal more than that, and Mr. Todman deserves congratulations on his appointment for several reasons.

Terence Todman, at 50 years of age, holds the second highest rank in the Foreign Service, that of career minister. If his appointment as assistant secretary of state is confirmed by the Senate, as it is expected to be, he will be occupying one of the highest federal government posts ever held by a Virgin Islander. At the same time, he will also have risen to one of the highest federal offices