

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE DISCOVER AMERICA INTERNATIONAL POW WOW

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Annual Discover America International Pow Wow held in St. Louis last September attracted more than 400 travel experts from some 60 foreign countries and the interest it aroused throughout the world resulted in an estimated \$100 million in travel business for the United States.

This international event was organized by DATO—Discover America Travel Organization—with the support of 288 U.S. firms which supplied "Discover America—Visit U.S.A." Travel accommodations, goods, and services to help further the growth and improvement of tourism in this country.

A highlight of the September meeting was an address by F. C. "Bud" Wiser, former president of Pan Am which I should like to include in the Record for the benefit of all Members of the House and their constituents who may be less than fully aware of the great tourism opportunities that exist within our own national borders. As chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, I believe, too, that Mr. Wiser's comments will be of great value to the Members in considering the Air Service Improvement Act of 1978 which will be brought to the floor during this session.

Address follows:

DISCOVER AMERICA INTERNATIONAL POW WOW
Thank you for the invitation to join with you today.

It seems particularly appropriate that you are meeting this year in St. Louis, the city which had leaders foresighted enough to finance a young aviator's dream of conquering the North Atlantic, alone and non-stop, just 50 years ago.

Charles Lindbergh's flight was a notable human achievement. But its ramifications were far greater than one man's courageous act. The flight of the Spirit of St. Louis captured the world's imagination. People for the first time began to recognize the possibility of development of peaceful aviation. Public support and private capital became abundantly available.

The air age was born.

The seed of mass international tourism was planted.

Today, we have gathered from all over the world to generate tourism, specifically tourism to the United States, in the ongoing effort to introduce people of the world to our land and to guarantee that our product provides what it promises. And, I think it safe to say, to see to it that we all make a little money doing so.

The Discover America Travel Organizations, with the support of the United States Travel Service, are prime vehicles for fulfilling this mission. I would like to take this occasion to congratulate Fabian Chavez

for his appointment as assistant secretary of commerce for tourism and to wish him and his associate Jeanne Westphal every success in carrying forward the work of the USTS.

The DATO Discover America International Pow Wows are the prime forum for continued stimulation of the VISIT USA program.

Pan Am, incidentally, worked closely with the Discover America International Committee in organizing and conducting the Brussels Mission to Europe in 1968 and has been an enthusiastic supporter of DATO from its inception.

Delegates at Brussels realized that organized, face-to-face communications between the suppliers of travel goods and services in the U.S. and international producers of tourism would be productive for all concerned from a business standpoint and for keeping the dialogue that had been opened going.

The first Pow Wow was held in New York in 1969, with 67 representatives from ten European countries meeting with 68 U.S. firms. The following year, Latin America was added to the network. The first world conference convened in Chicago in 1971.

Participation has increased rapidly. Bill Toohy tells me that this year he expects a total of 1,800 people to attend this ninth annual Pow Wow. They represent 60 countries and 288 firms occupying some 340 booths, along with other members of the travel community and foreign and U.S. press. Bill also reports that hundreds of millions of dollars of business have been initiated or transacted in your recent sessions compared with hundreds of thousands at the first Pow Wow.

It seems safe to conclude that the Brussels group seized upon an idea whose time had come and that operation of the Discover America International Pow Wow, with the constant cosponsorship and support of the USTS, has transformed this idea into a dynamic reality.

The Brussels Conference also set objectives that needed to be met if the United States was to realize its potential as a tourist attraction. Since then, considerable progress has been made toward achieving these goals.

The Brussels gathering identified specific concerns that Europeans had about visiting the United States—particularly concerns that tourists would not be welcome and that prices would be too high.

Since 1968, the U.S. has indeed become a more hospitable place to visit, as many of our guests have remarked, particularly on the occasion of the Bicentennial's Operation Sail.

Basically, we have finally admitted to ourselves that not everybody speaks our language and have taken steps to extend a more cordial welcome to our non-English-speaking visitors. Among the actions that come to mind are:

Multilingual college students provide language services at our major gateways;

Hotel chains have introduced language capability programs;

Multilingual signs have been installed at airports and in the national parks;

People who provide handling services have become more proficient in foreign languages; More and more tours cater to one language group, and

Travel experts who staff the toll-free Travelphone USA, a joint USTS, Travelodge and Pan Am venture, are equipped to answer, in seven languages, virtually any question a foreign visitor may have.

What has happened to prices the world over in the past nine years is no secret. However, it is encouraging to note that in an otherwise gloomy survey of the world economic scene, the International Monetary Fund recently reported that the United States is among the three nations which have done the best job of containing inflation. The other two, incidentally, are also travel-oriented countries—Germany and Japan.

The airlines have been in the forefront in the drive to restrain price increases, and the airlines have achieved this primarily through the continuing application of new technology.

Consider a few statistics. The U.S. consumer price index has risen 136 percent since 1948—U.S. airline air fares 27 percent. The consumer price index here has climbed 75 percent in the past ten years—international air fares 40 percent. The price of owning and operating an automobile has gone up 63 percent in the same period, the price of food 180 percent. In real terms, the price of scheduled airline service across the North Atlantic actually has decreased 44 percent since 1963.

Pan Am has long advocated the lowest possible economic fares, as the way to expand the market for international travel. It was Pan Am, in fact, which led an otherwise reluctant industry into transatlantic tourist fares in 1952. More recently, Pan Am has proposed budget fares for the Atlantic and supported reductions in APEX tariffs. As you know, the Civil Aeronautics Board scuttled the APEX filing for the Atlantic and directed us to up the price of the reserved-seat budget fare. We have done so and the fare was approved.

Both of these fares serve the objectives that Pan Am has been pursuing for a long time—using our scheduled services to offer the pleasure traveler low fares that simultaneously give us added revenues to hold down the level of fares for the business traveler. We shall continue to pursue these objectives.

Containment of price and development of new business has also been of concern to the U.S. domestic travel industry. Foreign visitors today have a wide variety of discounts available on domestic airlines, on Amtrak and on the bus lines.

European travel producers at Brussels stressed the need for higher commissions. The IATA airlines have since agreed to an increase in the basic point-to-point commission from seven to eight percent. Support of tour operators has also been greatly liberalized, with obviously positive results.

The efforts to attract foreign visitors, including those from Canada and Mexico, are paying off. In 1968, the U.S. hosted 12,000,000 visitors who spent \$2 billion. Last year we entertained 17,454,000 foreign visitors who spent \$5.8 billion in the U.S. and another \$1 billion for U.S.-flag carrier service. Noted travel writer and consultant William D. Patterson notes that this makes "the United States the globe's Number 1 destination in terms of \$6.8 billion earned from foreign tourism." The figures continue to climb; the USTS predicts there will be 18,600,000 foreign visitors this year, who will spend an estimated \$7.4 billion.

As is typical of all highly developed countries, U.S. citizens continue to spend more abroad than we earn from foreigners. However, last year the travel deficit narrowed to \$2.7 billion from \$3.1 billion in 1975; this was the smallest deficit since 1970.

The number of overseas visitors also continues to grow. In 1968 there were 1,800,000, and they spent \$640,000,000. Last year there were 4,500,000, a 20 percent increase over 1975. These people spent \$2.4 billion, a 30 percent increase over the previous year.

DATO and the USTS are to be congratulated on their role in this accomplishment. So is the travel agent/tour operator industry, whose impact is indicated by the fact that in 1976 travel agency sales in the U.S. alone were nearly \$15 billion. We know from our own experience the crucial role agents play in our business. This was underscored by a recent survey of Canadian vacation travel patterns. In 1976, 20 percent of the people planning trips consulted an agent, up from seven percent in 1970. Seventy-three percent of those planning an overseas trip and 83 percent of those buying a package tour took advantage of the services travel agents provide.

The USTS also deserves high marks for its efforts in promoting international tourism and in making visitors more welcome. We strongly support the USTS in its campaign to increase its budget, and we would urge that additional monies be channeled into increased advertising and promotion and into opening more offices abroad in the most promising markets.

While today's numbers are impressive, the United States is now only on the verge of establishing a mass market for tourism, particularly from abroad. I submit that now is the time for the U.S. travel industry, working through DATO, to set new objectives and develop new programs.

Various new approaches have been suggested, and I trust that they will be the subject of lively discussion here this week. Some possibilities the industry might want to consider include:

Discover America/VISIT USA weeks to bring together travel suppliers and producers could be organized in specific markets;

Travel showcases featuring travel industry exhibits that bring the product to the trade and consumer market could be developed for regions, states and cities;

The Pow Wow approach could be adopted to stimulate convention business through introducing meeting organizers to U.S. sites and facilities;

Better information systems could lead to greater attendance at conventions and trade shows and fairs in the U.S.;

Perhaps most importantly, DATO chapters could be established in other countries around the world to maintain constant VISIT USA efforts.

I have probably just scratched the surface. But let us begin to expand our thinking. We at Pan Am stand ready and eager to participate in developing new ideas and implementing new programs.

Over the years the airlines have played three major roles in the development of the tourist industry: enhancement of the quality of life, creation of jobs, and development of technology to bring fares within the reach of the average person.

The social and educational values of travel have been known, albeit dimly, perhaps since the first prehistoric man wondered what was to be found outside his own valley and climbed the hill to look. In the Book of Daniel we read, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

During the last quarter of this century, international travel will enrich life on a scale never before possible. The tourist industry is the largest quality-of-life enhancer the world has ever seen.

Major responsibilities in the development of this phenomenon has fallen on the world's airlines, for they have used technology to conquer the obstacles of distance and of price. However, while airlines make it possible for the average man and woman to travel be-

tween continents, airlines do not compel them to do so. Airlines are the method, not the motive.

Futurologist Herman Kahn recently wrote: "People seem to have an almost insatiable desire to travel; and for increasing numbers the money and time available for travel have been growing, while the facilities for traveling have become more convenient and less expensive."

T. A. Wilson, chairman of the Boeing Company, has stated: "Until recent times most of us relied on explorers, missionaries, military personnel or news media representatives to make the unfamiliar portion of our world more familiar. Air travel now provides the means for all to participate directly in the process. In effect, what Marco Polo did in 1272 A.D., thousands now do daily. Before the end of this century, the number will increase to millions."

All this activity creates jobs. The IATA member airlines employ some 840,000. But this is just the nucleus. All airlines must buy supplies ranging from paper napkins to aircraft. All airlines must rely on the travel services and support industries.

No one has ever added up worldwide totals. However, we have some indicative samples. For instance, the sales volume of U.S.-built widebodies—the 747's, DC-10's and 1011's—has amounted to \$15.5 billion to date. Of that sum, about \$9 billion represents payroll. The U.S. Department of Commerce has calculated that for each \$1 of sales of completed aircraft, \$2.19 is generated in sales for all the companies that supply its component parts.

DATO estimates that travel in the U.S. generates 3,800,000 jobs directly, with payroll of \$22 billion and an additional 2,000,000 indirectly. Employment in the travel industry over the past two decades has grown more than twice as fast as overall non-agricultural employment, and has proved remarkably recession-proof.

Travel industry jobs depend on economic air transport and economic air transport depends, in turn, on aeronautical technology and airline efficiency.

The purpose of improved aeronautical technology, in terms of airline goals, is to provide superior economic performance as well as superior technical performance. Thus, the first long-range jets offered economic performance far superior to the piston-engined airliners they replaced. In turn, the wide-body 747 provided even better economics.

When the 747 went into service in 1970, its direct operating costs were about one-third of those of the piston-engined airplanes in service 20 years earlier—and about half those of the 707. The 747 engine is about 30 percent more fuel efficient than the original 707 engine, and the 747 overall is just about three times as productive as the most efficient 707.

Figures like those explain why the rate of increase in air fares has been less than the rate of increase in the price of most goods and services. Also that relatively low rate of increase helps to explain why air travel, domestic and international, has grown so rapidly.

The world airlines as a group recently entered a new era. The petroleum crisis dealt them a grievous blow from which they have not recovered. More than ever, they need to acquire improved technology in order to offset higher costs. Short term, they need to replace obsolescent airliners with more efficient modern ones. Long term, they need to be able to acquire advanced technology that is on the shelf but not yet embodied in airliners—airliners that will be as great an improvement over the 747 as the 747 was over the 707.

Let me reemphasize that the ability to buy new technology has been a principal fac-

tor in keeping fares down. It will be a principal factor for the future. The purchase of new technology must be financed either by taxes or by airline earnings. The preferable way is earnings. The consumer of air transportation and the supplier of transportation services have a stake in air line earnings high enough to improve service and to contain fare increases.

That is tomorrow's challenge.

Today's challenge is to expand tourism to help generate earnings to meet tomorrow's needs.

That's what the Pow Wow is all about and I wish you the most successful Pow Wow yet.

I am sure that Charles Lindbergh would have applauded your activities. He was a life-long apostle of the peaceful uses of aviation to promote world commerce and understanding among all the peoples of the world. ●

NATIONAL SECURITY AND WORLD PEACE

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter—like perhaps several of my colleagues—from five former Supreme Allied Commanders of NATO. It is a very ominous and important message concerning our national security and world peace.

I am on the record voting for the removal of the embargo on arms for Turkey and, after reading this letter, I hope that my colleagues will share in this view.

I include this letter in the RECORD:
WASHINGTON, D.C.

June 1, 1978.

Hon. TED RISENHOOVER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RISENHOOVER: As former Supreme Allied Commanders of the North Atlantic Alliance, we are deeply concerned by the damaging consequences of the U.S. arms embargo on Turkey for United States and NATO security. We view with alarm the deterioration in NATO's southern flank caused by the sharp decline in Turkish military capabilities and the increasing alienation of Turkey from the United States. Should Turkey, as a result of the embargo, turn away from this country and reduce or terminate its commitment to NATO, the whole of Southeastern Europe and the Middle East would become more vulnerable to Soviet military pressure.

Turkey is vitally important to our Western collective security in that it (1) controls the passage of Soviet war vessels from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean; (2) houses large numbers of strategically important U.S. and NATO facilities, some of which are uniquely situated for collecting intelligence on Soviet military activities; (3) provides an air defense warning critical to the operation of our Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean; and (4) provides a major contribution of army forces to NATO. The continued adherence of Turkey to the West is particularly important to Greece. If Turkey were detached from NATO, Greece would be surrounded by neutral and Communist states and would be less able to deter or prevent Soviet political or military advances.

It is imperative, therefore, to stimulate a resolution of the differences between our two Eastern Mediterranean allies, Greece and Turkey, and to promote a just and humane

Cyprus settlement in a way that does not undermine U.S. and NATO security. Our need for our Western defensive alliance is now greater than ever in light of the ominous Soviet military build-up in Europe of recent years. We, therefore, strongly support the lifting of the embargo on arms for Turkey.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. GOODPASTER,
LYMAN L. LEMNITZER,
LAURIS NORSTAD,
ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY.●

**MARIO BIAGGI SPEAKS OUT FOR
RULE OF LAW IN CYPRUS**

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I and a number of my colleagues in the House are most concerned by the administration's proposal to lift the congressional arms embargo against Turkey. The actions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opposing this action was an important step but the issue is by no means resolved.

On April 16, in an impressive and impassioned demonstration some 10,000 to 15,000 Greek-Americans gathered in Lafayette Park to protest the lifting of the embargo and calling for adherence to the rule of law in Cyprus.

A featured speaker at the rally was my colleague MARIO BIAGGI from New York, one of the staunchest supporters of the arms embargo and responsible for the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 which provided the first U.S. commitment of funds for rehabilitation aid to Cyprus. His statement provides a clear perspective of the issues involved and deserves the close attention of my colleagues.

Mr. BIAGGI's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARIO BIAGGI—
APRIL 16, 1978

It was almost four years ago when Turkey, in an act of immoral and illegal aggression invaded Cyprus. To this day Turkey continues to occupy more than 40 percent of Cyprus and control a much higher percentage of its key industries. Three years ago, the United States Congress in response to these ruthless actions voted to impose an embargo on further U.S. military arms and assistance to Turkey for it was some of this aid which was used to invade Cyprus. I was proud to have been one of the main advocates of the legislation and felt it demonstrated to the world the Congress' belief in the rule of law.

This Administration has proposed a lifting of the arms embargo due to fear that Turkey will make good on her threat to close all U.S. military bases. Yet the fact is the illegality and immorality which prompted the arms embargo has not diminished. Turkey continues to illegally control a sizable portion of Cyprus. Human rights violations are continuing—thousands of Greek Cypriots remain refugees on their home land living lives of despair—some 2000 Greek Cypriots remain missing having been that way since the invasion. Yet the United States, the new champion of human rights has chosen to overlook this situation and instead take an action which will

have the effect of sanctioning the status quo on Cyprus.

The question of human rights on Cyprus is of deep concern to me. A recent communication to the United Nations by Mr. Joseph J. Stephanides, Charge d'Affairs of the Permanent Mission of Cyprus to the United Nations portrayed graphically the extent to which human rights of violations exist in Cyprus. Mr. Stephanides stated "the living conditions of the enclaved Greek Cypriot inhabitants in the areas of the Republic under Turkey's military occupation have recently become unbearable as a result of unthinkable inhuman practices which they systematically employ . . . These are medieval conditions of horror, torture and continuous harassment." Mr. Stephanides appealed to the world community when he states, "There can hardly be any justification for inaction and apathy of the face of the impartially documented and internationally verified gross violations of fundamental human rights by the Turkish arm of occupation against the people of Cyprus as a whole."

Turkey, if in good faith could have sought a resolution of this unlawful occupation and its consequences. They have had four years to demonstrate their good faith. In the continuing absence of such a commitment and the continuing presence of human rights violations it is intolerable that this Administration would even suggest a change in the embargo.

To lift the embargo at this time would thwart the will of the people as expressed by the Congress. It would endanger our favorable relations with the people of Cyprus and Greece. Can we not expect their friendship to turn to hostility because of our abandonment and betrayal?

America's credibility is at stake. We must insist that Turkey show its good faith by negotiating a lasting peace on Cyprus including a reunification for those thousands of Greek Cypriots who are refugees on their own land and a full accounting of all missing Greek Cypriots.

The role America plays with respect to Cyprus will be a barometer which other nations will use to gauge the integrity and viability of our foreign policy. Our respect for the rule of law must not waiver. Our insistence of respect for human rights cannot be compromised. Our pursuit of a lasting and just peace on Cyprus must continue.●

JOYCE HARRISON PARK

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to include in the RECORD the following poem written by Ms. Marie Cunningham Brown, an outstanding member of the staff of the House Select Committee on Aging, in which she expressed her pride in the successful struggle of her sister, Ms. Joyce Harrison Park, to become the first professional member of her family. Ms. Park will graduate on Friday, June 2, 1978, from the School of Dentistry of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery of the University of Maryland at Baltimore. I believe all who read this RECORD will be warmed by the pride and love expressed in this poem:

JOYCE HARRISON PARK

(By Marie Cunningham Brown)

The happiness of the moment is evident through the radiance of your smile.

The pride we feel is evident, too, we want the moment to last a while. Memories of long ago begin to cross my mind. I wondered then, what would be for you with the passage of years and time. For you were only two when Mama died and couldn't understand why we cried as we held you close to us.

We knew the years ahead would be difficult and hard to tread. Our words were all that we had to give you. I believe you remembered most of what we said.

We promised you our love and encouraged you to live your life to the fullest.

You set a goal for your life, you became a wonderful mother and loving wife.

You set a higher goal for yourself and how you did persist.

You graduated from college on your own and have now become a dentist!

And here we are again holding you close to us and sharing your moment of triumph.

Should you see a tear or two today, they are but a symbol of the dreams we all shared for your success. Know that it means as much to us as it does to you!

Your brother, Jesse and sisters, Marietta, Olivia, Rosa, Bertha, Henrietta and Marie.

And of course Catherine and Geraldine, in memory.●

**FEDERAL HANDGUN LAWS AND
STRICTER ENFORCEMENT CAN
REDUCE CRIME**

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been endorsing stronger, more effective Federal gun laws aimed at deterring the criminal misuse of handguns.

An editorial which appeared in the May 27 edition of the Chicago Tribune emphasizes the need for such laws by citing statistics on the number of homicides that involved handguns during 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action is now. The Congress must stop backing down from enacting effective handgun legislation. The public has demonstrated time and time again that it would support stronger gun laws and stricter enforcement of our current laws. One of President Carter's campaign promises was to enact this type of legislation. Almost 2 years have passed since we heard those promises.

Mr. Speaker, I hope each and every Member of this body will read the attached article from the Tribune. The points it makes deserve our consideration and prompt action. The article follows:

HOMICIDE BY HANDGUN

Of the 823 murders in Chicago in 1977, 444 involved handguns. Police Supt. James O'Grady drew the natural inference—"Without question the best method of curtailing senseless killings and maimings both of

juveniles and adults is to minimize the ready availability of handguns."

True, people kill people. And true, people can be—and are—killed with a variety of instruments other than handguns. People can be killed with axes and ice picks—each used once in a 1977 Chicago killing. They can be killed with scissors and screwdrivers—each used twice in Chicago in 1977. But only handguns were used as many as 444 times.

More than half the murders [460] arose out of quarrels that escalated to a homicidal extreme. On the basis of combined statistics, the "typical" murder would be one committed with a handgun on a Saturday in September, between 1 and 4 a.m., by a black male aged 16. The police district with the fewest murders was the Central District, including the Loop.

Nearly everyone is against murder, but doing something about handguns remains controversial. In recent testimony before a House subcommittee, a spokesman for the National Rifle Association said, "Half the households in the United States presently own firearms." Obviously a highly popular response to the handgun menace is to go out and buy a handgun.

Chicago Judge Allen F. Rosin put it this way: "It's not only the bad people who carry guns, but the good people, too. The good people are afraid of the bad people, so they carry guns. That's the way it is on our streets nowadays."

This spring a Chicago alderman proposed an ordinance calling for a 10-day jail term for any unauthorized person found carrying a gun. The idea was endorsed by John Townsend, deputy chief of homicide and robbery detectives, and Joseph DiLeonardi, homicide commander. But the alderman sponsoring the proposal was lonely independent Ald. Martin J. Oberman [43d].

By now it should be obvious that only national legislation can possibly provide effective gun control.

Opinion polls show strong majorities in favor of national laws controlling the purchase of handguns. But the National Rifle Association continues to intimidate Congress. President Carter wants to outlaw Saturday-night specials, but hesitates to attempt anything before the next elections.

We can expect handguns to continue to mow down Americans at a rate of 9,000 a year—including hundreds in Chicago. This will go on and on until Congress and the President muster the resolution [if they ever do] "to minimize the ready availability of handguns," to quote Supt. O'Grady again. ●

ALASKAN LANDS BILL

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, due to pressing business in my congressional district, I was absent on Friday, May 19 when the House of Representatives concluded consideration of H.R. 39, the Alaskan lands bill. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 338, an amendment to continue mineral assessment provisions, "nay" on rollcall No. 339 to recommit the bill to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and "yea" on rollcall No. 340, final passage of the bill. ●

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress, I have consistently supported Federal minimum wage legislation. I have also opposed most exemptions to these laws.

However, recent events have forced me—and, I believe, many of my colleagues—to reexamine our national minimum wage legislation in light of its effects on those whom the law is designed to enhance and upgrade.

Specifically to be reexamined is whether the appalling 16.9 percent unemployment rate for teenagers and the shocking 35.3 percent unemployment rate for black teens demand a move to a lower minimum wage for youth to encourage hiring among young people.

Raising the minimum wage also hits small businesses—especially of the mom-and-pop variety—terribly hard.

The following Washington Post article by William Raspberry points out our efforts to do good by raising the minimum wages might be self-defeating.

Indeed, as hard as it may be to accept, Mr. Speaker, our efforts to do good by periodically increasing the minimum wage might be backfiring on us.

RAISING WAGES—AND THE JOBLESS RATE

(By William Raspberry)

The D.C. City Council is considering legislation to put William and Willie Mae Clark out of business.

That's not what council members have in mind, of course. They are concerned about local residents who are struggling to live on \$2.75 an hour—\$110 for a full 40-hour week. They want to raise the local minimum wage to \$3.25, 60 cents higher than the present federal minimum.

Viewed from the side of the struggling worker, the proposed increase seems impeccably humanitarian. William and Willie Mae Clark represent the other side of the picture. They are owners and operators of the Sparkle Car Wash at 933 Florida Ave. NW, which they acquired—"for too much money"—after the 1968 riots. They are afraid to death that the minimum-wage increase will be approved.

"It would just about put us out of business," Mrs. Clark said the other day. "And not just us. A lot of blacks trying to make it in business would be hurt by this."

The Clarks have figured their break-even point at an average of three cars per hour per attendant. "That's what it takes, at \$3 per car, to cover our overhead: mortgage, gas, electricity, water. The water bill alone has tripled in the 10 years we've been here, even though we're not using any more water."

If the minimum wage goes up, so does the overhead. Mr. Clark isn't sure the business can stand it. "There's only so much you can charge for washing a car before people say, 'The hell with it,'" she said.

One way of dealing with the increased minimum wage would be to lay off some people. But the Clarks' non-automated carwash requires a minimum of seven attendants.

Another way is to increase business, but if they knew how to do that they would have done it already.

The third way is to install automatic, exterior-only equipment. "If we could do that,

we could operate the place with just me and my husband and maybe one or two other people. But being small and black, we can't get the financing to go automatic."

Even if they could, it would defeat the purpose of the City Council proposal. Instead of seven or nine employees making \$2.75 an hour, they'd have one or two making \$3.25. As it is, they could wind up with zero employees making zilch.

The Clarks represent an aspect of minimum-wage legislation that is frequently overlooked. The tendency is to look at those working now earning substandard wages and to think how much better off they would be if they all got raises. Some of those workers would, in fact, be better off. But some untold number would be out of work.

(Astonishingly, the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics has no data on the number of workers who lose their jobs as the result of increases in the minimum wage.)

Some businesses—groceries, gas stations and larger restaurants, for instance—are able to absorb minimum-wage boosts simply by raising their prices. Others, including carwashes, laundries and shoe-repair shops are likely to discover that there are limits to what the traffic will bear. At some point, you decide to wash your own car, or buy wash 'n' wear shirts, or bargain-basement, throw-away shoes.

The Clarks are a reminder of something else as well. Those who advocate increases in the minimum wage tend to think of fat-cat capitalists exploiting poor workers whom they employ at slave wages. There's no doubt that a lot of employers are paying their people less than they deserve and less than the employer can afford.

But not all of them. "They say low-income people need more money," Mrs. Clark said. "I would agree with that—if they were worth more."

"We'd like some more money, too. I pay myself less than the minimum wage—\$70 a week. My husband, who works another job, draws \$110 every two weeks. We drive a 1971 automobile."

The Clarks, in brief, are exploiting no one. It is admirable, in these days when we all seem to be looking for ways to fatten our own bank accounts, that the council is paying some attention to those who work at poverty wages.

This is merely a reminder that it might be useful to pay some attention to Sparkle Car Wash, to all those automated carwashes that employ two people, to the laundries that are going out of business—and to the thousands of teen-agers who cannot find work because the law says they have to be paid more than the employers think they are worth—before they raise the minimum wage. ●

FOOD AID TO LAOS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the State Department's announcement that it will provide 10,000 tons of food aid—mostly rice—to Laos.

The food situation in Laos has been serious since the end of last year. Drought and accompanying famine have been widespread. The need for emergency food aid has been clear for some time, and the 10,000 tons to be provided by the United States will help alleviate a potential catastrophe in Laos.

Whatever we may think of the current regime in Laos—and I regret its communist nature—we should be proud of the United States for its humanitarian decision to provide emergency food relief.

As one who urged the State Department to decide in favor of food aid to Laos, I would like to mention the critical role played by my colleagues, Representatives PETE McCLOSKEY and SONNY MONTGOMERY and Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY. The people of the United States and the people of Laos can be thankful for these normally concerned Members of Congress. ●

AFRICAN ULCER

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 17, 1978 Indianapolis Star is thoughtful and deserving consideration by every Member of Congress:

AFRICAN ULCER

Renewed warfare in Zaire's Shaba province—formerly Katanga province—reminds of the long shadow inevitably cast by unwise foreign policy long held by the United States and other western nations.

Cuban-led Katangese rebels from Angola, it's reported, have staged another invasion of Zaire's southernmost, mineral-rich region which borders on Angola. AZAP, Zaire's government-controlled news agency, says Zairian dictator Mobutu Sese Seko has convened his "crisis staff" and that the U.S., France, Belgium, Communist China and Morocco have been alerted "so that these countries would help Zaire to deal with the grave situation," as they did in last year's so-called "80-day war."

Commenting on the background of last year's upheaval, we pointed out that Katanga was forced to become part of Zaire—formerly the Belgian Congo—at the time that country gained independence in the early 1960s. Katanga, we noted, "had little ethnic connection with the Congo as a whole (merely a chunk of African territory carved out for his own gain a century earlier by Belgium's King Leopold II) and when independence finally dawned it wanted real independence—of its own." It failed.

Considered "essential" to Zaire's viability, it was bombed and blasted into submission by United Nations decree. Blindly obedient to the inadequately thought-out policy of self-determination of nations earlier proclaimed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the U.S. government under President John F. Kennedy supplied the aircraft and munitions for the brutal operation.

But this African ulcer will not heal. Inflamed by blind adherence to a well-meaning policy proclaiming self-determination of nations but failing to define what nations, the Katangese unrest keeps boiling, boiling.

And—irony of ironies—while the Katangese were originally pro-western and the original Zaire government under Patrice Lumumba was clearly pro-communist, now the situation is reversed. Mobutu, though a typical African tyrant, is at least nominally pro-western. But the Katangese insurgents in desperation have grasped the tempting hand extended by Angola, backed by the Soviet Union and its Cuban mercenaries.

Last year France airlifted Moroccan troops

to help dictator Mobutu keep under his thumb an African territory Zaire had no good right to own in the first place—unless by the discredited decree of long-dead, exploiter-supreme Leopold II. The U.S. and other countries provided monetary support.

So these questions must remain: How long will this foolishly implanted African malady continue to plague world peace? How long must the American people endure shallow, ill-conceived U.S. foreign "policy" which means well but fails to perceive its peace-shattering shortcomings? ●

WELFARE REFORM

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, welfare reform remains one of the toughest challenges to this Congress. Comprehensive welfare plans from the White House and the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Welfare carry price tags in excess of \$20 billion. Because that is a cost that Congress is not willing to pay, many writers and pundits have pronounced welfare reform dead this year.

Welfare reform is not dead this year.

Within the approaches proposed in the House and the Senate, we have the foundation for a major welfare plan—at a reasonable cost—that can be passed this year.

To that end, I would recommend the lead editorial in the New York Times of May 23, 1978:

REDEEMING THE WELFARE PLEDGE

President Carter fulfilled a campaign pledge last year when he submitted a sweeping welfare reform proposal to Congress. But key Democrats, like House Ways and Means Chairman Ullman and Senate Finance Chairman Long, balked at the nearly \$20 billion price tag and for all practical purposes declared the controversial plan dead on arrival. Even as Representative Corman's special subcommittee labored conscientiously on the original proposal, welfare reform was quietly stricken from Washington's legislative priority list.

Still, several Congressmen, notably Representative Ullman and Republican Senators Baker and Bellmon, persevered to devise more modest programs. All pretense of grandiose reform has vanished now, but a bill incorporating four critical ingredients of reform stands a chance—if only Congress and the Administration can overcome the partisanship that impedes compromise on the competing Democratic and Republican plans.

Minimum national benefit levels. Whatever new welfare law Congress passes, it should establish uniform benefit levels. Benefits now vary dramatically, from a high of \$6132 for a family of four in New York City to a low of \$2556 in Mississippi. The Ullman formula would raise the national minimum to \$4200, an increase over present levels in 11 states.

Welfare fathers. Any new welfare plan should also extend coverage nationally to families headed by unemployed fathers, eliminating pressure that drives families apart. At present, nearly half the states refuse such coverage. Both the Ullman and Baker-Bellmon bills would require it of all states, although to limit such coverage to 17 weeks a year, as the Ullman bill does, seems harsh.

Job creation. If the cycle of welfare dependency and poverty is ever to be broken, welfare recipients must be brought into the world of work. They need training in marketable skills and jobs that offer reasonable wages and hope for the future. Baker-Bellmon is the more appealing on this score. It would provide public service jobs under CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act), the primary Federal job program for the poor. The Ullman plan would set a minimum-wage ceiling for such jobs; Baker-Bellmon would pay prevailing public service wages, thus avoiding the creation of another level of workers beneath the already stigmatized CETA work force. More important, it would virtually guarantee a job to at least one parent in every two parent family.

Fiscal relief. Lastly, Washington must help the cities and states. Poverty—and migration of the poor—is a national problem, attributable largely to forces beyond local control. Yet the costs are now shared by all levels of government. For example, New York City pays 25 percent—over \$400 million next fiscal year—of the aid to families with children. Mayors and governors will find Baker-Bellmon the more generous of the two measures in providing added fiscal relief.

Like the larger original Carter plan, both bills address the most glaring deficiencies of the current welfare system. Their differences seem reconcilable. And the President, who deserves credit for trying to straighten out the "welfare mess," can help by pushing welfare higher on his legislative agenda. In the end, substance will largely be dictated by cost. Even within the \$7 to \$9 billion ceiling on new expenditures suggested by Representative Ullman, Congress can fashion a sound welfare package that responds to pressing human needs. Is that too much to expect of a White House and Congress controlled by Democrats, self-proclaimed champions of the poor?

THE DEFENSE OF THE WEST

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, before the outbreak of World War II, Sir Winston Churchill warned his countrymen of the impending dangers posed by the growth of Nazi Germany's military power. But his pleadings were to no avail. His speeches were even censored by the British Broadcasting Co. in 1936 as being too alarmist. Opposition to the diabolical schemes of Hitler and his ministers of death came too late, and millions of innocents paid the ultimate price for the follies of their complacent political leaders.

In the past 10 years we have witnessed yet another peacetime military buildup of unprecedented proportions, certainly unprecedented since Hitler prepared his war machine for the conquest of Europe. In virtually every field of modern weaponry, the Soviet Union has made impressive gains. It was recently reported in the prestigious technical journal, Aviation Week and Space Technology, that Soviet tests of heavy SS-18 and SS-19 ICBMs surpassed the most pessimistic projections of Western defense analysts. In six different tests of these new Soviet heavy missiles, at least 50 percent of them were able to strike targets within a radius of

600 feet. Needless to say, the Carter administration failed once again properly to gage the degree of Soviet progress in improving their missile accuracies. No longer can the United States take comfort in the prevalent view that the West enjoys an uncontested technological superiority.

Mr. Speaker, once again the peace and security of the West is threatened by the vast demonic energies of a ruthless totalitarian power. In Europe, along the front lines of Western defense, there exists an imbalance of conventional forces favoring the Communist bloc by a margin of roughly 2 to 1.

Perhaps it is fitting that another Churchill should once again warn us of the impending danger. In his timely article, "The Defense of the West," Winston Churchill II outlines the need for greater cooperation among Western allies. He fears a new arms agreement with the Soviets that will result in lopsided advantages for the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Churchill's wise and timely counsel to my colleagues:

THE DEFENSE OF THE WEST
(By Winston S. Churchill II)

For more than 30 years the peoples of Europe—unique among the generations of the 20th century—have enjoyed the inestimable blessings of peace. Out of the ashes and devastation of two World Wars a new Europe has been built—a Europe in which the living standard of the average family far exceeds anything dreamed of only a few years ago and which has achieved for its peoples unprecedented social and technological advances.

The peoples of the Western democracies fought the Second World War with, above all, two goals in mind: the maintenance or restoration of their countries' freedom and the establishment of a lasting peace. There was a widespread recognition that mistakes were made in 1919 which should not be repeated in 1945; principal among these had been the oppression of the vanquished—summed up in Lloyd George's phrase: "We will squeeze the German lemon until the pips squeak"—and the failure to accept the right of peoples to self-determination. Thus, when the United Nations was established in 1946, it was founded on the principles of self-determination and respect for human rights and had as its aim the maintenance of peace through the restraint of aggression by a worldwide system of collective security.

When the last survivors of the Nazi concentration camps were liberated, there was a general assumption in the West, whose peoples had endured, suffered and sacrificed so much, that they had won freedom, not for themselves alone, but for all mankind. Alas, it was not to be. In the moment of triumph, the wartime alliance was betrayed. The Soviet Red Army which occupied half of Europe, coming ostensibly as "Liberators" from the Nazi scourge, came in fact as a force of invasion and occupation. A generation and a half after the end of the War, more than 200 million people of Eastern Europe continue to be denied both basic human rights as individuals and self-determination as nations. For many, for example the Czechoslovaks, seven years of Nazi occupation has been followed by more than thirty years of Soviet occupation. Today, in Czechoslovakia alone, there are no fewer than five Soviet divisions with more troops and tanks than Britain's entire Rhine army—they are not there as a defensive force, but as an army of occupation. In each of these countries, we

see long traditions of nationhood and independence submerged under the oppressive rule of totalitarian dictatorship and the police state.

THE GROWING SOVIET CHALLENGE

Today a new challenge presents itself to the Western democracies, a challenge which, for the first time in a generation, seriously calls in question the prospects for stability in Europe and for world peace. Not content with denying human rights to their own peoples and independence to the nations of Eastern Europe, the narrow political clique yielding power in the Kremlin is in danger of disturbing the delicate equilibrium of forces which has been the foundation of world peace for more than a generation. Once again we see a single nation, ruled by totalitarian dictatorship and motivated by an unconcealed determination to dominate the world, building up a war-machine far beyond any requirement of self-defense or the deterrence of war. Whether the Soviet leadership has embarked on this policy of arms-escalation for the purpose of furthering aggressive military designs or of providing a strong power-base from which to wield decisive diplomatic pressure and military blackmail, is impossible to know. To argue the point is irrelevant for, whatever the intentions of the Soviet leadership today, they can change over a weekend. What is indisputable is that this buildup, together with the political designs that are behind it, represents a challenge which the Western democracies will ignore at their peril. Our democratic society is being put to the test—at the end of the day are we to be found wanting? The brutal challenge that confronts us inevitably, and rightly, leads us to re-examine the values on which our society is founded. Are those values still valid today? If so, are they worth defending? And, if we conclude that they are, what are we prepared to sacrifice to defend them? Are we prepared to spend as much on defense (£110.64 or \$220 per capita in 1976), as for example, we spend on alcohol and tobacco (£162.46 or \$324)? Are we, if need be, prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice and lay down our lives in defense of freedom, as two generations have so selflessly done before us?

The Soviet Union's challenge to the West is threefold: a growing military threat at both strategic and conventional levels; a military and economic assault against the Third World as evidenced by recent Soviet involvement, direct and through third parties, in Africa; and a campaign of political subversion designed to undermine the Western democracies from within—the case of Portugal being merely the most flagrant so far.

THE SOVIET BID FOR SUPREMACY

While engaging the West for much of the 1970's in a diplomatic offensive known as "detente," with the aim of persuading the Western democracies to lower their guard—a ploy in which they have been remarkably successful—the Soviet leadership simultaneously launched an all-out bid to achieve military supremacy over the West.

The NATO allies have long drawn comfort from the fact that, though they are outnumbered by the Soviets in the primary measures of military power—tanks, artillery, maneuver battalions, armored personnel carriers, combat aircraft, and so forth—NATO holds a significant "qualitative" advantage in its weapons, particularly nuclear and advanced conventional weapons in the same way that the Victorian empire-builders fighting superior numbers of Africans and Indians, took heart from the fact, immortalized by Belloc, that "We have the Maxim gun, and they have not!"

The days of effortless supremacy for the

West are now gone. By a supreme effort, involving the diversion of vast economic and technological resources, the Soviets have taken the SALT I Agreement of May 1972 as the opportunity to catch up with the United States and achieve parity or "rough equivalence" in nuclear strike-power.

The Soviets now enjoy the psychological strength of no longer being the underdog in the nuclear race and, by the same token, the United States, having lost its former clear advantage, may feel more wary of being involved in any future confrontation with the Soviets. Meanwhile in Europe the strengthening of Soviet conventional forces—more than one million Soviet soldiers with no fewer than 25,000 tanks now face Western Europe—has given the Soviet Union the capability of a "standing start" attack, as was so dramatically achieved in Egypt and Syria against Israel on October 6, 1973. The Western allies, like Israel, base their defensive strategy on the mobilization of reservists and the deployment of reinforcements, but the recent development in Soviet strike capability means, according to the top military authorities in NATO, that the Alliance can now be sure of no more than 72 hours warning—rather than the 30 days warning or tension period previously relied upon.

Most worrying of all are the current trends in Soviet production. Soviet armaments factories are churning out 3,000/4,000 T-64 tanks, 1,800 combat aircraft and 250 nuclear missiles a year—out-building Britain's entire inventory every three months. Neither the restraint of arms-production shown by the West nor the mood of "detente" has in any way been reflected in an abatement in the arms-escalation policies of the Soviet Union.

Thus, it must be the aim of the Western democracies to secure a serious and binding arms-control agreement with the Soviets. However, with the exception of an agreement not to deploy more than one anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, little has been achieved in the SALT negotiations, and nothing at all in the talks on Mutual Balance Force Reductions (MBFR).

In the absence of a satisfactory SALT or MBFR agreement, the NATO allies will have no choice but to make a seriously increased effort to strengthen their defenses, for only in this way can it be brought home to the Soviet leadership that they are wasting their time—not to say their peoples' resources—through their arms-escalating policies and that they had best revert to the previous policies of peaceful co-existence that prevailed under Khrushchev. If they do not, the nations of the Western Alliance will find themselves on the downward path they have trodden with such disastrous results already once this century, a path on which the political options open to them will become more and more restricted until they reach the point of no return.

EUROPE MUST STRENGTHEN ITSELF

For too long the nations of Western Europe have taken a free ride off the United States and have neglected their own defenses. If some 300 million of the most prosperous and technologically capable people of the world are not prepared to make such modest sacrifices as are required to maintain their freedom, they will not long remain free, nor will they deserve to. Britain can play, if she so chooses, a key part in strengthening the cohesion and unity of Western Europe and can, by giving a good example to our European partners, strengthen Europe's defenses so as to ensure that the deterrent is seen to be valid by those who may contemplate either war or military blackmail.

If we ignore the warnings, if we fail to confront the harsh realities that are before us, there is a danger that we will see peace, which we have taken so much for granted,

slipping from our grasp. All too frequently it has been glibly asserted by politicians that the facts cannot be put before the people as they would be unpopular. I venture to believe that the overwhelming majority of the British people, when confronted with the facts, have enough common sense and moral fiber to recognize that there is, in the last resort, nothing more important to them than to continue to be able to live their lives in peace and in freedom. Only by arousing our people to the new dangers that confront them can we hope to turn the world away from the disaster course on which it is set. If we can achieve this, there can be no doubt that the strengths and values of the free society will prove more enduring than the ideologies of the totalitarian police states. Although these despotisms give the appearance of being all-powerful, they are in reality rotten to the core and they will ultimately be overthrown by their own people demanding liberation—provided only that the Western democracies are able to keep the torch of freedom burning brightly.

(NOTE.—The above article was revised for *Policy Review* from a chapter in the forthcoming anthology, *In Defense of Freedom*, edited by Kenneth Watkins and published by Cassell and Co., London.) ●

THE LATEST PORK BARREL:
H.R. 10929

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during my years of public service, the formulation of budgets has always been of particular interest to me. While a member of the Michigan State Senate, I served on the appropriations committee, which provided me with firsthand knowledge of the budgetary process and its many intricacies. Based on this experience and knowledge, I am a very firm supporter of efficient, sensible budgets—and am outraged when attempts are made to inflate budgets, especially with “pork-barrel” projects. This type of senseless spending only serves to weaken our monetary system by adding to the spiral of rising costs.

Therefore, I was most disturbed by the actions of the House with regard to H.R. 10929, the Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act of 1979. As a former military officer, I strongly support a strong, solid national defense. I believe that America must remain first in defense if we are to maintain our position of world leadership. However, I become very distressed when I see this Congress passing authorization bills which are inflated with pork-barrel projects—especially in the area of defense. I think that there is little doubt in anyone's mind that H.R. 10929 is our latest pork barrel.

Of particular concern to me is the committee's attempt to provide DOD assistance to the Lake Placid Olympic Organizing Committee. The Department of Defense did participate in the 1960 Winter Olympics at Squaw Valley, but it did so at a very low level. But what is more important, is that the 1960 participation by DOD was embodied in separate legis-

lation on which hearings were held, and the funding provided to support these activities was approved through the normal appropriations process. The 1960 participation was limited to services uniquely within the competence of the DOD” and were not intended “as a replacement for services available from civilian sources.”

But today, we find support for the Olympics in our Defense Department authorization, with virtually open-ended services available. I support the Olympics wholeheartedly, but I state unequivocally that this type of provision does not belong in a defense authorization bill. It is really the worst type of pork-barrel, as the provision virtually hands a blank check to the Olympic Organizing Committee.

Therefore, I was very disappointed to see Congresswoman SCHROEDER's amendment to rectify this provision go down to defeat in a voice vote. I can only wonder how long this type of pork-barrel will continue until the American public cries “enough.”

In a larger sense, I think the Congress is failing in its duty to work toward a balanced budget. H.R. 10929 was reported out of the Armed Services Committee a full \$2,423,308,000 over the President's budget request. How can we, as representatives of the people, talk about reducing inflation and lowering taxes when we continue to approve such inflationary bills?

I think it is high time that we put some credence into our rhetoric. I was one of the 67 Members of Congress who voted against H.R. 10929. I would hope that in the future more Members will take a closer look at our seemingly mindless authorizing habits and begin to heed the cry of the American public to hold the line on unnecessary spending. ●

MIAMI EDUCATOR HONORED

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that an outstanding educator in my area has been honored by the publication the Migrant Educator as one of the outstanding educators serving the children of migrant workers.

I would like to share with our colleagues something of the background and achievements of this former migrant child who is now giving so freely of herself to help other children of migrant families.

Dr. Billie Clare Davis is the director of the high school equivalency program, University of Miami. A former migrant who grew up in the agricultural migrant stream, Dr. Davis has spent a number of years as a freelance writer, lecturer, and consultant in areas of education, curriculum, and social problems as related to migrants, multiethnic, Spanish-speaking, and disadvantaged children and youth.

Dr. Davis is best known for her autobiographical story, “I Was a Hobo Kid,” which relates experiences of a migrant child. The story originally appeared in *Saturday Evening Post* and was later featured in numerous other anthologies. This story was also filmed by the National Education Association under the title “A Desk for Billie.”

Because of her work in education, Dr. Davis has been the recipient of various awards, among them one for Meritorious Service to the Field of Education, by the Missouri Education Association; Outstanding Achievement, by the Florida Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and Distinguished Alumni Award, from Drury College.

From July 1968 to the present, Dr. Davis has been associated with the University of Miami high school equivalency program. She first served as a resource teacher in staff development, then as instructor in social studies and language arts; Curriculum Coordinator for 1 program year, associate director during the 2 program years ending in 1973, and, finally, director since November 1973.

The letter and article follows:

D. A. LEWIS ASSOCIATES, INC.,

February 2, 1978.

HON. CLAUDE D. PEPPER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER: Dr. Billie Clare Davis, Director of the High School Equivalency Program at the University of Miami, was recognized as Educator of the Month in a recent issue of our newsletter. A copy of the article is furnished for your information.

The Migrant Educator is a monthly news publication read in more than 40 States by those concerned with the education of children who migrate with parents seeking employment in agriculture and fishing. The main objectives of the newsletter are to serve as a channel for disseminating news and useful information, encourage interstate cooperative efforts, and stimulate professionalization and program pride among migrant educators.

I regret the delay in bringing this to your attention. We are now instituting a procedure for regularly informing members of Congress of these awards. It has been our experience that, when so informed, the Congressman was pleased to learn of national recognition given to one of his constituents, and often further honored the recipient by sending a congratulatory letter.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. HUSS,

Editor.

[From the Migrant Educator, July 1977]

EDUCATOR OF THE MONTH—DR. BILLIE CLARE DAVIS

This month's Educator of the Month, Dr. Billie Davis, is the Director of the High School Equivalency Program, University of Miami. A former migrant who grew up in the agricultural migrant stream, Dr. Davis has spent a number of years as a free-lance writer, lecturer, and consultant in areas of education, curriculum, and social problems as related to migrants, multi-ethnic, Spanish-speaking, and disadvantaged children and youth.

Dr. Davis is best known for her autobiographical story, “I was a Hobo Kid,” which relates experiences of a migrant child. The story originally appeared in *Saturday Evening Post* and was later featured in numerous other anthologies. This story was also

filmed by the National Education Association under the title *A Desk for Billie*.

Because of her work in education, Dr. Davis has been the recipient of various awards, among them one for "Meritorious Service to the Field of Education," by the Missouri Education Association; "Outstanding Achievement," by the Florida Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and "Distinguished Alumni Award," from Drury College.

From July 1968 to the present, Dr. Davis has been associated with the University of Miami High School Equivalency Program. She first served as a resource teacher in staff development, then as instructor in Social Studies and Language Arts; Curriculum Co-ordinator for one program year, Associate Director during the two program years ending in 1973, and, finally, Director since November 1973. ●

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS DEPRIVE TEENAGERS OF JOBS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, last October I expressed concern over the adverse effects which minimum wage increases have on our Nation's youth.

Many businesses—faced with paying higher wages for services they normally provide through the hiring of youth or other low-pay, unskilled workers—choose to discontinue those services or hire workers with better skills.

According to an article by Richard Strout in the May 12 edition of the *Christian Science Monitor*, my fears appear to be well founded. Unemployment among teenagers—especially minority teenagers—has risen since the minimum wage increased this past January.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to have this happen. Many of these teenagers seek part-time employment to help support their families, others to pay for their college tuition. It would seem to me that establishing a youth wage differential would be beneficial both to the teenagers and to those employers of unskilled labor who thus are able to avoid raising prices for services provided to consumers. At the same time, I do not feel it would have any adverse effects on the job market for skilled workers. The editorial follows:

JOBLESS TEEN-AGERS AND THE HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE

(By Richard L. Strout)

I am beginning to think that I have been wrong all these years on the minimum wage. It has been accepted dogma of most economic histories that minimum wages are the appropriate way to protect low income workers; the idea goes far back to steel workers' strikes in President Harding's administration. They worked seven-day weeks and 10-hour days, and once a fortnight a 24-hour shift. Pay was low. The eight-hour day had the support of President Harding—one of the few social reforms. I believe, that he ever vigorously backed. Along with it came the minimum wage. The AFL-CIO is all out for the minimum wage and the Carter administration has just raised the federal minimum to balance off inflation.

The time has come, I think, to take another look. Rep. Paul Simon, a liberal Demo-

crat from Illinois, is troubled by the matter as are many others. Yes, a minimum wage by all means, to make sure that low pay workers get a floor under their income. But how about the unemployed, unskilled youths who can't get jobs because the minimum wage is more than they're worth? There are hundreds of thousands of them.

Department of Labor statistics on youth unemployment show teen-age unemployment at 17.3 percent in March—a point and a half higher than last December. The minimum wage was increased last January and teen-age unemployment rose, too. Unemployment for black teen-age workers is currently at an incredible 39 percent. It is up a point since the new minimum wage act. In fact overall unemployment of all workers has fallen in the same period, down from 6.4 percent to 6.2 percent; every category of workers listed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics has shown improvement but one—the teen-agers that the minimum wage was supposed to aid.

The minimum wage was increased last January from \$2.30 an hour to \$2.65, or 15 percent. Organized labor hailed it. Alas, the subsequent loss of teen-age jobs just about canceled out, the increase in jobs due to the government's own employment programs.

Debate over this has gone on a long time. In 1970 the Labor Department documented the matter. It reported, "There is some basis for the inference that the effect of the federal manpower programs and the federal minimum wage have tended to offset each other." A later paper by the Congressional Research Service called this result "ironic and even pathetic." Indeed it is. Mr. Simon quotes the director of the Congressional Budget Office as testifying recently: "Increases in the minimum wage . . . can diminish employment opportunities for less skilled workers, particularly teen-agers."

Black teen-agers hanging about in American slums without the discipline of jobs are tragic and menacing. Over half of them now are unemployed. It is no way to run a democracy. There have been riots in these circumstances in times past and there could be again. Minimum wage laws were enacted to aid the poor and friendless but the time has come to reconsider their effect. Instead of fighting reconsideration organized labor should encourage it.

Why can't the United States do what many European countries do, institute youth wage differentials to stimulate employment for youngsters? Mr. Simon notes that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development recently held an international conference to consider youth unemployment. It referred directly to the adverse effect of minimum wages on youth employment; opinion appears "fairly widespread" it reported, that one cause of idle youth is the "relatively high wage rates . . . for entry level jobs." Cut through the jargon and what it says is that a lot of employers can't afford regular pay to unskilled youngsters: "By and large, a single undifferentiated minimum seems to reduce teen-age employment . . . reduced work experience may have long-lasting consequences."

In short, I think that a reform that was spendid in its time needs to be reconsidered. Liberal Mr. Simon concludes, "We ought to have a lower minimum wage for young workers." ●

TUITION TAX CREDITS

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we have completed ac-

tion on one of the more controversial bills to come before the 95th Congress—the Tuition Tax Credit Act. As is often the case with such legislation, the issue has been reduced to its most simplistic terms. Those of us who voted against the bill will bear the stigma of opposing a much needed tax break for parents with children in private primary and secondary schools.

I would like to take this opportunity to state that my opposition to H.R. 12050 was based solely on my opposition to providing tuition tax credits to college students.

I support modest tax credits for tuition paid for private elementary and secondary school students. I voted for an amendment to have the bill cover these students. I supported the amendment which would have provided loans to all college students.

If the rule governing the debate on H.R. 12050 had allowed it, I would have supported a move to strike the provision which gave tuition tax credits to college students, and I could have then supported the bill. Unfortunately, such action was not possible under the rule. I therefore had no choice but to oppose final passage of H.R. 12050.

I continue my support for tuition tax credits for private elementary and secondary students. I will support any future bill which provides reasonable credits for these students alone.

My opposition to tuition tax credits for college students stems from my belief that such aid would be both ineffective and inequitable. Higher education is a major, long-term investment for most families. When tuition bills are due, a tuition tax credit several months of a year in the future will not be very useful to those families having trouble meeting this expense. Even if it were paid in advance, a credit of \$250 toward an annual expense of \$3,000 to \$5,000 simply does not help enough to make a difference.

The Carter administration's proposal to increase direct Federal student grants to middle- and low-income families and loans to all students, regardless of income, would be much more effective in meeting this need. Furthermore, such direct aid can be distributed selectively to those who actually need assistance. A general tuition tax credit for college students will result in a huge drain on the Treasury, and an increase in the deficit, with no positive benefits. I could not vote for such a bill.

Credits for private elementary and secondary students are another story. Parents who send their children to private schools help take a burden off public schools while still paying taxes to support the public system. They deserve a break. Furthermore, the modest tuition tax credit proposed in the Vanik amendment, which I supported, would have provided this break while not encouraging any significant shift in school enrollment from public to private schools.

I wish I could have supported final passage of a bill which would have given credit only to elementary and secondary students. I did not have this option, and I could not, in good conscience, support tuition tax credits for college students.

Since the college tuition tax program far exceeded the loss of the elementary and secondary tuition tax, the bad aspects of the legislation far outweighed the good and I therefore opposed final passage of H.R. 12050.●

THE HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEM IN CAMBODIA

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the human rights problem in Cambodia today deserves the attention of all American citizens. This body passed a resolution last month (H. Con. Res. 573) requesting that the President call upon foreign countries which have diplomatic relations with Cambodia to rectify the inhuman situation by both the use of direct influence upon the Cambodian authorities and by raising the issue in the appropriate international forums.

In my own view, the United States should do everything in its power—short of military intervention—to help bring the violations of human rights in Cambodia to an end and to help alleviate the plight of the hundreds of thousands who have suffered. I have urged the United States minimally to provide refuge for some 15,000 Cambodians reported to be in camps in Thailand and elsewhere in Southeast Asia, and to make it clear that other escapees would be welcome here.

At its annual convention on May 21, the American Jewish Committee—a distinguished Jewish organization that has stood up for human rights throughout the world—passed a resolution specifically dealing with the Cambodian problem. The committee called upon the Third World nations to vocalize their disapproval of the Khmer Rouge regime and requested that provisions be made to alleviate the abominable conditions the refugees are forced to endure. The AJC also suggested that the President meet with the leaders of other nations in order to place multinational pressure upon the regime. Finally, there was a proposal to establish a nongovernmental inquiry tribunal for the purpose of investigating the actual circumstances of the Cambodian situation through the testimony of firsthand witnesses and victims.

I hereby submit the text of this forthright resolution for the consideration of my colleagues and commend the efforts of this worthy organization.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA

If published reports of mass killings in Cambodia by its Communist rulers are even only partially true, then the scale of murder in that small, tragic land, perpetrated in pursuit of a political end, approaches the enormity of the Nazi extermination based on a myth of racial purity. If these reports are true, the Cambodian regime is guilty of the ultimately violation of human rights—the mass murder of its own citizens.

The AJC is dismayed by the failure of all but a few states to take cognizance of the killings and the failure of the UN itself to

deal with the situation with the great urgency it warrants.

We call upon the developing nations of the world, especially in Africa and Asia, to register publicly their outrage and protest against this deliberate and massive destruction of life.

We urge the admission to our country under the parole provisions of the immigration law, or under special legislation, if necessary, the thousands of Cambodian refugees living in tragic circumstances in camps in Thailand. We also urge other countries to admit generous numbers of such refugees.

We call on President Carter to invite the leaders of the democratic nations to meet with him to consider possible courses of action to bring to bear maximum moral and political pressure against the reign of terror in Cambodia.

We call upon concerned non-governmental organizations to establish an international inquiry tribunal composed of jurists, religious leaders and other persons of high reputation respected internationally or in their countries for their independence and integrity, to hear public testimony for escapees and other with first-hand knowledge, and make known their findings.●

TRIBUTE TO EARL A. ROTH

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincerest warmth and admiration that I pay tribute today to Earl A. Roth, who has been the dean of the College of Business at Eastern Michigan University since its creation in 1964. I had the privilege of studying under Dean Roth while I attended Eastern Michigan University, and so I am especially aware of his fine talents and academic leadership.

I pay tribute to Dean Roth today because he will soon be retiring from his post at the college of business. On July 1, 1978 this educator will end 25 years of service to EMU—a very distinguished career indeed. Prior to his appointment as dean, he served as head of the department of business for 3 years. At Eastern, Roth has served as chairman of the faculty senate, chairman of the Eastern Michigan University North Central Association of Self Study, acting dean of the graduate school, and acting vice president for instruction.

Prior to coming to Eastern, he served as head of the distributive education department at the University of Missouri and State director of the Missouri Department of Education from 1950 to 1952. Dean Roth is also a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Pi Epsilon, and Beta Gamma Sigma and is listed in "Who's Who in American College and University Administration" and "Who's Who in the Midwest." His bachelors and masters degrees were earned at Ohio State University and his doctorate from Indiana University.

Under Dean Roth, Eastern's college of business has grown to be the second largest business college in Michigan, and certainly one of the finest in the Midwest. He has had a spectacular career

and has touched many thousands of students over the years.

I wish Dean Roth every happiness and success in his retirement. He will certainly be missed at Eastern, but the university will be forever richer for having had his guidance.●

PUBLIC AWARENESS OF ASBESTOS DISEASES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been investigating the problems associated with occupational exposure to asbestos. This is a problem which is, justifiably, attracting increased public attention.

It is a problem for which a solution must be found. Because the Federal Government is the employer of a large number of workers who are exposed to asbestos, I am hopeful that we will be a leader in working out the solution. Secretary Califano has provided a real service in increasing public awareness of the problem, as increased awareness is a step that must necessarily be taken on the road to solution. It is in this vein that I am submitting for the RECORD an article that appeared in Friday's Los Angeles Times. I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read it, and to ponder the severity of the problem which faces us.

HAVE HIGH CANCER RISK—THOUSANDS EXPOSED TO ASBESTOS TO BE STUDIED

(By Henry Weinstein)

SAN FRANCISCO.—John Morris, a 49-year-old submarine repairman, is living "on borrowed time." But each day, he says, he is thankful to Dr. Phillip Polakoff, a Berkeley physician who told Morris last summer that he—like thousands of other shipyard workers—is a victim of asbestosis, an irreversible disease resulting from a scarring of the lungs.

There is no medication for the disease. Morris is still working, but he experiences shortness of breath. That makes climbing on the ladders in the submarines at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo more stressful.

But he says he is living "a day at a time, and so far I'm in pretty good shape."

The disease decreases the amount of oxygen that gets to the blood system. If Morris feels the slightest "symptoms" in his lungs or develops a cold, he immediately goes to Polakoff because he knows he could rapidly develop pneumonia and die.

Polakoff's voice breaks when he talks about Morris and the thousands of workers he and his colleagues at the newly formed Western Institute for Occupational/Environmental Sciences, Inc., hope to aid in their battle against the illness caused by asbestos, the so-called "magic mineral" that has 3,000 industrial uses.

Thursday Polakoff launched the most extensive screening program of persons exposed to asbestos that has been undertaken anywhere in the country. He does not yet know the persons in the program will be and hopes to find them over the next month. Such persons have a much higher chance than the norm of developing lung cancer, stomach cancer and other diseases.

This summer Polakoff and his associates plan to examine 2,000 current and former workers who have been exposed to asbestos, mostly in shipyards from World War II to the present. They will utilize a hotline where concerned workers can call for information and a mobile van supplied by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to supply free X rays to the workers. The data will be analyzed at USC cancer control center.

Of the 2,000 persons the new institute hopes to examine, 500 will be women who worked in the shipyards during World War II and have not worked around asbestos since that time. Persons with an exposure as short as a month or two have developed asbestos-related diseases, according to Health, Education and Welfare Department officials, as have wives who merely washed their husbands' asbestos-laden clothes. A number of these women have developed mesothelioma, a rare cancer of the chest and abdominal lining.

The remaining 1,500 participants will include 300 longshoremen who are at least 40 years old and who had their initial contact with asbestos at least 15 years earlier, and 1,200 presently employed or retired ship workers.

Thus far, Polakoff's nonprofit institute has received \$150,000 in federal funding, \$50,000 from various unions and "\$650 from one company" to launch the program. The study needs another \$300,000.

The project is a landmark that "if successful will be used in other communities and with other dangerous substances," said Gabriel Gillotti, regional administrator of the federal Occupational Safety and Health Agency here. "Up to now the problem of asbestos-related diseases hasn't been a priority. We have to find out the magnitude and the severity of the problem and publicize it," he said at a news conference here.

Federal Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Joseph A. Califano last month warned millions of Americans who worked with asbestos during and after World War II that as many as 51% of them might die of lung cancer or other diseases as a result of that exposure. About 4.5 million of the 8 to 11 million persons he said are in danger worked in shipyards during World War II.

Polakoff already has had 359 present and former Mare Island workers X rayed at Herick Memorial Hospital in Berkeley. Each of the workers had a minimum of more than 10 years time elapsed since initial exposure to asbestos. Fifty-nine percent of those examined had lung abnormalities and 23% of those had significant abnormalities, Polakoff said.

Polakoff stated that about 400,000 residents of the Bay Area alone are at high risk for lung cancer because of contact with asbestos. He based this figure on estimates that 2.5 million people worked in the bustling shipyards at Hunters Point, Emeryville, Alameda, Richmond, Vallejo and Sausalito during the 1940s.

The problem is not limited to shipyard workers, noted Art Carter, chief of the state's Division of Industrial Safety. He said 3,500 businesses in California are now registered as users of carcinogens (cancer-causing substances), and that 68,000 workers handle asbestos presently in California. A number of these work in brake-lining repair shops in Southern California and should have special medical checkups, he said.

Along the same line, John Henning, secretary of the California Federation of Labor (AFL-CIO) said "this is not just a northern California problem." Thousands of persons, he said, have been employed in shipyards in the Los Angeles and Long Beach areas who are also at risk.

Polakoff cited a study by Dr. Jean Felton who X rayed 500 workers at the Long Beach

Naval Shipyard in June, 1977. "These men had primarily short-term exposures (one to 14 years). Despite this brief elapsed period from onset of exposure, 30% had asbestos-related abnormalities," Polakoff said.

Normally, it takes 15 to 35 years after initial exposure for the diseases to appear and by then it is often too late to do anything. Workers have breathed in millions of microscopic-like asbestos fibers which are tasteless, odorless, invisible and indestructible.

"Once a fiber enters the lung, it rarely comes out," said Polakoff, who is a certified specialist in occupational medicine.

The mobile van this summer will do 100 or more X rays a day starting June 17 at union halls in Vallejo, Oakland and San Francisco. The X rays will be provided to those examined on a confidential basis. Persons detected to have problems will be urged to see a physician and be put on some sort of health maintenance program or have further tests.

"This is only one study," said Polakoff, 32, who studied medicine at Wayne State University in Detroit and at Oxford. "People who have been exposed to asbestos need a whole battery of tests."

He said a study by Dr. Irving Selkoff of New York, the nation's leading researcher on the relationship of asbestos to cancer, showed that a smoker exposed to asbestos is 30 times more likely to develop lung cancer than a nonsmoker who has been exposed, and 90 times more likely than a nonexposed nonsmoker.

Polakoff was asked to look into the problem by John Robinson of the Mare Island Metal Trade Council in December, 1976, after Robinson discovered that a number of his union colleagues had developed lung problems.

He had sent 25 X rays to Selkoff at Mt. Sinal Hospital in New York and was shocked to learn that 17 of them showed serious problems. "The Navy took these X rays and they never said anything to any of the workers," said Robinson. Naval officials said they were unaware of any problems when questioned later. ●

PROTECTION FOR THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in northeastern Minnesota is the most heavily used unit in the National Wilderness Preservation System. This federally managed wilderness is the largest interconnecting lakeland wilderness in the country, making it the premier spot in the Nation for wilderness canoeing and camping.

The 1964 Wilderness Act applies contradictory standards to the BWCA and has resulted in conflicts in the management and use of the area, as well as in major litigation as the demands and pressures on BWCA resources have increased.

The Burton-Vento compromise bill, approved by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, seeks to clarify the purposes of the Wilderness Act. The legislation to be considered on the floor shortly will protect the BWCA wilderness resources while still providing certain flexibility to accommodate local concerns.

It is important to recognize that once a wilderness area is despoiled, many years and much in the way of energy and resources are required to rebuild it. There are few places in the world where the beauty of nature is more strikingly reflected than the Boundary Waters of northern Minnesota. We have a compelling responsibility to look to the future and to protect for our children and grandchildren the possibility of experiencing a world of nature as well as of technology. I strongly urge sympathetic consideration be given to the Burton-Vento compromise bill. ●

MANOLO REYES

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to include in the Record the following testimony given by Dr. Manolo Reyes, distinguished former Latin American commentator for WTVJ channel 4 in Miami, before a congressional committee about the Castro regime's most recent African military adventures. Dr. Reyes has in the past offered numerous committees of the Congress a wealth of information and analyses pertinent to the Castro government and I believe his generosity of time and talent merit this recognition:

TESTIMONY

Since 1970 up to now I have testified twelve times before Committees and Subcommittees of the Senate and the House of Representatives about the Cuban situation. For the most part, my testimony has been based on reports and information emanated from within Cuba. I have also given my own evaluation and analysis according to the issues and fact-pattern received from the Island. This testimony is based on the same premises.

The Fidel Castro regime's involvement in Africa is more larger than it has been said up to now. The actual number of Cuban mercenary troops in Africa range from 66,000 to 70,000.

Most of the soldiers that Castro sent to Africa, up to approximately the first 40,000, were reservists of his army. To achieve that goal he had to call those up to 45 years of age. He did not want to touch the three big armies that he has inside Cuba: The Western Army, The Eastern Army and The Central Army.

Facing an increasing battleground in Africa, now Castro has begun to draw soldiers for the African Military Adventure from those three armies. Castro is sending the troops to Africa following the orders of the Soviet Union, which is supplying uniforms, weapons, ammunitions and several contingents of men for the African Adventure through an international communist brigade.

At the same time the Soviet Union is helping Castro to maintain the terror in Cuba. Since Castro is draining soldiers from his three big armies for Africa, the Soviet Union is providing Russian soldiers to Cuba, on a basis of 4 to 1. Per each 4 soldiers that Castro sends to Africa, Moscow sends 1 to Cuba.

This has increased the number of Soviet soldiers about 5,000 in the first quarter of this year. There are now, stationed inside

Cuba, spread throughout the Island, some 30,000 Soviet troops.

Fidel Castro and the Soviet Union want to re-edited the British Colonialism that once existed in Africa, and that ended when the British Government withdrew from that part of the world.

There is a big unrest inside Cuba because the majority of the Cuban people is against the communist military adventure in Africa. The Cuban people claim that Castro condemned the American presence in Vietnam and now he has made a Vietnam in Africa. But above all, the majority of the Cuban people pointed out to specific reasons for their unrest.

1. Cubans have nothing to do in Africa. It is not a war of the Cubans. And by nature, Cubans are not worriers.

2. Thousands of Cuban families have been hit very hard due to the African war because their husbands, fathers, brothers and sons are returning from Africa injured, crippled or in a coffin. And all of that for the Communist system, repelled by nature, by the Cubans—and a war—that has no exigent reasons for the Cubans.

There are three other strong reasons of friction between the Cuban people, Castro and the Soviet Union.

1. At the beginning of his regime, Castro said he was going to expel the United States from the Island because Cuba was for the Cubans. The reality shows that Castro expelled the Americans from Cuba and brought the Soviets into the Island, in a bigger number and broader authority. Today the final word in Cuba, whether it is the main decision of the Government or in a little town, the decision is made by a Russian official.

2. Castro has been in power for almost 20 years and even though he has pledged innumerable times that Cuba was going to be a golden cup—the Cuban people still have a Ration Card for everything. They have to make long lines—under sun or rain—for many hours to get small quantities of basic food or clothing. The Russians have special places and passes to buy whatever they want. Cubans are not allowed to get near those places.

3. The heavy authority exercised by the Russian officers upon the Cuban soldiers. Tension has been so great that Russian and Cuban soldiers have been separated throughout the Island in different military barracks.

In special paragraph we point out the crucial situation that Castro is having with the new breed of Cubans. Castro is not a symbol anymore for the Cuban youth. The Batista ordeal happened 20 years ago and Castro now has nothing to offer to the Cuban youngsters, "Only a Ration Card—and Africa."

Castro continues the exportation of his so-called "Communist Revolution". To that effect he has inside Cuba more than 200 guerrilla training schools to instruct Red Agents from differing parts of the world. Recently, in this month of April, CBS-TV confirmed in its 60 Minutes Sunday Show in a program entitled Terror International, that some of the most important international terrorists, responsible of killings and kidnappings throughout the world, were trained in Cuba. Also is logical to assume, that since the majority of terrorist acts have been committed lately in Europe, there is a growing possibility that those kind of acts would start to proliferate soon in America, including nuclear terrorism.

Finally, there is another frustration for the Cuban people inside the Island, frustration brought about by the United States giving up the Panama Canal. Most of the Cuban people firmly believe that after the Panama Canal, now Washington will give up the Guantanamo Naval Base, the only military base of the United States inside a communist territory.

And they are also fearful due to the sentence of the late Marshall Grechko, Minister of Defense of the Soviet Union, who once said: "He who domains the maritime passages of the world, will domain the world."●

DAVIS-BACON FRUSTRATES HOME WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, in 1976, Congress appropriated \$200 million for home weatherization programs to be administered under the community action program (CAP) of the Community Services Administration (CSA). What has happened to this program, as has been the fate of numerous other Federal construction programs, has been summarized by Eric Green in the latest issue of the Reporter:

What the Congress giveth to CAP's, the U.S. Department of Labor [through its administration of the Davis-Bacon Act] . . . may have taketh away.

A Department of Labor memorandum on the applicability of the Davis-Bacon Act to weatherization projects performed by CETA workers has seriously jeopardized further CAP involvement in the program by forcing the payment of wages far in excess of those that can be afforded. If the Davis-Bacon provisions are rigidly enforced, many CAP's will be required to pay CETA weatherization workers \$10 per hour and above, with most CAP's completely unable to pay such wages.

Thus, as is typical with the Davis-Bacon Act, not only does the taxpayer suffer but so do the intended program beneficiaries. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Field Memorandum No. 433-77 which has muddied up the waters of the home weatherization program, as well as the full text of Mr. Green's article. It is only the latest case study of the counterproductiveness of the Davis-Bacon Act:

FIELD MEMORANDUM No. 433-77

The Labor Department has included in the memo answers to some of the most commonly asked questions about Davis-Bacon. A sample of those questions and answers follow:

Question: Are Davis-Bacon wage rates required for individuals employed in weatherization and home repair activities?

Answer: If the individuals are employed as participants and no federal funds other than CETA are being used, then Davis-Bacon wage rates would not be applicable (except, of course, as described in the "background" portion of this Field Memorandum). If another Federal source of funds is being used in conjunction with work being performed by CETA participants, then the requirements of the other Federal funding source must be used to determine whether Davis-Bacon rates must be paid.

Question: What form should consultation with appropriate labor organizations take?

Answer: Prime sponsors are to notify area officials of building-trades unions, or union councils, of their intention to design, approve or operate construction-related CETA work activities. These officials are to be pro-

vided copies of CETA components or project applications which describe work statements, pay rates, and other operating details. After union officials have been allowed a period to inspect the plans, meetings are to be held with union officials to review plans. This requirement does not mandate that the prime sponsor obtain union concurrence, but rather insures that affected unions are informed and provides a reasonable opportunity for these unions to comment, and discuss potential problems or make suggestions before the proposed work activity begins. Prime sponsors must then consider advice given or positions taken by union officials, but may proceed to implement planned activities in accordance with other CETA requirements.

For further information about this field memorandum or the Davis-Bacon Act, contact Christopher C. Richter at the Department of Labor at (202) 376-6774.

CAA'S FEAR ENFORCEMENT OF DAVIS BACON ACT

(By Eric Green)

What the Congress giveth to CAP's, the U.S. Department of Labor and, inadvertently, the Community Services Administration may taketh away.

CSA and its 865 subsidiaries at the local level, the Community Action Agencies, rejoiced when Congress agreed in 1976 to provide \$200 million for a home weatherization program, which would be run in large part by CSA and the CAP's.

As the September/October, 1976 *National Center Reporter* noted, CSA and the CAP's looked upon weatherization as the golden chance to improve their credibility throughout the country. If CAP's and CSA operated a well run weatherization program, so the theory went, CAP's could buttress their long-standing contention that they have operated community action projects with "demonstrated effectiveness."

Most CAP's to date have indeed run well-oiled weatherization programs. But last September, as a result of repeated requests from CSA and the CETA prime sponsors, the U.S. Department of Labor unleashed a new "field memorandum" which may ultimately cause a tragic denouement in weatherization for CAP's.

This new field memo, #433-77 has raised a tempest in the CAP world. The memorandum was supposed to clarify the relationship of the Davis-Bacon Act to the hiring of CETA workers for weatherization projects. But instead, the "clarifying" memo has (1) muddied the waters to make Davis-Bacon rules appear even more incomprehensible and/or (2) jeopardized further CAP involvement in weatherization.

CAP's must wrestle with three factors as they try to unscramble the meaning of this new memorandum: (1) they must recognize the new questions raised by this memo; (2) they must evaluate its effects; and (3) they must find solutions to their Davis-Bacon problems in order to continue weatherization projects.

THE QUESTIONS

The Department of Labor says officially that the hiring of CETA workers for weatherization projects must comply with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act if the project is multi-funded. The Davis-Bacon Act, in brief, says that construction workers must be paid at the prevailing wage rate for the area. The Secretary of Labor establishes the prevailing rate for each region in the country. If Davis-Bacon provisions are strictly enforced, many CAP's will be forced to pay CETA weatherization workers \$10 per hour and higher in order to meet the union wage scale. CAP's find it financially impossible to pay those salaries.

But what the Labor Department says officially about Davis-Bacon and what it says

"off the record" remain two separate matters. Despite their new field memorandum and their official warnings about the need to comply with Davis-Bacon, the fact remains that DOL will accept, de facto, implicit agreements between CAP's and the unions which will satisfy both parties, while skirting the issue of Davis-Bacon. These tacit, informal arrangements allow CAP's to remain in weatherization and hold down the cost to pay CETA weatherization workers.

The Labor Unions agree to these arrangements because (1) they remain uninterested in providing weatherization jobs to members. Weatherization projects are notorious for offering low-paying salaries.

Unions also agree because (2) they improve their community image. The unions can point with self-satisfied pride to their concern about finding jobs for the disadvantaged population. In reality, finding weatherization jobs for the disadvantaged insures that union workers will face less competition for the higher-paying skilled jobs. In many instances, however, the disadvantaged lack the skills to perform the higher-paying union jobs.

VIEW FROM CSA

Dick Saul, Chief of CSA's weatherization program, looks upon the new Labor Department memorandum as "awakening a sleeping dog."

"I think most CAP's have worked things out," he said. "The problem as I understand it is that the Labor Department is not leaving well enough alone."

Saul says an interagency meeting between CSA and the Labor Department would help resolve the issue of enforcing Davis-Bacon. He says that forcing CAP's to hire weatherization workers at the same wage scale as carpenters and more highly skilled labor remains inherently unfair.

Saul says that the Labor Department's new zealousness in enforcing Davis-Bacon (and as a result providing more jobs for union members) may be an outgrowth of the Ford Administration's attempt to win political support from the "hard-hats."

"I think this has led to some rather outlandish interpretations," Saul added. "At that time there was probably some politics behind it. There was high unemployment in the building trades and everybody was trying to get votes and it was done at the top level. I think we're sort of stuck with some of that . . . It's something we have to get on top of and I'm hoping there could be some negotiations and understandings. I don't think we're ready at this point to say anything in an article because there hasn't been any negotiation."

VIEW FROM THE BUREAUCRACY

The Department of Labor's Mel Bernstein indicts CSA, among others, for causing the present furor about Davis-Bacon. Bernstein said CSA asked for an interpretation of the Davis-Bacon Act because "they didn't like what they saw in the law."

"The people, including those at CSA, were screaming for clarification of Davis-Bacon. Now they've got it. Those are the risks they took in asking for it. The local agencies, the prime sponsors, and the Community Action Agencies were yelling and screaming for an interpretation. I'm sure they were asking for a ruling because in many cases the local unions were on their backs," Bernstein said. Bernstein is a member of the Employment and Training Administration's Taskforce for Youth Programs.

Another ETA manpower specialist, Eric Johnson, says the Labor Department wrote the field memorandum because "we were getting more and more calls from prime sponsors about the legality of hiring CETA workers for weatherization."

"There was an increasing problem as we brought more and more people into the CETA system," Johnson recalled. "Prime

sponsors in different regions were calling us and asking, 'Is that all right? Is this all right?' Rather than continuing to act in an ad hoc way, we decided to set up a clearer policy concerning the CAP relationship with Davis-Bacon."

THE EFFECTS

Jim Gardner, a Manpower Specialist for the Department of Energy, says that the CETA program is not considered in most cases to be covered by Davis-Bacon.

Gardner, who wrote a first draft of the No. 433-77 regulations when he worked at the Labor Department, explains that the labor union determines the fate of the CAP weatherization program.

"The problems develop in areas with both high unemployment and a strong unionized industry," he noted. "In these cases, the unions are very reluctant to say to the price sponsor, 'O.K., you go ahead, you work on these poor people's homes.' The unions are very reluctant to say, 'We have got these skilled carpenters who are out of work, you hire them and pay them the minimum wage.' That's against the principles of the union also. So you run into a dilemma in these types of cases. If you must comply with Davis-Bacon and you can't resolve your problem with the union, then you're out of business," Gardner says.

Gardner adds that Davis-Bacon requires CAP's to pay the prevailing wage for CETA weatherization workers. The prevailing wage is determined by computing the wage rates for jobs that compare to weatherization positions.

But many CAP's wonder what happens when no agency or union performs work that is similar to weatherization. How do you then determine your wage scale, CAP's ask. Gardner explains that in cases where no one is performing work comparable to weatherization, the experience of the employee comes into play in determining the prevailing wage.

"If no one does comparable work, you base the wage rate on the experience of the people you're hiring. When you're talking about CETA employees, you're talking about people who really don't have any skills. Davis-Bacon makes allowances for that. Where a journeyman might get \$10/hour, an untrained individual might get \$5/hour. So you retain that type of flexibility in CETA also."

Gardner indicates, however, that CAP's involvement in weatherization does not usually bother the labor union.

"If the government doesn't go in there and weatherize those homes, those homeowners are not going to have the money to have anyone else do it," Gardner points out. "They don't even have the money to buy the materials to do it themselves let alone possess the skills that would be required to weatherize a home. So you're really not taking anything away in doing this. Ordinarily the unions are more than happy to cooperate even to the point of lending the CAP's some technical assistance if needed. If those union members want jobs, then you have a problem because they'll go in and say you must pay union wages."

WEATHERIZATION

The Program Chief for the weatherization program for a large northeastern state says that union cooperation has allowed his local agencies to run weatherization programs throughout the state.

"Davis-Bacon does not really apply here as far as I can tell," he said.

"We certainly haven't had the problems and we have a highly unionized state," the program chief claims. "Where you run into the problem is with the unions. We had some problems initially but we worked them out. We've never had a problem with CETA funds, with wages or with unions."

He adds, "You have to deal with unions. You can't ignore those guys. They're there and you have to be able to accept a certain

amount of rhetoric. We'll sit down with the unions and work it out. It's when you ignore them or try to flout them that you then get into trouble. If you don't (deal with the unions), you deserve to get pounded. If your country or city government is dividing the people, or they're saying they're not going to pay more than 'x' numbers of dollars, then let them fight with the unions."

SITUATION IN BELLINGHAM, WASH.

Suzanne Deming runs a \$1 million weatherization program in a 5000 square mile rural area spanning four counties in north-central Washington State. Her present dilemma illustrates what happens when different parties interpret in different ways Davis-Bacon applicability to the hiring of CETA weatherization projects.

Deming blames CSA and her local "balance of state" program agent for her problems in delivering weatherization to her region. Unless the situation is resolved, she says, her program faces possible termination.

"There is the theory that you could get around Davis-Bacon by classifying weatherization people in non-prevailing wage scale jobs," she said. "Around here the only thing that would be comparable to weatherization would be carpenter's jobs or carpenter's apprentices . . . It's up to CSA to say that Davis-Bacon does not apply to weatherization. But CSA has dodged the issue for the last 3½ years. What needs to be done is for CSA to say 'no, this is not work on public facilities for major rehabilitation. This is energy conservation. The people involved are not necessarily skilled carpenters. They're trainees. They're getting on-the-job training.'" (Davis-Bacon requires paying the prevailing wage for major rehabilitation work on public facilities.)

Deming says CSA continues to dodge the issue because of its reluctance to become engulfed in a "hassle" with the unions. She says in her own case that she has made informal, unwritten agreements with the local unions, similar to the way some other states resolved their Davis-Bacon problems.

"Locally, I have a pretty good relationship with my unions and they are not giving me any trouble. We have made a very good informal agreement about how we can handle this . . . But we can't put it in writing because the unions are not able to do it and neither are we . . . putting it on paper would show a lot of violations."

Deming maintains that the local CSA program agent, who oversees her weatherization project, refuses to provide assistance to clear up the confusion about Davis-Bacon. The program unit for her region wants a formal, written agreement between the unions and her Community Action Agency, the Whatcom County Opportunity Council, before it will agree to waive Davis-Bacon.

"But we just can't do that," she maintained. "The argument is that we are in violation of Davis-Bacon . . . and that we're going to have to pay retroactively for all the times we violated the law. The bottom line about this whole situation is that CSA should just clean up this matter. If they did that, there shouldn't be any problem at all."

"We've had no assistance from our regional CSA office. It may be a small issue to them but when you have to operate that program at the local level it is no small issue. I think it has come to the point that something has to be done because these weatherization programs are no longer just small projects. It's become major. We're also very much involved in housing issues and unless we get some clarification on Davis-Bacon, it's going to jeopardize some of the other things we're doing. CSA has got to do something; otherwise CAP's are going to be out of weatherization."

"If CSA told us, then we would be in good shape," Cloyd Campbell, CETA supervisor in Deming's region said. "We would prefer it in writing to make sure our tracks are cov-

ered. Then DOL would hold us harmless (would not hold his agency liable) and we would have no worries at all."

But Campbell warns that CSA seems reluctant to ask for a waiver. "CSA has bosses too—Congress being the top dog. Apparently they don't want to give the statement," Campbell said, adding, "If I was in CSA's position I'd take a chance . . . you just can't let your CAP agencies hang on forever by the thumbs. You've got to come out with a decision. This may sound a little strong, but it sounds to me like a dereliction of duties."

SOLUTIONS

Mel Bernstein from the Labor Department suggests that CSA ask for a special waiver from Congress to exempt weatherization programs and other forms of CETA public service employment from Davis-Bacon guidelines.

Bernstein says that Congress and the labor unions should be amenable to supporting the waiver for CAP's.

"Congress is very supportive of weatherization," he said. "When we talk about weatherization, we're talking about relatively unskilled jobs. It requires elementary carpentry, installing a window or blowing insulation into an attic . . . not highly skilled jobs. They do not conflict with highly skilled unionized jobs. Any recommendation to help facilitate the weatherization project would probably go over well in Congress."

But Eric Johnson at DOL paints a far darker picture for a waiver for CAP's involved in weatherization. He says that bending CETA reauthorization legislation does not alter Davis-Bacon provisions for weatherization programs.

"It appears the most definitive way to resolve this issue in favor of not paying the prevailing wage would be to change the legislation for other construction type funding programs," Johnson commented. "The fact that Davis-Bacon is not mentioned in the CETA legislation is not really the pertinent point here. I do not see any indication that Congress will change the present wording on the law. Merely deleting Davis-Bacon requirements under CETA still won't make it clear whether to absolve people (such as CAP's) from paying Davis-Bacon wage rates." Johnson questions whether Congress remains strongly committed to continuing weatherization programs.

"I feel that Congress is no so strongly interested in weatherization projects that they would be willing to anger the unions and go against their own previously set policy regarding Davis-Bacon," Johnson continued. "They wouldn't feel it was worth doing. While weatherization is something really nice and they've been sticking it on a lot of places lately, I haven't seen the movement afoot to really push that kind of thing. If someone put this waiver up and the unions said 'nay' it would be stopped. Even if the unions sat back and just watched, Congress would still let it (the waiver) die. I don't see a movement to push it other than rhetorically."

Johnson agrees that the present strategy, which calls for union and CAP's to agree *sub rosa*, has enabled CAA's to stay in weatherization.

"With union guidance and review, a prime sponsor can set up special types of projects which in effect strictly follow the law and still allow part of the work to be done with CETA people at less than Davis-Bacon wages."

THE HENNEPIN COUNTY SOLUTION

Bill Brumfield, the prime sponsor for a CAP weatherization program in Hennepin County, Minnesota, suggests another alternative to keep Community Action Agencies in weatherization.

"We've been able to make some agreements with the local union here. The union wants

us to pay union supervisor and maybe three or four CETA apprentices. What we've done here is pay the wages from community block money to pick up the wage differential.

"CAP's should get a commitment that the local government will come up with the money to make prevailing wage. They should find a way to pay the differential by utilizing either some local money or some other federal monies. General revenue sharing money is another possibility. You don't have any strings attached with that. Countercyclical (emergency) funds for areas with unemployment higher than 4.5 percent is another possibility . . . We don't have any confusion about the law. We just have to comply with it."

OPINION FROM DOE

Jim Gardner from the Department of Energy concludes that ultimately the political realities in each prime sponsor area will determine the fate of the CAP weatherization program.

"The big thing," he said, "is how much strength does the union have and what is their feeling about whether weatherization comes under Davis-Bacon. If the union says 'yes it does' then you've got a lot of problems."

"But you've got a lot of regions that fall in gray areas. The prime sponsors are afraid to make a decision on Davis-Bacon because they fear that a year down the road, they'll come down the wrong way. They're afraid that the government will hold them liable for back pay and that they'll have to pay very large amounts of money. Prime sponsors who are in that particular type of situation should read that memorandum (No. 433-77) and figure out what to do. Those who are in a real fix should be able to tell from reading that memo what action they should take."

The U.S. Department of Labor's Field Memorandum No. 433-77 was sent on September 13, 1977 to all regional administrators of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The memo was written, according to DOL, to uniformly apply the provisions of Davis-Bacon to all CETA programs.●

BAUCUS MAKES EVERY EFFORT

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, while I favor tuition tax credits, one of our colleagues who is opposed to tuition tax credits—MAX BAUCUS—was not able to be here today. Max has one of the best attendance records in Congress, and I know that he mails a compilation of all of his votes to every western Montana household.

I say this, because I know that Max made every effort to be here today to vote on this issue. Because of the Northwest Airlines strike and a number of other problems, he was simply unable to get here from Montana on time.

Max had his staff working through the night trying to make some sort of connections to get him here for today's votes and back home again in time for his primary election June 6. This turned out to be impossible. But he has made his position on tuition tax credits clear by arranging for pairs on each vote.

While I disagree with Congressman BAUCUS' opposition to tuition tax credits,

I think the people of Montana can be proud of his willingness to take a stand on a controversial issue even when he was unable to make the vote.●

ONE-MAN FIGHT TO PUT INCENTIVE IN WELFARE AID

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker. Recently, an article appeared in the New York Times regarding Dr. Leonard Greene who is the head of the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies in White Plains. I would like to take this opportunity to share this with my colleagues. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1978]

ONE-MAN FIGHT TO PUT INCENTIVE IN WELFARE AID

(By Nancy Rubin)

When Leonard Green injured his hands last year doing temporary work in a Mount Vernon factory, his foreman urged him to go on relief. "You're a fool to continue working," said the man, "you've got lots of kids and you'll get more benefits on welfare than you will by working here."

Leonard Greene was not surprised. Founder and president of the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies, he had intentionally falsified his identification (though not his injury), so that he could personally witness the plight of the unskilled worker. He was now experiencing first-hand what he had always known in theory: that the current welfare programs provide individuals with powerful work disincentives, rather than encouraging them to seek employment.

In a study released by the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies late last summer on Westchester's food-stamp program, Dr. Greene's observations were once again confirmed. The survey, which was conducted in conjunction with the Institute for Suburban Governance of Pace University indicated that the number of persons participating in the Federally sponsored food-stamp program within the county had doubled during the last five years. Today, it is believed to include over 40,000 individuals—most of them young, poor, and living in female-headed households—at the cost of \$700,000 a month. Seventy-nine percent of the recipients also draw relief from other forms of public assistance.

Although the growth rate for the food-stamp program in Westchester falls well below the national level, the most disturbing aspect of the study is the dependency patterns formed by users of food stamps. According to the study, more than two-thirds of the program participants have received stamps for over a year, while 53 percent apparently having lost all hope of economic recovery, expects to continue receiving stamps for at least another 12 months. These figures, Dr. Greene explained, suggest that once people start receiving public assistance, they find it difficult to give it up.

"The government, with all good intentions, has hurt the people, instead of helping them. It has created generations of people on the dole," said Dr. Greene, who has repeatedly testified before Congressional committees on various aspects of welfare reform. "We've become hooked on the idea of providing public assistance benefits, rather than developing programs that would give people some incentive to work."

Dr. Greene, who is also a computer scientist and inventor of flight instruments, such as the Stall Warning Indicator (which is now standard equipment on many aircraft), is the president of the Safe Flight Instrument Corporation in White Plains. He first became interested in welfare reform over a decade ago, when he offered an unskilled black worker training as a computer assemblyman in his factory. "A few days later he came back and told me he couldn't take the job because he would be making too much money for his family to qualify for low-income housing," recalled Dr. Greene. "That really bothered me and I got to wondering what kind of society we had that fostered that kind of dependency."

Criticizing the current welfare benefit laws for their inefficiency and poor design, Dr. Greene noted that the Institute is currently involved in a study analyzing \$250 billion in Federal funds being distributed through 182 separate welfare programs across the nation. Much of it, he added, is needlessly swelling the national debt, undermining the economy, and doing little to alleviate the real causes of poverty.

"Many people think the current welfare system is ineffective because of the opportunities for fraud and abuse," he said, "but that's only a small part of the problem. The larger observation is that the government is oppressing the people with its benefit regulations, and destroying the fabric of American life."

The economist cited the case of a married couple that reaches retirement age. Despite the wife's years of work and contribution to the labor force, she is expected to give up her rights to Social Security benefits in lieu of her husband's allowance. "That's essentially a penalty for having a wedding certificate," Dr. Greene said, "and just one instance of the many inequities in our laws."

Or take the case of the small farmer who must utilize all his land each year in order to survive. At the same time, the wealthier farmer is able to idle his land, collect government benefits for doing so, and even become involved in selling futures on government-supported price controls. "We've forced out the farmer with our grapes-of-wrath approach," said Dr. Greene. "The trouble with our laws is that they don't allow the near poor any vertical progression."

To remedy the situation, Dr. Greene proposes "cashing out" all the existing benefit programs, including low-income housing, food stamps and other welfare benefits. In their place, Dr. Greene has developed the "fair share" concept of welfare reform, or negative income tax, which would give all citizens, whether rich or poor, individual income allowances. Persons with little or no income would receive the full benefit of the allowance, while individuals with higher incomes would be taxed on a graduated scale, similar to the current income tax laws. Non-need families, thus, would not be eligible to receive their allowances, but their monies would be turned back to the government instead to help fund the program.

"The idea is to make funds available to everyone who really needs them," said Dr. Greene, "but not by arbitrarily cutting off people because they fall above a certain minimal level of income, as the laws require today. Instead, the allowance is meant to be distributed on a sliding scale, so that a man who is living with his family just above the poverty line, for instance, might receive enough assistance to help him keep his house or farm. It might make all the difference and provide him with the incentive to keep on working."

A firm believer in the individual's ability to better himself, Dr. Greene has applied many of his economic theories to the operation of his own business. At Safe Flight, where he has always hired large numbers of disadvantaged youths, the handicapped and

older workers, Dr. Green encourages his employees to advance through the ranks to administrative and executive positions. Several years ago, in fact, the company attracted several highly skilled technicians from a competitor with an early retirement policy to come work at Safe Flight, where "abilities, not birthdays," were stressed.

The recipient of countless awards and honors, Dr. Greene has received a commendation from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for his establishment of the Chain Scholarship Fund, a national college scholarship foundation. In 1974 he was named one of the top three independent business leaders in the United States as the Albert Gallatin Award winner for the Northeast. The businessman said he was particularly pleased with that award because it was "an endorsement of his fundamental beliefs about the positive relationship that can be formed between management and labor."

But perhaps the best insight into the man was offered during a recent Congressional hearing on welfare reform when a reporter asked Dr. Greene why a prominent businessman like himself had become so actively involved in the reform of national economic policies. "I don't want to be a successful member of a sinking ship," he said, "we're all in this together and if we ignore the people trapped in our economy, we are essentially undermining the future of the quality of life in this country, and the value of all the things we have strived for." ●

REFRAIN FROM WATCHING TELEVISION 1 NIGHT EACH WEEK

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has asked his people to refrain from watching television one night each week, utilizing that evening to enhance the family unit. I consider this a most laudable suggestion, one which perhaps our own people might do well to emulate.

Not only is the emphasis on family life a commendable notion in itself—the suggestion that we relieve ourselves of television's declining quality programming for at least one evening a week is doubly attractive. While there is no denying that the electronic media have the capability to educate and inform, the caliber of programs now being aired hardly takes advantage of this opportunity. On the whole, television seems determined to appeal to our baser nature; to lionize the less desirable segments of society, and to fill in the lulls between sensational productions with vapid and inane presentations.

How many of us have looked on as our children and grandchildren gaze at the one-eyed monster with glassy eyes? Entire evenings may pass in total family silence as a stream of ridiculous programs pass across the screen. Evidence of growing dissatisfaction with television's programming is given by the number of corporations which are withdrawing their sponsorship in protest.

I do not claim to be an expert psychologist, and I will make no comment as to the supposed link between violent crime and television violence. I simply believe

that the American people would do well to rediscover the lost art of family enjoyment, communication, and conversation while the tube lies dormant one night out of seven. Perhaps if enough of us adhere to this policy, television programmers will realize we are a bit brighter than they had thought. If they do not, at least we will be spared their insulting efforts for a short period of time. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAX BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 18, and 19, 1978, I was absent from the legislative session of the House of Representatives.

The House considered H.R. 39, the Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation Act during this period. This bill was the subject of lengthy debate and extensive compromise in the Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Knowing that numerous amendments would be offered on the floor I decided to oppose all amendments and support the open rule and the Committee compromise. Thus had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 330, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House agreed to the rule (H. Res. 1186) under which the bill was considered, "yes."

Rollcall No. 335, H.R. 39: Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation. The House rejected an amendment that sought to make certain boundary changes in order to reduce the total acreage within parks, wildlife refuges by approximately 5 million acres to permit selection of these lands by the State of Alaska "no"; and

Rollcall No. 336, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House rejected an amendment that sought to reduce lands to be designated as wilderness from approximately 66 million acres to 33 million acres, "no."

Rollcall No. 337, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House agreed to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole "yes"

Rollcall No. 338, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House agreed to an amendment that continues minerals assessments provisions and requires the President to submit a proposal to Congress by October 1, 1981, for a procedure for evaluation applications by individuals wishing to carry out mineral exploration or extraction on conservation system lands "no"

Rollcall No. 339, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House rejected a motion to recommit the bill to the Committees on Interior Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries with instructions to report it back forthwith containing an amendment in the nature of a substitute (text of H.R. 12703 previously offered in the Committee of the Whole), "no"; and

Rollcall 340, H.R. 39: Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation. The House passed the measure to designate certain lands in the state of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, National Wild and Scenic Rivers and National Wilderness Systems, "yes". ●

LIFTING THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "Carter and the Turks" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, May 19, 1978.

Soon, Congress will be considering H.R. 12514, the International Security Assistance Act of 1978, which contains provisions regarding Greece and Turkey and the lifting of the partial arms embargo against Turkey. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to give careful and full consideration to this very important foreign policy decision whether to sustain provisions of H.R. 12514 and lift the embargo against Turkey.

The editorial urges us, as Members of Congress, to make this decision on the basis of a rational foreign policy judgment on whether lifting the embargo will support NATO and strengthen hopes for progress on a Cyprus settlement.

It seems to me that there is now a very crucial need for a positive foreign policy initiative in the Eastern Mediterranean to move the situation off dead center. Lifting the embargo can hopefully help create an environment in which successful negotiations for a Cyprus settlement can occur and in which Greek and Turkish confidence can be restored in the NATO alliance.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 19, 1978]

CARTER AND THE TURKS

President Carter has a host of foreign policy problems but none more serious now than the question of Turkey's weakened role in NATO. So far he has not given this matter top priority. The Panama treaties and the Middle East arms package consumed his energies in Congress. But now that the day has been won on these issues, it is indispensable that the President similarly pull out all stops in an effort to get Congress to lift the U.S. arms embargo on Turkey. No less is at stake than the strength and stability of the Western alliance in the face of growing Soviet assertiveness.

It is ironic that at a time when the Russians are exploiting fresh opportunities to extend their influence—in Africa, the Middle East, Afghanistan—the U.S. Congress is helping them. For that in effect is what it is doing. Washington's European allies alone seem to understand that if Turkey is not soon helped to improve its deteriorating defenses, the whole southeastern flank of NATO, now a strategic Mediterranean buffer between the Soviet Union and the Middle East and between East and West, will be softened. Already the United States has had to shut down some of its military installations in Turkey.

Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit does not go so far as to suggest that Turkey will pull out of the alliance. But, under growing pressures at home, he is being forced to look to other alternatives if the U.S. Congress continues its myopic policy. He has told Mr. Carter that Ankara will not sign a joint statement on NATO's future at the upcoming summit in Washington and he hints that Turkey will re-

duce the size of its armed forces (it now has the second-largest standing army in NATO).

That may sound like arm-twisting to some, but, in Mr. Ecevit's eyes, things look quite different. Failure of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to end the embargo, imposed when Turkish troops occupied northern Cyprus, has had serious repercussions in Turkey. Many Turks feel that they are being treated like second-class citizens, that the West does not appreciate them, and therefore that they should perhaps stand all alone, bolstering their ties with the nonaligned world and—yes—with the Soviet Union.

On the Cyprus issue the Turks believe they have put forward reasonable opening proposals. UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim in fact termed them concrete and substantial, but the Greek Cypriots refuse to talk now—a stance Ankara views suspiciously as tied to a desire to keep the pro-Greek deadlock in Congress.

Whether these suspicions are true or not, the American lawmakers can be faulted for playing politics instead of pursuing principle. It is no secret that the pro-Greek lobby is highly organized and cohesive. It has influence over some important congressional posts and its financial support of Democrats and Republicans alike is a matter of public record.

Can it be doubted that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and other members of Congress would view the situation differently if, instead of the pro-Greek chorus, pro-Turkish voices were heard in the land? To Turkey's disadvantage, there are few such. Hence President Carter faces a tough task in persuading the lawmakers to be ruled by good sense and patriotism rather than their political emotions. He managed this admirably well in the case of the Mideast arms deal. For the first time the power of the Jewish lobby in the Congress was broken because of a perceived overriding national interest.

This must be the touchstone in the Turkish arms issue as well. There is no rationale in sounding the alarm about the Soviet Union's inroads around the world and growing challenge to the West—when the West itself does not keep its house in order.●

ADMIRALTY ISLAND, ALASKA

HON. LAMAR GUDGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the areas in Alaska that most needs protection is Admiralty Island. It is an island 100 miles long and 25 miles wide, located just south of Juneau, where it is a memorable part of the Alaskan experience to millions of people who have traveled the Inside Passage, which bounds the island on the east.

Foremost among those who seek permanent protection of Admiralty Island's fisheries, wildlife, and scenic values are the people who live there, the Tlingit Indians of Angoon. The village of Angoon, the only community on the island, is the last stronghold of traditional Tlingit culture—one of the most advanced and artistic cultures in North America.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 8651, a bill initiated by the people of Angoon, to establish the Admiralty Island National Preserve as part of the national park system. After considering this proposal in conjunction with the larger Alaska

bill (H.R. 39), the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Alaska Lands reached agreement with the people of Angoon to include Admiralty Island as a designated wilderness area in H.R. 39. This is strongly supported by the people of Angoon.

Moreover the island is famous for its salmon, with an estimated production of 2 million fish every year. Sitka deer inhabit the island, and the bays and tidal flats are habitat for migrating waterfowl and shorebirds. In addition, it is one of the best areas in Alaska for brown bear. As early as 1901, President Theodore Roosevelt recommended the island as a brown bear refuge. Also biologists find that Admiralty has more bald eagles, an endangered species and our national symbol, than all the other 49 States combined.

In view of the cultural value, the bald eagle habitat and the brown bear habitat, Admiralty Island needs wilderness protection, House enactment of H.R. 39, assuming similar action in the Senate, guarantees this protection.●

PIERCE COUNTY RADIO WATCH HONORED

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, local and State leaders in Pierce County, Wash., have designated May as Pierce County Radio Watch Month in recognition of an outstanding public service organization in my district.

This most dedicated organization has, for 7 years, maintained an around-the-clock monitoring service on channel 9; the national emergency channel. They notify local and State law enforcement agencies of any emergencies that occur in the area.

Because of the earnestness with which Pierce County Radio Watch has approached this responsibility, they have earned a reputation of accuracy and effectiveness among local law enforcement agencies. They have developed an excellent system for screening information before they transmit it; and they have instigated procedures to get correct and useful information to the right people. Every agency they deal with has nothing but praise for the coordinating efforts of this valuable community service organization.

The Pierce County Sheriff's Office and the Tacoma Police Department receive more than 100 calls a month and the Washington State Patrol gets about 60 calls a month from Pierce County Radio Watch. Often, these calls are the first they receive of an emergency, that can range from a lone female who ran out of gas at 3 a.m., to a stalled auto on Interstate 5 during rush hour traffic, to such an emergency as a recent gyrocopter crash in Tacoma.

Law enforcement agencies routinely have come to depend on Pierce County

Radio Watch to complement their own communications network. And, in recent years, they have expanded their surveillance effort to include traffic reporting for KVI radio in Seattle, helping them to improve their traffic reporting network for listeners throughout Puget Sound.

While many people in Pierce County are not yet aware of the services provided by Radio Watch, the daily lives of thousands are affected daily by the work of this excellent organization.

I recently presented Pierce County Radio Watch with a flag that was flown over the Nation's Capitol in their name. Today, I would like the U.S. House of Representatives to be aware of the excellent 7-year record of this organization during May, Pierce County Radio Watch Month.●

DIVESTITURE NOT NEEDED TO DEVELOP COAL SURPLUSES

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress nears completion of some sort of national energy plan, I wanted to call my colleague's attention to a recent report carried by the news media. The gist of that report was that oil and nuclear fuel energy companies should not be barred from acquiring coal lease properties on the basis of antitrust law.

The study was requested by Congress, and conducted by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. According to the study, prohibiting oil and nuclear energy firms from buying coal-bearing properties might actually decrease competition for this new energy resource. The Justice Department found the current coal markets in the United States to be "workably competitive."

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think this is good news, and for several reasons. First of all, it is reassuring to know that no major abuses of antitrust law seem to be occurring in an area as vital to our economy as energy. Second, I hope this study will serve to balance the on-going discussion as to the nature and desirability of maintaining privately held energy companies. Third, and most importantly, I hope that this report may prove to be the cornerstone of our efforts to increase production of the abundant coal supplies in the country.

Congress can do many things to set national energy policy. We can approve seminars and fund research into coal conversion. We can enact tax breaks or tax penalties to encourage conversion to coal. We can, in short, erect the signposts to point the way to our energy future. We cannot, however, legislate the extraction of coal. Ultimately, this job must fall on the tried and proven shoulders of the free enterprise system.

This Justice Department study seems to suggest that the free enterprise system is working pretty well without Government intervention. If Congress acts

like a conservative gardener, and prunes and trims the economy only when necessary, I think we can be assured of a bountiful harvest of energy for future generations.●

THE NATIONAL ENERGY TRUST FUND ACT

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation entitled the "National Energy Trust Fund Act" for basically two reasons: Because I have a strong commitment to solving our energy problems, and I do not feel that our leaders are adequately addressing the problems. When I first came to Washington some 18 months ago, I truly believed that the time had come to really deal with our energy problems in substantive terms. We had experienced an "energy crisis" and piecemeal attempts at solving it. We had listened to a great deal of rhetoric, with little action toward implementing the spoken words. But January 1977 saw a new Congress and a new administration which promised to be intent and forthcoming on our energy problems. I looked forward to taking part in this important mission.

We were certainly led to expect great things—and at one point I thought we were on the right track with the creation of a new Department of Energy. However, 18 months later I feel frustrated and disappointed because we are not really any nearer to dealing with our energy problems that we were in January 1977. What has been done? The creation of a new department, yes—but it continues to flounder and is still not fully organized. The energy bill is now over a year old and has not been enacted. Quite frankly, I feel that bill fell so short of our goals that I voted against it. Now, we are presented with "Phase Two" of the energy plan—a memo sent up to Congress 1 day after the budget deadline containing proposals of which 95 percent have already been approved in some form by the House Science and Senate Energy Committees. This is the work of an administration that "declared war" on our energy problems?

Quite frankly, I believe the administration's so-called energy plans are an affront to the American people and fall very short of the type of commitment we must have. It is my firm belief that what this country needs is a strong, national effort in energy, similar to the commitment made to the space program in the 1960's. The space program certainly proved our leadership abilities overall—and the resourcefulness of the congressional committees in particular. Once a strong, cohesive commitment was made to space, the Congress was able to accelerate programs to achieve a major goal—reaching the Moon—in a relatively short period of time.

And in the area of science itself, Americans have proved their resourcefulness again and again. For instance, at

one time, all of our tires were made of rubber, imported from Brazil. But now, thanks to our scientists, our tires are now made from synthetics produced in this country. With a commitment to this goal, we were again able to achieve in a relatively short period of time.

When will our leaders not only realize that energy is a No. 1 priority, but act like they realize it, as they did with the space program? At our present rate, we will never be able to accelerate energy development—of any sort—to meet the goals of energy independence. Our economy is dependent to a large extent on a stable energy supply—much of which is now imported. We have no choice but to accelerate our energy program with a goal of energy independence.

To do this, we must work to increase our research and development of non-fossil energy sources. Oil, gas, and coal—from any part of the world—will not last forever. If we do not concentrate our efforts on nonfossil, nonnuclear sources, we will experience the greatest energy crisis ever. This is not a dramatic omen—it is simply a truth which we must face and deal with.

It is with these thoughts that I present the National Energy Trust Fund. The purpose of this bill is very simple—to encourage and conduct a comprehensive national program of basic and applied research and development and technical demonstrations of alternative energy sources. Furthermore, this bill would seek to promote a partnership between the public and private sectors in terms of energy development—which is vital to all aspects of our economy.

The Secretary of Energy is directed to make loans, contracts, and grants to qualifying individuals and organizations. (Organizations include municipalities, colleges, universities, corporations, and unincorporated businesses.) These financial arrangements would serve to carry out the purposes of this act in terms of alternative energy sources. (Alternative energy sources are defined as nonfossil, nonnuclear (excluding fusion technology) energy sources including (but not limited to) solar power, geothermal energy, and new techniques in the provision and use of hydroelectric energy.)

The trust fund would be funded from the proceeds of any tax heretofore or hereafter imposed specifically to promote energy supply or for energy conservation purposes and then appropriations as necessary. The Secretary of the Treasury would hold the trust fund and report each year to the Congress on its fiscal condition. The Secretary would be able to invest any funds which were not necessary for withdrawals for energy purposes.

Furthermore, the funding in this bill is increased in incremental steps, and then decreased in later years to further encourage energy independence. Our purpose is to accelerate research and development in alternative energy with a space program type of commitment, to reach our goal of energy independence in a relatively short period of time.

I cannot emphasize enough the absolute need for a strong, cohesive commit-

ment to alternative sources of energy. Without such an effort—of which we are certainly capable—we will never see the end of our energy problems.

I urge my colleagues to consider the seriousness of this problem, and hope that they will join me in this effort to prepare our country for energy independence as we prepared America for the journey to the Moon.●

THE HARRIS SURVEY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent Harris survey, a massive majority of Americans favor the United States and the Soviet Union coming to a new SALT agreement that would limit the number of nuclear missiles each country can deploy. Mr. Harris found a 75 to 12 percent majority favoring this position in a poll released on May 22, 1978.

This survey is significant because it should encourage our negotiators to press forward at this time with the knowledge that there is a sizable domestic constituency which will work for ratification of a satisfactory agreement.

The survey also found that there is a 74 to 17 percent majority in favor of both countries ending all nuclear testing, which is in line with the decision of the Carter administration to seek a comprehensive test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

Since this poll gives valuable insights into the current thinking of Americans on relations with the Soviet Union, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues.

The text of the poll follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 22, 1978]

THE HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris)

Reports that the American people have turned less favorable toward detente and have cooled on their desire to see the United States and the Soviet Union agree on strategic arms limitations simply have no basis in fact. To the contrary, there appear to be sizable majorities of the public who deeply hope agreements between the world's two leading superpowers can be achieved.

Despite rather widespread claims to the contrary, a recent Harris Survey of 1,563 adults nationwide has found:

A 71-15 percent majority favors "detente—that is, the United States and Russia seeking out areas of agreement and cooperation." A year ago a slightly higher 75-10 percent majority supported detente, while in 1976 a 73-16 percent majority held the same view. By any standard, support for arriving at key agreements between the two countries is substantial and overwhelming.

Specifically a 75-12 percent majority favors the U.S. and Russia coming to a new SALT arms control agreement that would limit the number of nuclear warheads and missiles they can deploy. Just a year ago, the margin

was 66-8 percent. In the past 14 months, backing for SALT has gone up 9 points. Recently, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and chief arms negotiator Paul Warnke reported that real progress had been made on SALT negotiations and that final agreement might be only a matter of weeks away. It has been suggested that Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev might well be invited to visit President Carter in Washington this summer for a summit meeting, at which new SALT agreements would be announced.

On three other key areas of potential agreement, massive majorities are favorable:

On "increasing trade between the U.S. and Russia," a 70-18 percent majority nationwide register their approval, up slightly from the 66-16 percent majority who felt the same way in 1977.

An agreement between the U.S. and Soviet Union to "end all nuclear weapons testing" meets with 74-17 percent approval by the public. A year ago, a slightly larger 75-12 percent majority favored such an agreement.

By 63-21 percent, a sizable majority also favors the U.S. granting Russia "the same trading rights with us as most other nations have." This would mean giving the Soviets the "most favored nation" rights enjoyed by other countries with whom we conduct trade.

It is clear from these findings that there is still a favorable climate for detente in this country. Large majorities feel that in a nuclear era, confrontations between the two leading nations in the world must be avoided. This means finding areas of agreement which might then ease tensions.

At the same time, according to recent Harris Surveys, the American people are uneasy about Soviet and Cuban military activities in Africa as well as about violations of human rights within the Soviet Union. And they seem to feel that the U.S. should not hesitate to make forceful representations to the Kremlin on these matters.

What they do not want, however, is to have the progress of the SALT talks and the prospects for increased trade linked too closely with these other issues. The public believes that a policy of pluralism must be a cornerstone of U.S.-Soviet relations in this advanced nuclear age.

For the Carter administration, agreements on SALT and trade with the Russians could well turn around the dismal 63-29 percent negative ratings that the public has given the President on his conduct of foreign policy. At the heart of this judgment is people's feeling that President Carter has not handled relations with Russia very well. Indeed, they give him a lower rating on this score than any President in the last 15 years.

What a solid majority wants to see is progress in negotiations, patiently and effectively worked out, with no danger to America's security. And that objective can be achieved, in the minds of a 71-15 percent majority, by pursuing the policy of detente.

TABLES

Between April 29 and May 6, the Harris Survey asked a cross-section of 1,563 adults nationwide in in-person interviews:

"Do you favor or oppose detente—that is, the United States and Russia seeking out areas of agreement and cooperation?"

DETENTE WITH RUSSIA

[In percent]

	1978	1977	1976	1975
Favor.....	71	75	73	62
Oppose.....	15	10	16	15
Not sure.....	14	15	11	23

WOULD YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE (READ LIST) AGREEMENTS WITH RUSSIA?

[In percent]

	1978	1977	1975
The United States and Russia coming to a new SALT arms control agreement:			
Favor.....	75	66	59
Oppose.....	12	8	14
Not sure.....	13	26	27
The United States and Russia agreeing to end all nuclear weapons testing:			
Favor.....	74	75	(1)
Oppose.....	17	12	(1)
Not sure.....	9	13	(1)
The United States and Russia increasing trade with each other:			
Favor.....	70	66	52
Oppose.....	18	16	25
Not sure.....	12	18	23
Russia being given the same trading rights with us as most other nations have:			
Favor.....	63	61	55
Oppose.....	21	19	23
Not sure.....	16	20	22

1 Not asked.

THE ECONOMICS OF GUNS AND NODULES: WHY WE NEED A DEEP SEA MINING BILL

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, the deep seabed mining issue has echoed in the halls of Congress for many years. In the past, however, the administration has viewed each session of the continuing United Nations Law of the Sea (LOS) Conference with optimism and has not supported domestic deep sea mining legislation for fear that it might disrupt negotiations perceived to be delicate.

Last year, at the start of the sixth session of the LOS Conference, the administration began to change its position. For the first time the folks downtown began to recognize the need to move forward with domestic legislation. The head of the U.S. delegation at the LOS, Ambassador Elliot Richardson, has stated that the proceedings at the Conference which have entered into its second decade of negotiations should not deter the progress of domestic legislation. As a result of the willingness of the executive branch to work with the Congress on this issue, many of the questions which have surrounded deep seabed mining in the past have been worked out. The product of these efforts is H.R. 3350 which will be brought before the House next month.

I have always maintained that a sound and equitable LOS treaty is preferable to any form of unilateral action taken by the United States to encourage the development of deep seabed mining. This view is reflected by the interim nature of H.R. 3350.

However, I also believe that if a treaty cannot be obtained, the United States cannot afford to wait and allow our technological lead to dwindle and at the same time subject ourselves to serious economic disruptions in our supplies of strategic minerals.

Although experts generally agree that the threat of long-term cartelization of the nickel, copper, cobalt, and manganese markets is minimal, I stated my concerns last year that the possible adverse effects of short-term disruptions in supply had not been satisfactorily dispelled. Unfortunately my statement of last year has been substantiated by recent events, a description of which follows.

During the second week in March, rebel forces began what turned out to be a well planned and executed assault on Zaire's copper-rich Shaba Province. This campaign culminated in the shutdown of more than 75 percent of Zaire's annual copper production and 90 percent of that country's cobalt production capacity. According to the Washington Post, the rebel forces, which are now purportedly retreating into Angola, succeeded in rendering Zaire's Shaba Province mines inoperative for a period of at least 6 months to several years.

The repercussions emanating from the recent turn of events in Zaire will be felt, not only in that country and region of the world, but internationally for months and possibly years to come.

By cutting the main artery supplying Zaire's economic blood, the rebels effectively imposed a major economic setback to a nation which is struggling to meet its massive foreign debt obligations. Internationally, the termination of mining operations in the Shaba Province has already begun to affect the world price of these strategically important metals.

The financial section of the Washington Post has provided an alarming chronicle of the impact the conflict in Zaire has had on the world price of copper:

On May 15, 1978, news of the rebel invasion into the mining district of Zaire caused copper prices to increase a cent per pound—to 59.20 cents/lb.

On May 17, 1978, the Zairian conflict triggered a wave of speculative demand which caused copper prices to jump by 0.7 to 0.8 cents per pound.

The following day (May 18) copper prices advanced 1.0 to 1.4 cents a pound, finishing at 60.90 cents/lb.

On May 19, 1978, the Washington Post reported: "the rebel invasion of copper-rich Zaire triggered heavy speculative demand that lifted copper futures on New York's Commodity Exchange (Comex) about 2.5 cents per pound."

According to the Washington Post, on May 22: "Reports that rebels had flooded copper mines during hostilities in Zaire stimulated another wave of speculative buying yesterday that inflated the prices of those futures."

"Mining engineers and technicians fleeing the African nation told reporters that even if they returned to work, it could be six months before the mines were operational."

"Copper futures, accordingly, jumped nearly a cent a pound on top of a 2.5 cent price hike last week."

On May 25, copper prices increased by 2.5 cents per pound in the wake of news verifying the forced reduction in Zaire's copper production. The spot contract on New York's Comex finished at 64.40 cents per pound compared to the quoted price for copper of 58.00 cents per pound on April 28.

In 1976, Zaire's cobalt production accounted for 51 percent of total world production. Cobalt is normally produced

as a byproduct of nickel and copper ore production and processing. Nickel and copper markets have been depressed lately due to low prices for these metals. Consequently, production of these two metals has been cut back. Demand for cobalt was high during the first quarter of 1978, and reached an all time high in March. The combined effects of high demand and decreased production has precipitated a severe world shortage of cobalt.

As of May, African Metals Corp., one of the world's largest suppliers of cobalt, announced a rationing program whereby its customers would receive only 70 percent of their contracted supply allocation. As a result, while the posted price for cobalt (the price paid by African Metals Corp. customers under contract) has remained at \$6.85 per pound, the free market price for cobalt began to soar in late April to \$18 and \$20 per pound.

Since the United States is totally dependent on foreign sources of cobalt, the price trends for cobalt in this decade are especially disconcerting. In 1972, cobalt was selling for \$2.45 per pound. The price steadily increased to \$3.75 per pound in 1974, \$4.90 per pound in 1976, to the current price of \$20 per pound. Based on the current market price, the price of cobalt has increased an incredible 716 percent in 6 years.

Cobalt is critical to the United States from both strategic and economic standpoint. It is an essential element in many alloys and superalloys. Cobalt is especially important in electrical and aerospace industries.

In 1974, according to the Congressional Research Service, 83 percent of the United States cobalt imports originated in Zaire. The Department of the Interior stated that as of March of this year, consumer stockpiles of cobalt in the United States would meet only 2 months of this country's current consumption.

The prospect of major shortages of cobalt in this country is significant given the fact that Zaire's cobalt production could be deferred for 1 year. The fact that a worldwide shortage existed before the disruption of mining operations in Kolwezi, which accounts for 46 percent of the world's production of cobalt, can only mean that the price of cobalt will continue to rise.

The tragic events in Zaire provide a painful exposure of the vulnerability of the United States to supply disruptions in certain raw material markets. Other strategically and economically critical metals in this category include nickel and manganese of which 71 percent and 100 percent, respectively, of our annual consumption must be imported.

For the United States, there exists an alternative to this extremely dangerous one-sided trade situation. The solution lies on the bottom of the deep ocean. Scattered across the seabed throughout the world's oceans are potato-sized accretions which contain an estimated \$3 trillion worth of nickel, copper, and manganese.

Private corporations in this country and in other industrialized nations have

expressed an interest in mining these manganese nodules.

According to some estimates, by mining these nodules U.S. companies could meet all of our country's demand for cobalt and manganese by the year 1990.

What this means for the United States is a stable supply of these critical metals, a decreased balance of payments deficit (imports of nickel, copper, cobalt, and manganese contributed \$1.5 billion to our payments deficit in 1976), and increased stability in the world market for these metals. Stable prices, as Secretary of Commerce Juanita Kreps recognized in testimony before the Oceanography Subcommittee, will derive benefits for the international community as well as the United States.

Currently pending in the House is a bill, H.R. 3350. This bill would authorize U.S. companies to engage in mining of manganese nodules on the sea floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. The companies have the technology to proceed. What they need now is an interim legal framework under which they can continue expenditures and begin commercial recovery prior to the final resolution of a U.N. Law of the Sea Conference. The warnings of economic analysts have gone unheeded for too long. These warnings have now become realities. It is time for the Congress to act on this important legislation when it comes to the floor later this month. ●

CRIMINAL CODE REFORM

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last January the Senate passed a massive, 682-page criminal code reform bill and the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice is now trying to weed through this complex legislation. The Senate version of the bill represents a tremendous expansion of the Federal Government's criminal jurisdiction at the expense of civil liberties. The following Los Angeles Times editorial explains the need for caution in drafting the House version of this important legislation. In its haste, the Senate allowed intrusions upon many individual and first amendment rights which are crucial to our democratic society. The editorial points out that the balance between State and Federal power will be dangerously tipped toward the side of the Federal Government if the Senate's Criminal Code bill becomes law. I recommend to my colleagues this thoughtfully written editorial which clarifies many of the faults of the Senate-passed bill:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 24, 1978]

A LEAP IN THE DARK

Legislation to codify, revise and reform federal criminal law (S. 1437, passed by the Senate, and H.R. 6869, now under consideration by the House of Representatives) has

encountered a setback in the House judiciary subcommittee.

After 23 days of hearings, the subcommittee balked at the complexity of the massive, 682-page measure. Rep. Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.), summed up the committee's sentiment by calling the bill "a giant leap in the dark." Another committee member, Rep. Charles E. Wiggins (R-Calif.), says the House must take a long and independent look at reform, and not simply ratify the Senate action.

Supporters of the legislation proceeded immediately to the attack, but their arguments, instead of adding strength to their cause, became impressive new evidence that the code should be defeated.

The Washington Post prefaced its renewed support of the code with this confession: "It is almost impossible for anyone, other than the (Justice Department) lawyers who have lived with it for a decade, to comprehend all of the changes this proposed code would make in federal criminal law." Yet, from that admission, the newspaper went on to argue for passage of a bill that it finds almost incomprehensible.

The New York Times attacked the House subcommittee's analysis as "a cop-out on crime," an evaluation that reduces a momentous issue to a trivial level. The present form of the revision of federal criminal law would profoundly alter the relationship between the federal government and the states, and between the American people and the federal government.

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), who opposes the legislation, says it would "tip the delicate balance of police power in our nation too much in the direction of the federal government." That observation was a diplomatic attempt to state a hard truth in soft terms.

The code represents a massive invasion of federal criminal power into areas traditionally left to the states. In testimony before the House subcommittee, Prof. John Quigley of Ohio State Law School estimated that, under the bill, the annual criminal caseload of federal courts, now numbering 40,000, would increase more than five times. This would bring about a tremendous expansion in the apparatus of the federal criminal-justice system, including the FBI.

The significance of this vast extension of federal jurisdiction would be difficult to exaggerate. No longer would there be a "delicate balance" between state and federal police authority. Federal power would predominate.

In most fundamental way, the proposed code would reverse the relationship between government and American citizens. In our democracy, through the First Amendment that guarantees freedom of information, the government is kept under the watchful eye of the people. Under the code, as approved by the Senate, the government would become the watchful censor over the political activities of the people.

How did this come about in a measure that began as a well-intended effort by a national commission to rationalize a jumble of federal laws accumulated over nearly 200 years?

The commission's work started under President Lyndon B. Johnson's administration, fell into the hands of Richard M. Nixon's administration, which was dominated, even during the peak of its power after the 1972 election, by a siege mentality.

What emerged was legislation that was authoritarian in tone and substance, and whose guiding principle was the implicit assertion of the need to protect the government from its domestic enemies—the people.

During the uproar over Watergate, the proposed code, like nearly everything else, was overtaken and submerged in the news of the dramatic, day-by-day developments

that finally led to the ouster of President Nixon. But the legislation, which escaped the attention of most of the public, was not forgotten by its sponsors, nor by the Justice Department's team of lawyers who drafted the bill.

When the measure surfaced, as Senate Bill 1 in Gerald R. Ford's administration, the public finally became aware of its significance. Even proponents of the S 1 version have now admitted that it was an atrocity. It would have whittled away First Amendment freedoms, undercut Fifth Amendment protections and, in sum, enhanced the power of government, and diminished America's system of individual rights. It would have enabled the government to insulate itself from effective political criticism.

Yet a reform of the criminal code, a tedious task involving the rewriting and codifying of some 3,000 criminal offenses, was an appealing idea. Everybody agreed that, if not imperative, the revision of the code was worthwhile.

After the disaster of S 1, an immediate salvage effort was launched, with the technical assistance of the Justice Department squad that had continued to draft and redraft the bill through three administrations.

What finally emerged was S 1437 in the Senate and the companion bill in the House, and the new measure was hailed as a "masterful compromise" between liberal and conservative senators who otherwise could not agree on the time of day.

The compromise does represent an advance over S 1, but if the new version had been drafted in the dark it hardly could have failed to be an improvement over its predecessor, which was a carefully designed assault on individual freedoms.

Several improvements in the current draft should be noted.

Judges would be barred from prosecuting a news organization for violating a court-issued gag order, if the order subsequently were held unconstitutional. As the situation now stands, a news reporter can be punished for violating an order that is later declared invalid.

The so-called Nuremberg defense for public officials accused of law violations has been dropped. The old bill would have allowed them the defense of claiming that their lawless actions were committed in behalf of national security.

The new version would repeal the Smith Act, which made it a criminal offense to talk about the overthrow of the government by force.

Such gains, and some others, are not to be minimized, but to say that these changes justify enacting this legislation is to overlook numerous other statutes that lay a heavy burden on all forms of political expression.

Thomas I. Emerson, professor emeritus, Yale law school, comes to the conclusion that this bill "retains a large number of provisions which individually and in totality are gravely detrimental to the American system of individual rights."

Though enumerating them may be somewhat less exciting than reviewing a Rapid Transit District bus schedule, they demand close study because they give the government widely expanded power over the actions of American citizens.

Section 1301 (Obstructing a Government Function by Fraud) could be used by the government to impose censorship on government information. It would be a bar to prosecution that the "offense was committed solely for the purpose of disseminating information to the public." But the use of the word "solely" would virtually wipe out the protection if a jury could detect the presence of any other motive.

Section 1311 (Hindering Law Enforcement) would provide that a person was guilty of

an offense if he "interferes with, hinders, delays or prevents the discovery, apprehension" of a person charged with a crime "by engaging in conduct by which he knowingly conceals the other person or his identity." This provision could be used against a news reporter who refused to disclose his files to the government, or destroyed them to protect a confidential source.

Section 1331 (Criminal Contempt) would create an offense of not only disobeying a court order but "resisting" such an order. This term could be interpreted to include mere speech. News organizations would be exempt under certain conditions, as we noted, but other worms of expression would be subject to the authority of a judge.

There are many other aspects in this massive revision of criminal law that reflect the legacy of the Nixon years.

Section 1343 (Making a False Statement) says that a person is guilty of a crime if, "in a government matter," he knowingly makes "a material oral statement that is false" to a law-enforcement officer or to an official assigned "investigative responsibility." A mere disagreement between a citizen and a law-enforcement agent could subject the citizen to federal prosecution, and the outcome could depend on one man's word against another. Moreover, the offense would extend beyond a statement of fact, because it would include "a declaration of representation of opinion, belief or other state of mind."

Present law on false oral statements generally has been limited to false statements in the content of a quasijudicial proceeding, or in a situation where one person falsely tried to implicate another in a crime.

Several sections of the code would impose greater control on the flow of information from inside the government to the public. While national-security matters have to be guarded, and some information affecting the privacy of individuals should be protected, a democracy thrives on information, and withers when information is cut off.

The sweep and magnitude of the proposed reform is ominously impressive. If the code is approved in its present form, the weight of federal criminal law will be felt in every corner of the land.

Section 1831, for example, would extend federal jurisdiction over riots to any incident involving the movement of a person across state lines. A "riot" is defined as a public disturbance that includes as few as 10 persons. As one critic has said, the code would come close to converting the federal judiciary into courts of general criminal jurisdiction.

The reform of the entire body of federal criminal law is a logical approach—on paper. In reality, it is not. It is just too vast, too complicated for Congress to swallow at one time.

When the bill was perfunctorily debated a few months ago in the Senate, Sen. James B. Allen (D-Ala.) said, "There aren't five senators . . . who have any idea what's going on . . ." Sen. James A. McClure (R-Ida.) said the legislation had "become a law unto itself, a massive re-creation whose full implications are known only by its prosecutorial draftsmen (in the Justice Department) . . ."

The cautious position taken by Rep. James R. Mann (D-S.C.), the chairman of the House Judiciary subcommittee, is fully justified. He wants to limit his committee's work to the consideration of obsolete laws and some improvements in sentencing procedures.

Step by cautious step is the way to proceed on legislation that goes to the heart of our system of justice and affects the fundamental freedoms of the American people. ●

GREGORY WITTINE: UNPARALLELED COURAGE AND DETERMINATION

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a record of personal courage and determination in overcoming handicaps that is unparalleled in my experience. It is the record of Gregory J. Wittine, 22, of Baldwin, Nassau County, N.Y., who, on June 9 will receive the Eagle Scout award in a Court of Honor convened at the Cerebral Palsy Treatment and Rehabilitation Center, Roosevelt, N.Y.

We all know the rank of Eagle Scout is not easy to attain. Only 1 percent of all the millions of boys who enter scouting achieve that pinnacle of scouting. But Gregory Wittine faced even greater odds. He is so severely afflicted with cerebral palsy that he is unable to speak or walk, and has very limited use of his hands. He can communicate with others only by using an alphabet board on which he points to letters, laboriously spelling out his thoughts, letter by letter. To move about he must use a wheel chair.

You might well wonder how anyone with Gregg's handicap could dare to even think about winning the Eagle Scout award. But not only did Greg dream that impossible dream—with an unconquerable spirit of determination and perseverance, he set out to achieve that goal. From the time he entered scouting, Greg was sure that he would one day be an Eagle Scout.

Slowly, but methodically, he worked his way up through the ranks as a Tenderfoot, Second Class, First Class, Star Scout, and Life Scout. Each rank was achieved through effort and patience that would seem insurmountable to the average person. Because of his handicap, each step took far longer than usual. But the attainment of each higher rank only spurred Greg on to the challenge of realizing his goal to be an Eagle Scout.

Some of those challenges were unbelievably difficult. One merit badge Greg earned, for instance, required him to hike 10 miles. Greg crawled for 1 mile on his hands and knees, and was only persuaded to get back to his wheelchair after his knees were badly cut and bruised. Then he wheeled himself the remaining 9 miles.

When merit badges involved tests of knowledge, Greg spelled out his answers letter by letter on his alphabet board. Each merit badge required extra time and effort on Greg's part. But no matter how difficult the task, Greg held to his impossible dream. He never gave up. Merit badge by merit badge, Greg continued to climb higher in scouting ranks. Then came the magic moment. Greg won his 24th merit badge, and won approval from the District Council's Eagle Scout Review Board. He was told he had real-

ized his dream, and would be awarded the Eagle Scout rank.

Then, a final obstacle appeared unexpectedly which almost dashed Greg's hopes. The National Boy Scout Council at North Brunswick, N.J., refused to approve the award. The council acknowledged that Greg had met all the requirements, save one. The council said its rules permitted only those who had not reached the age of 18 to become Eagle Scouts. Greg was now 22.

The decision outraged Greg's many supporters and friends. His Scoutmaster Richard Golden, members of the Merroque District Eaglescout Review Board, Bernard Greenbaum and Max Kleinman, Senators and Members of Congress, were among those who deluged the National Scout Council with letters demanding reconsideration of Greg's case. The national press picked up the story. Early in May, the Boy Scout National Executive Committee met and decided to change its rules to permit persons with severe physical handicap to remain in Scouting past the age of 18, and to continue to advance in rank past that age if other qualifications were met. Furthermore, the committee made the rules change retroactive, so that Gregory Wittine could become an Eagle Scout. And on June 9, Greg will receive his long-sought award.

But in the minds of his friends and supporters, Gregory Wittine has achieved far more than the rank of Eagle Scout, impressive as that personal honor is. He has won a significant national recognition for the abilities of the severely handicapped. And, perhaps his greatest achievement, Greg has given each of us an invaluable example of the inexhaustible possibilities of human accomplishment, if only we have the desire, the courage, and the will to persevere.

Mr. Speaker, I will long remember the answer Greg gave when asked by a reporter what message he might have for others who have dreams, but face severe obstacles in achieving them. Slowly, letter by letter, Greg spelled out, "Keep Trying."

Mr. Speaker, we owe Gregory Wittine a debt of gratitude for the way he kept trying, and in so doing provided all of us with a shining example of the possibilities that lie within reach of the unconquerable human spirit. An example so compelling that it helped persuade the National Boy Scout Council to change its rules so that other handicapped Scouts will be encouraged in their efforts to follow the very difficult path Greg blazed for them.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LAMAR GUDGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 19, 1978, I was unavoidably absent from the House. Had I been pres-

ent, I would have voted on matters before the House as follows:

"Nay" on rollcall No. 339, on a motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 39, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act "nay" on rollcall No. 338, an amendment that continues minerals assessments provisions, and requires the President to submit a proposal to Congress by October 1, 1981, for a procedure of evaluating applications by individuals wishing to carry our mineral exploration or extraction on conservation system lands; and "yes" on rollcall No. 340, final passage of H.R. 39. I was paired with Mr. HAGEDORN on rollcall No. 339 and with Mr. CONYERS on rollcall No. 340.●

MOROZ: NO LAWBREAKER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues on a recent project in Philadelphia which demonstrates how various parts of our community can work together to successfully focus public attention on the denial of human rights abroad.

Several weeks ago, members of the Ukrainian community in Philadelphia staged a march to honor Valentyn Moroz, who has spent the past 13 years in a Soviet prison because he challenged the authority of the Soviet system by campaigning for Ukrainian rights.

The Philadelphia march was important not only because it expressed support for a courageous man who symbolizes man's hope for freedom; it was important also because it was the latest of several examples of Ukrainian-Jewish cooperation on the issue of human rights.

A recent commentary in the Philadelphia Bulletin explains the significance of this action. I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues. It is an excellent description of how the people of Philadelphia are working together to remind all of us of our obligation to speak out whenever human rights are trampled.

UKRAINIANS ON THE MARCH

(By Rosamunde Ginsburg)

Although it will take weeks before news of it reaches Valentyn Moroz via the grapevine in the Soviet Union's Mordovia Labor Camp, the Philadelphia Ukrainian community will celebrate his 42nd birthday tomorrow. The Committee for the Defense of Valentyn Moroz, a Ukrainian historian and political prisoner, plans a parade in his honor that will begin at 2 P.M. at Independence Hall and end at the Art Museum.

Moroz is no lawbreaker as we know the term. Yet he has been behind bars for the past 13 years, except for nine months between his first and second convictions. Nor is he a violent person who might harm himself or others. Yet he was a "patient" for almost two of those 13 years at the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry. This is in line with Russia's policy of declaring its dis-

sidents insane and sentencing them to indefinite terms at such institutions.

Moroz' first arrest was for having in his possession underground literature and Soviet-banned foreign publications. The second was for writing essays decrying the arbitrary nature of Soviet law and the Kremlin-directed destruction of Ukrainian culture.

In jail at the notorious Vladimir Prison, Moroz developed serious illnesses, was drugged and was given food contaminated with chemicals. There, also, he was badly hurt in an attack by other prisoners and later placed in solitary confinement for almost two years. He then undertook a four-and-a-half month hunger strike, trying to persuade the authorities to transfer him to a labor camp. They did so only after remanding him to the psychiatric hospital for nearly two years.

Defense Committee Chairperson Ulana Mazurkevich says, "We hope that all of the pressures we are bringing to bear, of which the parade is just one, will help Moroz gain his freedom. Making him a thorn in the side of the USSR just might hasten his release."

Ms. Mazurkevich recently returned from Washington where she met with Senators Richard Schweiker (R-Pa.) and Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), who have promised to write to Moroz pledging their support.

"Another aim," she emphasized, "is to call attention to the thousands of other political prisoners in the USSR." According to Soviet dissidents, at least 50 percent of these are Ukrainian. The reason for this disproportionately high number, they feel, is that Moscow is trying to eradicate the nationalist, or separatist, movement in the Ukraine.

This desire for self-determination goes back 300 years. Events such as the death-by-starvation of millions during the government-created famine of the 1930s served to intensify this yearning. The killing of Ukrainian culture—ethnocide—is far more subtle and continues to this day.

Saturday's parade is receiving support from members of the Jewish community. The Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry has adopted the non-Jewish Moroz as one of its "prisoners of conscience" for whom it has special concern.

This is significant in light of the fact that, historically, there has been anti-Semitism in the Ukraine. But, according to the Ukrainian Held, an underground journal written there, "Ukrainian Nationalism has not only purged itself of any such taint, but has actually come to regard the Jewish population with special friendship, as fellow-sufferers from the same oppression." Witness the trial of the Jewish doctor, Mikhail Shtern, against whom two thousand of his Ukrainian neighbors refused to testify and whose ultimate release they helped to secure. There is now cooperation between the two nationalities even though their goals are different.

The Jews want to leave the USSR. With this, the Russians have less of a problem because there is no homeland within their borders for Jews. (Even so, they have allowed only about 140,000 to emigrate since 1970.) With the Ukrainians, it is a different story. To allow secession and the formation of an independent nation, even though this is "guaranteed" by Article 72 of the Soviet constitution, would threaten the leadership with intolerable internal dissent.

So, Valentyn Moroz, a symbol of the Ukrainian separatist movement, becomes also the symbol of a new alliance between two peoples that have forged their collective zeal and resources into a weapon of heightened effectiveness. It is another triumph for the cause of human rights. ●

PROPERTY TAXES

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have let me know that they are very much aware that there is a hotly debated tax measure on California's June 6 primary ballot. This measure, the Jarvis-Gann initiative, would limit property taxes to 1 percent of market value and require a two-thirds vote of both houses of the State legislature for new taxes. Jarvis-Gann would restrain increases in State spending and make it difficult to raise tax rates.

We have States in our Union that operate with low tax rates. An article which appeared in the May 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal describes the growing attraction of the State of New Hampshire, which manages its affairs without an income or sales tax. They do not provide all the services that are found in big spending States, but many have found that they are better off without these Government programs. The article tells about a Californian who moved his family to New Hampshire and figures he is saving thousands of dollars, because of the lack of a State sales and income tax. New Hampshire may very well be, as its Governor describes it:

... one of the last strongholds of the free enterprise system.

With the passage of Jarvis-Gann, Californians may decide to follow in the footsteps of New Hampshire.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

NORTHERN NIRVANA—"NEW" NEW HAMPSHIRE FINDS THAT LOW TAXES HELP TO FUEL ECONOMY

(By David Gumpert)

MERRIMACK, N.H.—Until a year ago, Richard Hale was enjoying the California good life. The 40-year-old executive lived with his wife and two children in a nine-room hillside house, surrounded by a dozen varieties of fruit trees, outside San Jose. During his free time, he sailed in San Francisco Bay.

But after 13 years in California, the good life wore thin. Growing congestion was making it "increasingly difficult to commune with nature," Mr. Hale says.

So a year ago, when he got an offer to help run a microwave-parts company in southern New Hampshire somewhat larger than a similar firm he was running in California, he grabbed it. He hasn't been disappointed. Mr. Hale bought the same size house he had in California for half the proceeds of his old house. And he figures he is saving thousands of dollars annually because New Hampshire has neither the income tax nor the sales tax California has.

Mr. Hale continues to sail during the summer, and he has taken up ice boating in the winter. The Merrimack area, he observes, seems "very similar to San Jose 10 to 15 year ago." Even if he wanted to return West, he says, "I'd probably have difficulty getting my family back to California."

NORTHERN "SUN BELT"

Not too long ago, comparing California and New Hampshire would have seemed preposterous. Yet today, apart from the obvious differences in size and climate, New Hamp-

shire appears to many to be offering attractions similar to those California once offered. And it is experiencing a boom similar to that in some Sun Belt states.

In the last five years, 225 companies either have opened their first plants in the state or have moved their corporate headquarters here, creating more than 14,000 jobs. Many companies have come from neighboring Massachusetts; others have come from farther away. As one prominent example, in 1974, Wheelabrator-Frye Inc., a maker of engineering and specialty products, with annual revenues of \$482 million, moved its corporate headquarters to Hampton, N.H., from New York.

The new firms have helped fuel a population spurt that has made New Hampshire one of the nation's fastest-growing states. Since 1970, the state's population has increased by 15%, more than double the 6.4% national rate and even more than California's 9.6%. The Granite State's population growth has been exceeded by a few Sun Belt and Mountain states, but east of the Mississippi River only Florida has grown faster. Those who have come here have had little trouble finding work because New Hampshire's unemployment rate hovers around an enviable 3%.

THE PRICE OF GROWTH

But a growing and increasingly vocal minority in the state is contending that New Hampshire is paying a steep price for its fast growth. These critics argue that because the state has neither an income nor a sales tax (it is the only state to lack both), it can't provide the social services taken for granted elsewhere. For instance, the state ranks 50th in its per-capita contribution to education; thus, schools don't have kindergartens and parents of handicapped children must pay much of their children's education costs. Nor does the state operate a law school or a medical school.

But Gov. Meldrim Thomson, Jr., has little sympathy with those who would like to see the state doing more. "We have too many in the legislature who don't want to run the state as a business but as a charitable institution," he says.

Certainly, New Hampshire would appear to be a well-run "business." It has balanced books and is the only state in New England with a Moody's triple-A bond rating. State revenues come mainly from an 8% business profits tax and from levies on liquor, cigarettes and horse racing. State-owned liquor stores have the region's lowest prices and are purposely located near neighboring state borders.

"There's a lot of attraction up there," says James Howell, chief economist for First National Bank of Boston. And Keith Wheelock, president of Fantus Co., a corporate consulting firm, credits New Hampshire with being "aggressive in taking advantage of its assets."

The bulk of growth has occurred in New Hampshire's southernmost section, which is convenient to Boston and to scenic mountain and ocean areas. This area, known locally as the "golden triangle," is bounded by Salem and Nashua in the south and Manchester in the north. Although it contains under 4% of the state's land area, it has more than 30% of the state's 849,000 people and is becoming something of a boom area.

PLANTS ON A HANDSHAKE

Housing prices have soared. Motel rooms during the week are nearly impossible to get without making reservations weeks in advance. The area's leading industrial developer, Samuel Tamposi, builds plants and office buildings for customers "on a handshake." He says confidently, "If they won't take (the plants), someone else will."

This expansion has come despite an exodus since World War II of the textile and

shoe and leather firms that once formed much of New England's industrial base. As recently as 1968, shoe and leather companies employed 20,000 New Hampshire workers. Now they employ only about 11,000.

The state has more than made up these losses by attracting computer, electronics and other high-technology companies. The first substantial success in attracting new business came in 1971 when New Hampshire eliminated its cumbersome tax on inventories and machinery and equipment and substituted the flat tax on net operating profits. The new levy gave New Hampshire "an element of tax certainty" that it didn't have before, says Paul Guilderson, director of the state's industrial development office.

New businesses also have been attracted to New Hampshire because the state's corporate atmosphere is so hospitable. There is no land-use law as in neighboring Vermont, and a pro-business attitude is fostered by the state's two most influential public figures, Gov. Thomson and William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester Union Leader, the only state-wide paper in New Hampshire.

Gov. Thomson says he works hard at personally trying to persuade businessmen to relocate in New Hampshire. Once they arrive, he says, he tries to make them feel comfortable. "I'm as busy cutting ribbons as many politicians are kissing babies," he says.

Indeed, as Gov. Thomson sees it, New Hampshire is an island of stability in a sea of turbulence. "We may be one of the last strongholds of the free enterprise system," he says. "New Hampshire is what America was." He fights hard to maintain the status quo: When a couple covered up the state's official motto, "Live free or die," on their auto license plates, he unsuccessfully fought them up to the U.S. Supreme Court.

But the governor's critics maintain that his fiscal conservatism is false economy. One result of not having sales or income taxes is a heavy property-tax burden. The bulk of education costs and costs normally assumed by states, such as judges' salaries, financing of nursing homes for the indigent and certain welfare payments, come from property taxes.

"We have a mythology in New Hampshire that because we don't have an income or sales tax, it's cheaper to live here," says George B. Roberts, a Republican who is speaker of the state's house of representatives. He argues that if the state were providing services that most other states provide, its annual budget would be about 50% larger than the current \$528 million. "The social costs for things not done in New Hampshire have yet to be reaped," he warns.

Recently, the state has been taken to task for allegedly neglecting problems. A study done for the state legislature earlier this year argued that New Hampshire has probably identified only half the handicapped children "that would be expected on the basis of most research on the prevalence of handicapping conditions." And a class action suit was filed in February in a U.S. district court in Concord charging that children who have been identified as handicapped aren't getting the financial aid they are entitled to for special education.

The state and local communities also are charged with repeatedly trying to wriggle out of making legitimate welfare payments. New Hampshire legal-aid lawyers have filed at least 10 suits in federal court and countless others in state courts over the past four years to obtain welfare payments for indigent residents, says Charles Burkam, director of community education for the legal-aid service.

SCHOOL SCORES CITED

Gov. Thomson defends the state's current approach to services. He contends that the state's low education contribution is "good" because it means local community contribu-

tions are most crucial and "people are more apt to watch their money when it's spent closer to home." As evidence that his state's education system is working well, he points to a recent survey of scholastic-aptitude test results that showed New Hampshire students with higher scores than both the New England and the national averages.

Besides such spending issues, there also has been mounting concern around the state that perhaps the growth is happening too fast. Several dozen towns in southern New Hampshire have enacted ordinances designed to limit new housing construction in an effort to stave off service and budget demands.

Some businessmen are beginning to grumble that with the unemployment rate so low, they can't find the skilled labor they need and turnover is too high. For example, Centronics Data Computer Corp., a maker of computer printers, says its turnover has doubled to more than 30% annually since the company was founded in Hudson, N.H., nine years ago. "Almost anyone who works for us can have another job within 24 hours," says Robert Howard, president. "It's a very unhealthy situation for us and other companies."

State industrial-development officials say they are pushing hard to persuade out-of-state businesses wishing to relocate in New Hampshire to go north of the golden triangle. Also, at least three committees have been established in recent months, one by the governor, another by the legislature and a third by businessmen and civic leaders, to more closely monitor and possibly regulate the fast growth. "We realize we have a good thing going, and we want to keep it," says John Sununu, chairman of a governor's committee on New Hampshire's future.

TAKING THE PLEDGE

But changes in New Hampshire's way of doing things seem unlikely in the near future. Gov. Thomson, a Republican, is expected to run for reelection in the fall. Two Democrats who are challenging him already have "taken the pledge," political shorthand for promising not to propose new taxes. And a state official says he doesn't anticipate any regulation of the state's growth because "the primary thrust has been for local control."

To many executives who have relocated companies and plants in New Hampshire, the state is fine the way it is and certainly a big improvement over previous locations. Take Kollsman Instrument Co., a Sun Chemical Co. division that makes altimeters. For most of the early 1970s the company operated on Long Island, N.Y., at break-even point or a loss. High union wage rates and cumbersome union rules that hurt productivity were a big drain on finances, says Fred Gagnon, Kollsman's general manager.

In 1975, Kollsman closed its Long Island operations and moved to Merrimack, N.H. Today, without a union to contend with, wages are 17% to 18% lower than on Long Island, and productivity is "nearly double what it was," Mr. Gagnon says. Last year Kollsman had \$43 million of sales with 1,000 employees, compared with \$35 million of sales with 1,500 employees during the last year on Long Island. Most important, Kollsman is today turning a healthy profit, he says.

Similarly, when Mass Machine & Stamping Co., a \$4-million-a-year maker of flat washers, wanted to move to larger quarters from its Boston headquarters 2½ years ago, it discovered that "we just couldn't afford real estate in the Boston area," says Richard Theurer, executive vice president. The firm's officers looked in Nashua, N.H., met with Gov. Thomson and found Mr. Tamposi, the developer, who "had a building up here that fit us perfectly" at "substantially" less than anything in Boston, he says. Mr. Theurer says his firm couldn't be happier. His only fear is that so many others will see how attractive New Hampshire is that the state will be "ruined." ●

NEW YORK'S JUNE SHOWDOWN

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this body will be taking up the New York City Financial Assistance Act of 1978, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, and letter to the editor, by Francis Schanck, which appeared in the May 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

NEW YORK'S JUNE SHOWDOWN

The New York City financial crisis is rapidly building toward a last-minute crunch next month, which seems more and more likely to result in one of two outcomes. Either the city will be forced into the courts to formally recognize its bankruptcy. Or the federal government will open the spending floodgates by handing out blank checks to every band of city hall pols in the country.

At the moment the immediate parties are dancing through an Alphonse and Gaston fairytale. The municipal unions don't want to settle their wage negotiations until they learn how much money the federal Treasury is willing to throw in the pot, and Secretary Blumenthal won't say how much until there's a labor settlement. The state legislature is toying and froing on further state guarantees for more bond issues by the Municipal Assistance Corporation, while MAC says it can't use existing authority until the matter is settled. Union pension fund trustees hint that they won't make the bond purchases they've already promised if the whole house of cards is going to collapse anyway after current federal loans are repaid June 30. If the federal government is to do anything, new legislation will be necessary, and Sen. Proxmire, who heads the relevant Senate committee, has just postponed scheduled hearings, saying that other parties haven't fulfilled their commitments to get their affairs in order first.

The whole spectacle is based on the heady premise that New York's problem is a financing problem, that the essential task is to arrange the pieces of a complicated financial puzzle into a new infusion of loans. But the loan puzzle would be no problem if there were any real likelihood that the loans will ever be repaid. The doctors are concocting a patent medicine cure for anemia, but the patient has a severed artery. The fuss about financing only serves to obscure reality. New York's problem is a budget problem. The essential task is to stop spending more than it takes in.

This task New York's pols have steadfastly refused to face. The principal budget-cutting tool has been labor force attrition, which succeeded in reducing payroll numbers without reducing payroll costs. A billion dollar infusion of additional federal aid in programs like CETA has served to reduce the budget deficit, but it continues to run about \$1 billion a year, not counting \$700 million over two years the city has offered in the current labor negotiations.

Even today the city refuses to face up to fundamental decisions about what services it can afford to offer. After three years of "financial emergency" it still operates a municipal broadcasting system. It still operates a huge city hospital system despite a surplus of beds. It hasn't even begun to talk about the long-term blight it visits on itself by the huge middle-class subsidy of rent control.

The virtue of a formal bankruptcy would be to get reality on the table. No doubt it would result in a severe crisis, with work

stoppages, horrendous litigation, emergency legislation in Washington and Albany and so on. But the crisis would force some kind of decision on what can and cannot be afforded. The most sophisticated of New York's financial nursemaids have in effect been trying to arrange a bankruptcy by another name, hoping that conditions on federal loans would substitute for a bankruptcy crisis in forcing fundamental decisions. This has not worked; the result has been only to prolong the illusion and no doubt intensify the eventual misery.

This time the city may very well stumble into bankruptcy from the sheer complexity of the rescue effort, for the complexity diffuses away from any one or few individuals the political responsibility for a bankruptcy decision. On the other hand, the administration seems increasingly intent on redeeming the President's campaign promise to bail out the city no matter what. The crunch of next month's crisis will no doubt bring forth hasty and gimmicky legislative proposals, with "guarantees" and "loans" to hide a de facto federal subsidy for the city's feckless ways.

What Congress will have to remember is not complex, but simple: New York is returning to the trough a second time, that if it is fed again it will be back a third time and a fourth. And that as city halls everywhere see the lesson, New York will only be the head of the line.

DO NOT BAIL OUT THE BIG APPLE

If W. Bernard Richland had done some research into the history of municipal defaults in this century I doubt if he would have written "Why Bankruptcy Won't Cure the Big Apple" (May 4). Even a cursory review of what actually happened in the Thirties to the city of Detroit, the state of Arkansas and other political entities that defaulted in the Depression would not support his suicide scenario.

My relatively unheard voice was one of those other than The Wall Street Journal raised in 1975 recommending no federal rescue for New York City. As one who also was active in municipal finance during the Thirties, I read with considerable dismay the newest repetition of the Felix Rohatyn "call out the troops" theme. There is no evidence to support the assumption that basic governmental services stop when cities default. The seemingly general acceptance of this concept expressed by Mr. Richland as "no food, no coal, no oil, no gasoline for police cars, fire engines . . . no nothing" has been a principal contributing cause to the disastrous developments of the past three years.

In the Thirties when cities could not pay the interest or principal on their bonds, in most cases, bondholders' protective committees were formed. Representatives of the bondholders met with city officials and worked out a practical program based on the realities. Obviously it is to the bondholders' long term interests to have the city become again a healthy community as rapidly as possible. This means that cash must be found to maintain essential services and, as far as I know, no bondholders' committees ever held otherwise. Bondholders usually were willing, for an agreed upon period, to either eliminate or accept reduced interest payments on their bonds and extend maturities.

What happened in New York City's 1975 moratorium—another name for default—was just the opposite. Through the creation of the Municipal Assistance Corporation, some \$5 billion of New York City's maturing debt has been refunded at substantially increased interest rates.

It seems to me by far the greatest cost is, at best, a paralyzing and, at worst, a lethal blow to state sovereignty and local autonomy. The example for other states and

municipalities, if New York is rescued by the federal government, to go thou and do likewise is inescapable. Why risk voter displeasure by balancing budgets or prudently managing community affairs when profligacy pays so well?

All defaults are sad. When any individual or group of individuals is unable to meet its commitments someone gets hurt. Usually, and New York is certainly not an exception, efforts to prevent or to postpone the inevitable add to the total anguish. The brains which have been combining to avoid bankruptcy should be employed in using this powerful, if unpopular corrective device. Investors, over recent years, who bought New York and Big Mac bonds received yields well in excess of other, good quality, tax exempts. By reaching for those yields investors accepted the risks inherent in those bonds. How can investors be persuaded to buy top quality bonds at AAA yields if high risk bonds are to be rescued by the federal government?

FRANCIS R. SCHANCK,
Senior Partner, Bacon, Whipple & Co.
CHICAGO. ●

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL STEEL CAUCUS: QUARTERLY STATEMENT OF EXPENSES AND FUND BALANCE

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1978, the executive committee of the Congressional Steel Caucus approved the quarterly financial report of the caucus as of March 31, 1978. In accordance with executive committee order No. 1, I am respectfully submitting herewith the financial report for insertion into the RECORD. Henceforth, the Congressional Steel Caucus will make this information available to the full House of Representatives on a quarterly basis. The report is as follows:

Quarterly Report—Statement of expenses and fund balance statement

(House of Representatives, Congressional Steel Caucus, Statement of Expenses, March 1978)

Salaries	\$3,000.00
Travel	0
Stationery	235.55
Telephone	199.11
Publications	53.53
Equipment	85.01
Miscellaneous	0

Total expenses..... 3,574.20
(House of Representatives, Congressional Steel Caucus, Fund Balance Statement)

Total revenues (clerk hire and membership dues)..... \$11,350.00

Less expenses:	
January 1978.....	0
February 1978.....	2,000.00
March 1978.....	3,574.20

Total caucus expenses..... 5,574.20

Unexpended revenues..... 5,775.80

CONGRESSIONAL STEEL CAUCUS MEMBERS WHO HAVE PAID DUES AS OF MARCH 31, 1978

Joseph M. Gaydos, John F. Seiberling, Tom Bevill, Douglas Walgren, W. C. "Dan" Daniel, Richard H. Ichord, C. W. "Bill"

Young, Thomas N. Kindness, Robert S. Walker, Gus Yatron, Edward W. Pattison, Robert Duncan, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Barbara A. Mikulski, Charles J. Carney, Allen E. Ertel, Frank E. Evans, Benjamin A. Gilman, Donald J. Mitchell, Robert H. Mollohan, Donald J. Pease, and Tom Rallsback.

Robert A. Roe, Clarence D. Long, William F. Walsh, James Weaver, David W. Evans, John H. Dent, Michael O. Myers, John J. Cavanaugh, E. Thomas Coleman, Phillip E. Ruppe, E. G. "Bud" Shuster, Morgan F. Murphy, James L. Oberstar, Henry J. Nowak, Edward J. Patten, Frank Annunzio, Morris K. Udall, Austin J. Murphy, John P. Murtha, John W. Jenrette, Jr., Gary A. Myers, and James M. Hanley.

Ralph S. Regula, Stanley N. Lundine, Martin A. Russo, Robert H. Michel, Joseph P. Addabbo, Samuel S. Stratton, George E. Brown, Jr., Leo C. Zeferetti, James R. Mann, Robert McClory, Robert C. McEwen, Gunn McKay, Marc L. Marks, John M. Murphy, Thomas A. Luken, Douglas Applegate, Carl D. Pursell, and Mary Rose Oaker. ●

REPORT ON CHINA BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEHMAN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most respected Members of the House of Representatives is our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM LEHMAN of Florida.

Congressman LEHMAN returned recently from a trip that he and several other Members of the House and Senate made to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. LEHMAN wrote an excellent report on his visit to that country and I believe that other Members will read with interest his observations and I insert Mr. LEHMAN's report at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 2, 1978.

DEAR FRIENDS: One morning in mid-March, our Congressional Office received a call from the White House asking me to accompany a mission to Mainland China.

The relationship between the United States, the world's most productive nation, and China, the world's most populous nation, will be important in determining the future peace and well-being of the world. I was pleased to have this rare opportunity to learn first-hand about China, where a new leadership came to power in 1976 after the death of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, and to be able to share my observations and impressions of China with the people of the 13th Congressional District.

Later that day at the White House, I met with the other members of our delegation (three other House members and two Senators, including Florida Senator Lawton Chiles), for the first briefing session of what became an intensive course in the politics, society and economy of Mainland China.

On March 22, the evening before departure, we experienced our first combination of communism and cuisine at the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) Liaison Office in Washington. We were served delicious food in a room decorated with wall murals of poems written in Chinese calligraphy in Chairman Mao's own hand.

After a twenty-hour flight, we disembarked at Shanghai International Airport. Our group

was cordially welcomed to China with the customary tea reception by the Deputy Director of the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the Shanghai Revolutionary Committee, Li Chuen, and other PRC officials.

"It is fitting," our host remarked, "that your journey begins in the very city where President Nixon and Premier Chou En-lai issued the Shanghai Communique in 1972" which restored ties between the U.S. and Mainland China.

Two hours later, it was "wheels up" again on a Civil Aviation Administration of China (CAAC) plane to Peking. During the following twelve days, we visited many different cities, towns and villages as we logged over 30 hours of train travel and covered more than 500 kilometers by car and bus.

We drank tea with high government officials in the magnificent Great Hall of the People and with poor peasants in their dirt-floor huts. We toured factories that make diesel engines and those that produce porcelain. We saw huge oil refineries in operation and under construction. We visited classrooms for village children and day care centres in industrial areas. A ballet school performed for us and a medical school showed us the teaching of both traditional Chinese and modern Western medicine. We talked with farm laborers and farm commune brigade leaders, with factory workers and factory managers, with teachers and professors, and with city officials and civil servants.

DIPLOMACY AND POLITICS

The number one issue, we were constantly reminded, was normalization of relations between the U.S. and Mainland China. To the Chinese this means U.S. recognition of "one China", requiring the severing of diplomatic ties with Taiwan as a condition for establishing full diplomatic relations with Peking. We were often told that Taiwan is as much a part of China as Long Island is a part of the U.S.

The Chinese view Russia as their major external threat and always refer to their northern neighbor as "the Polar Bear." We were repeatedly warned that the U.S. must contain Soviet expansionism. A high Chinese official told us that the 30-year Chinese-Soviet mutual assistance treaty is a meaningless piece of paper that will not be renewed when it expires in 1980.

We acquired most of our political impressions in Peking, but found the people outside the capital more concerned with the problems of daily life than with politics and diplomacy. I find similar differences when I leave Washington to return home to South Florida.

INDUSTRY

Industry in China ranges from medieval to modern. There are huge factories, and also men still serving as beasts of burden, pulling heavy carts loaded with steel, wood and other materials through the city streets.

Inside the factories, we were surprised to see men and women working on heavy equipment and machinery without hard hats, safety shoes, goggles or even adequate lighting, the basic safety requirements now mandatory in the U.S.

Under its new leadership, Chinese industry has begun to adopt such capitalistic customs as incentive pay and piece-work wages. Foreign trade is also being expanded. Surprisingly, however, the Chinese communists are very financially conservative and refuse to use the foreign bank credits which they have been offered. They believe in a pay-as-you-go economy.

The top salary for an industrial worker is about \$60 a month, and women workers receive equal pay with men. One urban industrial family we met paid only \$3 a month for rent, which is subsidized, \$4 to \$5 a month for electricity and cooking gas, which are not subsidized, and \$10 for a month's

supply of rice, which has not increased in price in 20 years.

All the people with whom we spoke work six days a week, but members of the same family may not have the same day off, as factories operate every day with two or three shifts per day. Women workers receive 56 days of maternity leave with full pay, and child care is available at the factory when they return to work.

Workers receive promotions based on productivity, length of service, and, most important of all, political attitudes. Factory workers may retire at 50 and office workers at 55 with 70 percent of their previous salaries.

AGRICULTURE

Fifty kilometers from Tsupo, in Shantung Province, we visited a huge agricultural commune of 30,000 people, divided into work brigades. The commune is self-sufficient and the people seemed adequately fed. Individuals are able to grow their own gardens and to raise fowl, pigs and rabbits.

Since the communists came to power in 1949, the land has been leveled, improved, irrigated and drained. Crops are rotated scientifically. As far as we could see, mechanization on this and other farm communes is limited to drainage and irrigation pumps.

The sight of hundreds and hundreds of blue-clad people working the land by hand without a single machine leaves me with a lasting impression of the current state of Chinese agriculture. Farm machinery is slowly being introduced, however, and the future of farm laborers displaced by these machines may become a problem. China's officials will probably not permit farm mechanization to proceed more rapidly than their ability to absorb displaced farm workers.

TRANSPORTATION

In the major cities, the factories are located within self-contained communities so that people do not have to commute long distances to work. Homes, schools, stores, hospitals and theaters are all built together with the factories. Therefore, in metropolitan areas, bicycles and a few buses serve as the principal means of transportation.

Between cities, nearly everyone travels by train. When our group first arrived at Shanghai airport, we were the only passengers in the terminal. At the end of our journey, when we returned to Shanghai by train, we arrived at midnight and the railroad station was jammed with thousands of people. When our group did travel by plane, the aircraft ranged from modern Russian-made jets to ancient propeller planes of doubtful origin.

The trains are good and run on time. When we had compartments on our trains, they equalled any accommodations I have experienced in the U.S. or Europe. The train meals were of good restaurant quality, but the dining cars were often without heat, and we had to wear our warmest clothing as we ate.

Even the better hotels are not up to Western standards. The rooms are not too clean and toilet facilities are often primitive. With few exceptions, hotels are unheated, leading Rep. Gillis Long (D-La.) to name our hotel in Chi-nan "The Ice Palace." The huge block walls of the Russian-designed "guest house" seemed to retain all the cold of the past winter. Whenever the sun came out in Chi-nan, we ran outside to get warm.

SOCIETY-CULTURE

Because crime is so rare, China is the only country in the world that I have visited where you do not have to lock or even close your hotel room door. In one case, a shop clerk who had accidentally overcharged me the equivalent of about 50¢ tracked me down with great difficulty to make a refund.

There is no tipping in China, and people refuse even token gifts or souvenirs of any monetary value. The only things they would accept were polaroid photos I took of them.

All adults in China dress in two-piece Mao suits of either blue, green or grey. The women wear their hair either short or braided and the men's hair is closely-cropped. The only difference between the dress of soldiers and civilians is metal rather than plastic buttons. Officers are distinguished by four shirt pockets instead of two and by collars with red tabs.

Although adults dress alike, the children are dressed in a variety of bright-colored costumes. The children seem to be happy. We saw hundreds of children during our visit and never once did we hear a child cry.

Public displays of affection are not acceptable. In the whole of China, I saw only one young couple holding hands. As a method of holding down the birth rate, men and women are discouraged from marrying before their late 20's.

The Chinese retain their traditional concern and respect for older people. We saw the elderly automatically allowed to go to the front of the line when people queue up to get on the train.

The Chinese officials showed us the greatest hospitality and served plentiful quantities of delicious food. We even began to get used to the jellyfish, 100-year-old duck eggs, and camel hoof soup, all considered great delicacies. The yogurt was the best I have ever eaten and I found everything delightful except the sea slugs, which the Chinese value for their high protein content.

In the cities and towns, the buildings are a dull grey-brown. There are no birds or grass. In contrast, we saw the exquisite beauty of old China in museums, antique shops and ancient palaces. In Chi-nan, we saw old Buddhist temples and religious caves which had been dug 2,000 years ago. In Peking, we inspected China's modern annual arts and crafts exhibition.

We were apparently the first Americans to visit certain parts of Shantung Province, southeast of Peking. We were so unusual that even in the city of Chi-nan, which has over a million people, we found hundreds waiting when we came out of factories or shops. They were curious to see us and they waved and smiled.

EDUCATION, MEDICINE, AND LAW

Literacy in China is now almost universal. We often saw hundreds of people lined up three and four deep reading the newspapers which are publicly displayed on the sides of buildings. Just think of the future impact a homogeneous society of 900 million people who can read and write would have on the world.

In the public schools, we found joy and high spirits. The textbooks are thin and worn, but the teachers are gifted and dedicated, and the children seemed friendly and outgoing. However, their communist indoctrination begins in nursery school.

Medical care in China is free. Among its unique features are the "barefoot doctors" who take care of 90 percent of people's ailments after only one year of medical training.

High school students who wish to become physicians must first pass a rigorous entrance exam and are then admitted to a five-year medical school. The medical school we visited was not well-equipped by Western standards, but the artificial larynx (voice box) we were shown proved their ability to do very advanced research.

There are no lawyers in China, and there is no formal legal training. The judicial system works through non-adversary proceedings, and the rulings of those who administer justice in China are not subject to independent interpretation.

PROPAGANDA

Constant 1984-style propaganda is part of daily life in Mainland China, and it was

very difficult for us to understand its intensity.

To those now in authority, all current economic, moral and political problems are the result of the Gang of Four, the internal enemy of the people who, we were told, tried to destroy the spirit, the will and the future progress of the country. The Gang of Four was the losing side in the power struggle which broke out after the death of Chairman Mao and Premier Chou En-lai. It included Mao's widow and nephew, who were more radical and anti-intellectual than the present leadership.

We were often given examples of the Gang's effect. The ballet school had no spirit until they "smashed the Gang of Four." Then they had enough spirit to send a group on tour to Canada. The medical school had not been able to progress until, "overcoming their spiritual shackles, they learned well the teachings of Chairman Mao, and smashed the Gang of Four." Even the first words a patient spoke with his new artificial larynx were to praise Chairman Mao, thank Premier Hua, and denounce the Gang of Four. Our group concluded that the members of the Gang of Four were the busiest four people who ever existed.

FUTURE UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

Both America and China would benefit from increased mutual cooperation. The British, Canadians, and Australians already have newsmen in China, and we saw many Japanese businessmen. We should be expanding our exchanges of students, businessmen, reporters and other interested individuals.

The U.S. cannot remain the only major power in the world which does not have full diplomatic relations with Mainland China, but we need not move too fast. China does not produce much that we really need right now. Our present annual trade with China is only about the same as that with Guatemala, but the potential in the future could be very great.

At present, the U.S. Liaison Office in Peking is treated as well, if not better, than the missions of many other countries with full embassies in China. In the absence of formal diplomatic relations, however, we are unable to conclude trade, airline, shipping, consular and other types of intergovernmental agreements which would enable U.S.-China relations to develop beneficially.

Although I support the eventual establishment of formal U.S. diplomatic relations with Mainland China, we must also guarantee that there be no forceable military takeover by China of the people of Taiwan. Taiwan, a nation with strong economic and political ties to the U.S., is presently capable of defending itself against any conventional military threat from China, and Peking is unlikely to use its nuclear weapons against the island.

One could spend a lifetime in China and never know anything about the country. In the intensive program arranged for our group, we were able to absorb a great deal about this vast and puzzling land. From our visit, we learned how much progress China has made in the last thirty years. During the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren, it will join the ranks of the superpowers. We must, therefore, find some way to increase the future understanding and friendship between our two nations.

While we saw many beautiful sights in China, I am sure the most satisfying was at the end of our journey at Shanghai airport. An American air force plane was waiting there with a big red, white and blue flag on its tail. To us it meant "home again to the land of the free."

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM LEHMAN,
Member of Congress. ●

INTERDEPENDENCE AND TIMELY COMPONENT COORDINATION

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978.

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time over the past three decades, the House of Representatives unofficial Philosopher in Residence has produced "mini-essays" which contain great quantities of common sense.

Joe, who has probably known more House Members on a first name basis than any man in history has just produced another fine essay—this one entitled "Interdependence and Timely Component Coordination."

I ask unanimous consent to include his essay as a part of my remarks:

INTERDEPENDENCE AND TIMELY COMPONENT-CO-ORDINATION

Occasionally term selected for director of wide-range task is co-ordinator. Term breathes with potential for progress toward predetermined goals. It is harmonious adjustment of components involved in complex matters, few existing in isolation and composed of separate and related elements. It may be wise to deal with such factors one by one. Human minds grasp most readily single, uncluttered concepts. Still those facets are parts of the whole picture. In a specialized era, all facets have advocates who stress their aims. Competition among them can preclude evaluation of the situation. Then expert co-ordinator with new face and fresh approach may achieve impartial objectivity, difficult to attain by avid contenders.

Two thoughts come to mind. Professional golfers illustrate co-ordination process. When driving ball from first tee, they must co-ordinate every body-component. If any deviate at all, the drive is not good. Or, consider Law School Course. New students often are confused by variety of subjects: evidence, real property, sales and wills. Only in final year do they fall into perspective.

An astute teacher said that big problems merely are a collection of small ones. Solution lies in breaking the giant into its components. That counsel has pertinence now at every stage of human activity—from provincial tasks to international affairs. Certainly it applies to American domestic problems. We live in a world—figuratively and steadily shrinking in size with unlocking of each new secret of nature. Lightning-like rapidity of communication, moreover has produced a constantly-widening awareness of this progress—everywhere.

Just as ideas don't exist in isolation neither do people nor nations. Fortress America is an illusion. We cannot withdraw inside our borders to concentrate on what mistakenly may be considered our own, best interests. With infinite wisdom the Creator scattered material resources—far and wide. There are no natural monopolies, only those made by mankind. Self-sufficiency, too, is illusive. We all need each other for they have something we want. In the common interest of humanity—eventually we must learn to trust others.

Such emphasis-shift from selfishness to altruism—almost challenges human nature itself. Like all changes of magnitude, it will not arrive suddenly. Centuries of deep-rooted jealousy present formidable obstacle to that achievement. It will come gradually. For gradualness—anathema to some people—is a law of nature! Have any of us ever seen growth of grass, beards or fingernails? Yet they go on all the time. Furthermore, in the

Grand Design, diffusing material resources is—a parallel: skills, talents and ability of human individuals. With them we must also strive to cooperate.

Irrespective of title, doesn't every, able executive co-ordinate when reconciling conflicting views? Consultation on all schools of related thought is imperative; and it must be timely i.e., before decision-making. Otherwise, adversaries needlessly may be created! On signing Declaration of Independence, Ben Franklin said: "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately." Why not Declarations of Interdependence—with constant implementation thereof? For, Interdependence and Timely Component Co-Ordination—ultimately may contribute substantially to survival of the human species! ●

THE FIGHT TO IMMUNIZE CHILDREN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Christopher Cohen, one of our distinguished public officials, was alderman of Chicago's 46th ward and is now director of HEW's region V. Mr. Cohen is respected for his special interest in and knowledge of Government programs in our urban areas.

Director Cohen recently contributed an article discussing the importance of childhood immunization programs and the efforts made by the Government to contain the risk level of dangerous diseases across the country. The article appeared in the May 29 Perspective section of the Chicago Tribune; and I believe that it deserves the attention of the Members:

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 29, 1978]

THE FIGHT TO IMMUNIZE CHILDREN

(By Christopher B. Cohen)

Significant progress is beginning to show up in the national campaign to protect the 20 million American children most vulnerable to seven dangerous diseases.

Joseph A. Califano, secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare [HEW] took action a year ago to bring down high levels of risk. At the start, 40 percent of children under 15 were unprotected against the seven diseases—polio, measles, German measles [or rubella], mumps, diphtheria, whooping cough [or pertussis], and tetanus.

The campaign's specific goals are: to raise the immunization level against these diseases to 90 percent [the level needed to ensure against an epidemic]; and to set up a permanent system to provide comprehensive immunization to three million children born each year.

As a recent Tribute editorial pointed out "The vaccination campaign has the moral and financial support of the federal government." But it is truly a national, not just governmental, campaign enlisting the support of all sectors of American society: local, state and federal governments; voluntary organizations; professional health groups; educators; labor and industry. It is being waged with the will of citizens to mobilize against deadly—but defeatable—enemies, more than with Treasury dollars. It requires unprecedented efforts to arouse public concern about this country's intolerably low levels of childhood immunity.

Out of 52 million children under the age of 15 a year ago, more than 19 million were not immunized against the killer polio. And the number of kids unprotected was going up. It was apparent that many young parents had forgotten the iron lungs and crutches associated with the paralyzing effects of polio less than a generation ago and the mental and physical handicaps inflicted on thousands of rubella victims in the 1960s.

In Illinois, more than 50,000 youngsters had little or no protection against polio, according to a state health department survey done a few months ago.

Last year at this time we were most concerned about measles outbreaks. Measles cases increased each year since 1973. Nationwide, nearly 12 million kids were not immunized against measles. In Illinois, 43,000 of the 160,000 pupils entering school for the first time were not protected against measles.

Our progress recently has been good. Measles cases in the last three months of 1977 dropped 65 percent below the same period in 1976. The number of immunizations in publicly funded programs—the only ones for which there are complete figures—increased in 1977 over 1976 for all seven diseases. Consequently, measles, rubella and mumps cases have declined in most states during the first four months of this year over that period last year. The exceptions are Illinois and three other Midwestern states where rubella cases have increased this year.

The thing to remember is that these are not mere statistics, but figures that mean smaller numbers of children getting sick—some of them escaping lifelong handicaps. Few realize that out of every 1,000 measles cases there is one death.

Although this progress is encouraging, we have to work still harder to reach children in low-income areas and preschoolers everywhere. HEW is promoting immunization through its health service professional organizations and other federal departments to improve in these areas. We are making maximum use of all of HEW's programs such as community health centers, day care and Head Start centers, and early screening and treatment programs for poor children.

Many sectors have contributed to our successes so far:

Seventeen states have decided to enforce their school entry immunization laws, to refuse to admit children who don't have the required immunizations. Independent school districts [including Chicago] in many of the other states are doing the same.

Local school and health authorities nationwide are cooperating with each other more than in the past.

Medical organizations are asking physicians and auxiliary groups to review patients' immunization status and to educate parents about the importance of having youngsters immunized; hospitals are giving new mothers information and shot records before they leave.

The AFL-CIO is informing its members about the importance of immunization.

Businesses are helping with promotional activities. In some states, McDonald's has offered a free hamburger, french fries, or other rewards to children who get all their shots. Metropolitan Life Insurance's sales force gives booklets on immunization to parents.

Local chapters of voluntary groups such as Red Cross, nursing leagues, and PTA are helping schools to review records, contacting parents, and conducting publicity.

News media coverage of the problem has been excellent and some TV spots will feature characters from "Star Wars."

But there still are parents who don't understand that the preventable diseases can threaten their children's lives.

Parents should keep and periodically check the vaccination records of each of their children. If you're not sure whether a child has

had all the initial and booster shots, call your doctor or health care provider.

If a child is missing one or more shots, and you cannot afford to pay a doctor's fee, take the child to any of 34 public health clinics in Chicago [call 842-7910 for the nearest location] or look in your telephone directory for the city, county, or township health department nearest to you.

[3] Since schools are the principal places both for disease to spread and for opportunities to check immunization records, help your school and local health officials by cooperating when they send you forms asking to report on your children's immunization status.

[4] Get behind and participate in any drives in your neighborhood or school or church organization activities to locate children who are inadequately protected, to persuade their parents to have them immunized, and to spread awareness of the problem in your community. ●

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS AT OPENING OF EXHIBITION COMMEMORATING BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF GENERAL JOSE DE SAN MARTIN

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Hispanic Caucus in the House of Representatives, I was very pleased to note a recent address given by our colleague, the distinguished majority whip of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMÁS of Indiana, on the occasion of the opening of an exhibit commemorating the bicentennial of the birth of General José de San Martín.

Congressman BRADEMÁS, I think it is significant to point out, Mr. Speaker, delivered his address on this occasion in Spanish.

The ceremony at which Mr. BRADEMÁS spoke was conducted in the Hispanic Society Room of the Library of Congress on February 24, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. BRADEMÁS' address in English:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS

Dr. Boorstin; Ambassador Aja Espil of Argentina; my valued friend, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Alejandro Orfila; Dr. Kahler, Chief of the Latin American Division; President of the San Martín Society, Dr. García Godoy; Ladies and Gentlemen:

I count it a great honor to have been invited to be with you on this important occasion. You may ask why is it that a Congressman from South Bend, Indiana, should be speaking at the Library of Congress at an event marking the bicentennial of the birth of José de San Martín?

The answer is simple. Although I am a professional politician, I am at heart a frustrated Hispanist.

In the eighth grade I read a book about the Mayas that caused me to choose as the first career to which I aspired, that of archeologist, specializing, despite my Hellenic heritage, in Central America.

Later in school I thought that I wanted to be a businessman active in export-import work in Latin America. In college days, I

spent a summer in the mountains of the state of Puebla, Mexico, working with Aztec Indians, helping them build a playground, assisting them in coping with tropical diseases, and teaching them farm skills.

Later, as an undergraduate at Harvard, I wrote an honors thesis on the Sinarquista movement in Mexico.

And later still, as a student at Oxford, I decided, after having read Gerald Brenan's seminal work, *The Spanish Labyrinth*, to write a doctoral dissertation on the role of the anarcho-syndicalists in Spain during the Twenties and the first years of the Spanish Civil War. My research involved talks with anarchists exiled in Paris and in the South of France and work in libraries in Amsterdam and London as well, of course, as in Spain.

In 1961, during my second term in Congress, I visited Argentina with my Connecticut colleague, Congressman Robert Gaiimo, both of us young supporters of President John F. Kennedy and of the Alliance for Progress, to explore ways in which the United States could help colleges and universities in Latin America play a more effective role in the economic development and social growth of the nations of the rest of the hemisphere as well as in strengthening free political institutions there.

During nearly twenty years of service in Congress, I have continued my interest in Latin America and the Hispanic world generally—and as some of you may know, I have been a vigorous champion of Federal support of the arts and the humanities and of libraries, including the Library of Congress.

In this last connection, I feel a special kinship with the Hispanic Division of the Library and appreciation for two valued friends and outstanding members of its staff, Dolores Martín, editor of the Handbook of Latin American Studies, and Georgette Dorn, specialist in Hispanic culture.

I hope, then, that my Hispanic credentials are sufficiently in order to be permitted at least to offer some modest observations on this occasion.

WHO WAS SAN MARTIN?

Who was José de San Martín?
With Simón Bolívar, San Martín was the most important leader of the independence movement in South America.

San Martín was born in Yapeyú, Argentina. He received first-rate military training in Spain, where he also fought with distinction as an officer in the Spanish army against the forces of Napoleon.

Indeed, it was while San Martín was in a military encampment that news of the insurrection in South America reached him. In his own words, he "realized that the war he was fighting for Spain, he should really be waging against Spain and in favor of his homeland."

San Martín became commander of the revolutionary forces in Buenos Aires where he formed the famed regiment of grenadiers.

On being named Governor of the Province of Cuyo (now Mendoza), in the foothills of the Andes, he initiated untutored revolutionary forces in the art and discipline of fighting well-equipped Spanish armies.

In 1817, in a daring feat, San Martín and his army crossed the Andean Cordillera at the highest peak in the hemisphere. From snowy mountain paths, the revolutionaries fell upon the royalist troops in Chile and, after several major battles, freed the region from Spanish rule.

Although he was invited to accept the governorship of Chile, San Martín refused the honor and instead set out immediately to plan the liberation of Peru. In this effort he had the support, despite internecine struggles, of the government in Buenos Aires.

LIBERTY FROM SPAIN

Leading troops from both Argentina and Chile, San Martín proceeded to Peru. And

after battles and intricate negotiations with the Spaniards, Peru was also able to win liberty from the Spanish yoke.

San Martin governed Peru for over a year during which time he carried out far reaching liberal reforms. By 1822 he had reached the zenith of power.

The forces of Bolivar coming from the North and San Martin's approaching from the South met in Peru. San Martin realized that in order to stage a major final drive against the colonial power, one of the two leaders should become supreme commander of the allied forces. Unconvinced of Bolivar's wholehearted cooperation, San Martin resigned as Protector of Peru and handed over his entire army to Bolivar.

San Martin's gesture remains a remarkable example of self-denial and of putting patriotic interest ahead of personal ambition.

In an effort to isolate himself from the incessant infighting among Argentine patriots, San Martin went to Chile. Shortly thereafter, in 1824, he sailed for Europe convinced that his continued presence in Argentina could be perceived as a threat by rising political leaders.

It was toward the end of 1828 that San Martin made a final trip to South America, stopping in Montevideo. The news from across the River Plate was so disheartening that he returned to Europe without setting foot on his native soil. A pilgrimage to call upon San Martin became a must for Argentine and other South American visitors to France, among these, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, the great Argentine educator, who became an important nation-builder and a leading intellectual of 19th Century Argentina.

COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY

It seems to me, as we meet in the year 1978, we should remember above all the great influence which San Martin's deep commitment to freedom from Spain and to the principles of democracy exercised on the early independence movement in Spanish America.

There is no question that his activities hastened the declaration of independence by Argentina. In one letter San Martin wrote:

How much longer will we wait to declare our independence. Is it not ridiculous to coin money, hoist the flag, and have cockades and wage war against Spain, from whom one believes we still depend? . . . Men of courage should not fear decisions. If independence is not declared the Congress of Tucumán is a sham.

San Martin rejoiced greatly when on July 9, 1816, the Congress of Tucumán declared independence.

It is, I think, significant that he opposed a military regime for his country, stating that "military might is only capable of getting us out of the swamp."

Yet he made clear that he favored a strong and vigorous government "to avoid the evils that would result from war, disorder, and anarchy."

THE LESSONS OF SAN MARTIN'S LEGACY

In this day and age when democratic governments seem to be in such difficulty throughout the world, we should remember that San Martin believed firmly in the principle of representative democracy.

In a year when we are debating the signing of the Panama Canal treaties, it is fitting to recall San Martin's deep conviction that each nation should determine its own destiny.

San Martin championed as well a faith in a common American destiny for the people of the hemisphere. He enthusiastically endorsed the tenets of the Monroe Doctrine of preventing European intervention into hemispheric affairs.

He worked tirelessly toward recognition throughout the world of Spanish American independence, and you will recall that in

1822, the independence of Argentina was formally recognized by the United States.

Throughout his long retirement, San Martin was saddened by the continued and bloody struggles for power in many of the South American republics. He repeatedly offered to help in repelling French forces invading from the River Plate region.

He died in exile, in 1850, without seeing the ultimate unification of Argentina a decade later.

What, then, is the lesson of San Martin for our times?

He consistently placed the interests of his country above his own.

He constantly urged the peoples of South America to strive to build free, strong, independent and progressive nations.

Above all, he believed that the destiny of each nation should be shaped by its own people and not by outside forces.

Self-rule, self-government, strong democratic institutions, respect for individual rights—these were the lessons of the great "Liberator" of Argentina.

They are lessons we should do well to heed today. ●

REINTRODUCTION OF H.R. 12728, THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY DOLLAR COIN ACT OF 1978

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced H.R. 12728 which now will have 25 sponsors. The following are excerpts from my remarks given at the Subcommittee on Historic Preservation and Coinage:

Mr. Chairman, the administration has proposed that the new coin be issued with a so-called contemporary version of the liberty head design on the obverse side. This was very disappointing to many Americans including the Congresswoman's caucus, who had written to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the Department propose the portrait of Susan B. Anthony. I have for submission into the hearing record a copy of the letter dated March 22, 1978 the caucus wrote to Mr. Blumenthal. We never received a response which I find surprising and alarming.

Senator PROXMIRE, chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee has also introduced a similar bill in the Senate, and has reiterated his support for the portrait of Ms. Anthony. I am also aware that you Mr. Chairman are open minded as to whose portrait is placed on the dollar coin.

I wish to emphasize that this bill has the full support of a wide spectrum of women's organizations including the League of Women Voters, the National Organization of Women, the National Women's Political Caucus, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

That is why my colleague PAT SCHROEDER and myself are here today, to request that the subcommittee consider our bill to place Ms. Anthony's portrait on the obverse side of this new dollar coin.

Having an actual woman portrayed on a coin is not a unique concept. As early as 1837, a woman appeared on the circulating coinage in Great Britain, and as early as 1835, Spain circulated coinage with the profile of Isabel. In 1892 the Netherlands circu-

lated coins with the portrait of Wilhelmina. Thus, I would suggest that the concept of a portrait of a woman on circulating coinage in the Western world is not new. In fact we are one of the very few countries which has never had a woman portrayed on a circulating coin.

Why Susan B. Anthony? Today we have the unique opportunity to recognize and honor all women of our great country by placing the portrait of a woman on this coin, whose illustrious career spanned the 19th century, and who, perhaps more than any other woman, changed our lives through her single minded devotion to the principle that all Americans must participate in a democracy. She realized more completely than anyone else that in order for the women of America to truly participate as American citizens, they had to be given the right to vote. In 1848, she laid the groundwork for the passage of the 19th amendment.

Susan B. Anthony retained her leadership of the Women's Suffrage Movement until her death in 1906 at the age of 86. Unfortunately she never lived to see the fruition of her valiant efforts. Ratification, giving women the right to vote, did not occur until 1920, some 15 years later. Her motto "failure is impossible" is as applicable today to those of us who believe in human rights throughout the world. All Americans and in particular women, owe her a tremendous debt of gratitude for her undaunting courage in her single minded crusade to attain this precious democratic right-to-vote.

The portrayal of "Miss Liberty" has been found on American coins from the 18th century to the 1960's. Currently, we have established a tradition in the 20th century in this country of honoring outstanding American men by placing their portraits on our circulating coinage, beginning with Abraham Lincoln on the copper penny in 1909. Since then, our circulating coinage shows Thomas Jefferson on the nickel, George Washington on the 25-cent piece, Franklin Roosevelt on the dime, and Benjamin Franklin and John F. Kennedy on the 50-cent piece.

Without exception all of our circulating coins now honor Americans—not abstractions—individual men who have earned their place in our Nation's history. Is there any reason why we cannot honor a woman who actually lived? Must we retain a mythological figure? It has been said that all women can identify with the mythological portrayal of Miss Liberty, but I would like to respond by saying that there is one issue with which I am sure that the rainbow of American women in our country of every race, creed, and philosophy can mutually identify—it is the right to express ourselves at the ballot box—the democratic right to vote. Truly Susan B. Anthony who is principally responsible for enabling women to exercise this democratic right represents American women far better than the ill-conceived contemporary design offered to us by the U.S. Treasury. Susan B. Anthony is Miss Liberty and once more she is an American who helped Americans achieve the liberty and freedom we now enjoy.

The proposal to place Susan B. Anthony on the new dollar coin has generated some controversy and opposition from our own Treasury Department. That is not surprising. Susan Anthony generated controversy and faced opposition all her life. This fact did not deter her from her noble cause. We welcome the opportunity now to speak up for her. It would be a very special honor to have this woman's portrait placed on the new dollar coin. By doing so we honor all Americans who cherish our democracy, and their liberty, which has as its fundamental concept the right to vote.

THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT
OF 1978

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1978, I reintroduced the Economic Recovery Act of 1978, incorporating several new provisions which differ from the original bill. A summary of the new bill follows:

THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT OF 1978

The Economic Recovery Act implements the economic goals mandated by the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978 (the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill), which passed the House of Representatives on March 20, 1978. The Humphrey-Hawkins Bill includes a provision mandating economic goals and policies designed to obtain farm income at 100% of parity at the marketplace during the next five years. The Economic Recovery Act, in accordance with the provisions of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, gradually improves farm income during the next five years, reaching 100% of parity by 1982.

FARM COMMODITY PRICES

Agricultural commodities may not be bought, sold or traded for less than their established prices, nor for more than 110% of the established prices. The established price for each agricultural commodity (determined by the National Board of Agricultural Governors) is based on the parity price or the comprehensive cost of production price for each such commodity, whichever is greater.

The established price will not reach 100% of parity until 1982. The governing price level will be 85% of the established price in 1979, 90% of the established price in 1980, and 95% of the established price in 1981. Civil penalties are imposed for anyone who buys, sells or trades agricultural commodities at prices less than the above stipulated price levels or in excess of 110% of the established price.

NATIONAL BOARD OF AGRICULTURAL GOVERNORS

The Economic Recovery Act establishes a National Board of Agricultural Governors. The Board shall establish and administer all agricultural production and marketing programs in the United States.

The Board is composed of 50 farmers, 2 consumer representatives, 2 labor representatives, 2 business representatives (all appointed by the President) and the Secretary of Agriculture. Of the 50 farmer members of the Board, the President shall select one from among the 3 members of each state ASCS committee, which shall be elected by the producers of each state. The farmer members of the Board must be actively engaged in agricultural production as their primary source of income. Each Board member shall serve for a term of 3 years.

The Board's functions include establishing the following: parity prices and comprehensive cost of production prices, established prices, national production goals, acreage allotments and marketing quotas, a reserve program and import quotas.

NATIONAL PRODUCTION GOALS

The Board shall establish annual national production goals for each agricultural commodity. The production goals shall be based upon: (1) estimated domestic requirements, including reserves, and (2) estimated export requirements, and (3) levels of production consistent with U.S. agricultural conservation programs.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

The Board shall establish acreage allotments and marketing quotas for each agricultural commodity in an amount equal to the production goals established for such commodity. The acreage allotments and marketing quotas shall be based on the production history for each farm, taking the highest production during three of the five previous years. When appropriate commodity groups may elect, by producer referendum, to participate in either the acreage allotment or marketing quota program.

Each producer's production history shall be retained with the land for which such production history is established. Marketing quotas may be negotiable only between bona-fide farmers within states and on an annual basis. Producers may not exceed their normal crop acreage unless specifically authorized by the Board.

The Board shall establish rules and procedures to adjust the allocation of acreage allotments and marketing quotas to assure fair and equitable allocation thereof. The Board must allocate marketing quotas in a manner that will not adversely affect the economy of any county or local community.

The Board shall decrease or increase the allocation of acreage allotments or marketing quotas for each commodity to reflect decreases or increases in the production goals for each such commodity. Such adjustments in acreage allotments or marketing quotas shall be applied uniformly to all producers of each commodity.

Producers may grow, raise or produce any amount of agricultural commodities on their individual normal crop acreage, but no agricultural commodities shall be sold or traded in excess of their acreage allotment or marketing quota. All agricultural production which exceeds the respective acreage allotment or marketing quota, and which is storable, shall be sealed by the Board and stored at the producer's expense as a producer-owned reserve which shall be administered under terms established by the Board.

NON-FARM CORPORATIONS

No acreage allotments or marketing quotas shall be allocated under this Act to non-farm corporations if a majority interest in any such corporation is held by those not engaged in farming operations. The Board may, at its discretion, delay implementation of this provision from two to five years.

Farmer-owned cooperatives, family farm corporations and charitable organizations are exempt from this provision.

RESERVE PROGRAM

With the consent of Congress, the Board may establish a reserve program which will be flexible enough to acquire stocks of commodities produced in compliance with acreage allotments and marketing quotas but which, because of unforeseen changes in supply and demand, the market cannot absorb. In order to acquire stocks, the Board shall issue marketing quotas for the purchase of commodities produced in excess of domestic and export requirements. All stocks on hand at the time this Act becomes law will be eligible for purchase by the Board as part of the reserve stocks.

Reserve stocks may be stored by producers at commercial storage rates or under such other terms and conditions as the Board considers necessary.

Reserve stocks shall be released only for use in domestic food and fiber emergencies or disaster situations, as determined by the President, and for humanitarian food or fiber relief needs in the event of emergencies in other countries. Reserve stocks of each agricultural commodity may be sold in quanti-

ties equal to the difference between actual production and the national production goals for each commodity. If more than a minimal amount of any commodity is required to meet production shortfalls, the additional reserve stocks will be purchased from available producer-owned supplies.

IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY

The Board shall limit the volume of competitive agricultural imports to the amount necessary to fulfill national consumption needs when the U.S. experiences a shortfall in production.

All imported agricultural commodities shall be priced at a minimum of 110 percent of the established price, or 10 percent over the current market price, whichever is greater. The tariff revenues obtained from the importation of agricultural commodities shall be placed in a special credit account for the exporting nations to purchase U.S. products. The special credit account shall be established and administered by the Board.

No agricultural commodities shall be exported at less than 100 percent of the established price, except for those commodities exported under food assistance programs.

Federal inspection regulations covering agricultural commodities produced in the United States shall also be applied to imported agricultural commodities as a condition for entry into the United States or its possessions.

PRODUCER REFERENDUMS

The Board's recommendations regarding acreage allotments and marketing quotas shall be subject to producer referendums. If 15 percent of the producers who have a production history affected by the Board's recommendation petition the Board for a referendum, the Board shall, not later than one month after validating the petition, conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of such producers. If the Board determines that more than a majority of the producers voting in the referendum oppose the proposed recommendation, it shall be withdrawn.

In any event any commodity group wishes to be excluded from the provisions of this Act, such producers may use the referendum procedure so that all of the producers in the commodity group will be able to vote on the question.

CONSUMER INFORMATION

Retail food stores shall be required to post information providing a comparison between average cost to consumers for food products and the average farm value of the same product in order to clearly establish the amount which farmers receive for their share of the food product. This information shall be displayed prominently in retail food stores.●

THE NEED FOR THE HUMANE APPROACH OF HOSPICE CARE

HON. DOUGLAS WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, in the May 30, 1978, issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Nicholas von Hoffman comments on the health care his mother received during her terminal illness. I encourage all Members to read his account for it illustrates the need for the humane approach of hospice care for the terminally ill.

THE STRUGGLE TO DIE IN PEACE

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

"I understand," the doctor told me. "I have an 86-year-old mother who hates doctors. It's quite embarrassing."

The doctor was taking over the management of my nearly 80-year-old mother's case of terminal cancer. A kindly man, who understood this was not the time for treatment but for palliation and the patient's comfort, he was a godsend to a woman who had long since elected to do without the services of orthodox medicine.

What Mother had been encountering were high-tech physicians who couldn't accept someone who had decided not to leave the world via the Hubert Humphrey route. Ten or 12 years ago when she first became aware of having the disease, Mother had decided she would not permit surgery, radiation or chemotherapy, and she has stuck to the decision ever since.

It was up to the rest of us to convince the various kinds of practitioners of medicine that she was of sound mind and mature judgment and her wishes should be observed. That's not so easy with some kinds of doctors. In certain situations it's not the family that pleads for something, anything to be done, but the doctor who pleads with the family to permit it.

A little reading and a little asking around should quickly convince anyone that a patient with advanced cancer may be making a medically sound choice in refusing treatment. Often the odds that the treatment can have even a temporarily palliative effect are long, while the odds that the same treatment will cause awful side effects are relatively short. You won't bet money on a race horse with those chances so why bet the last days of your life?

For some doctors that's hard to live with, so hard their own emotions push them to say wild things in order to be allowed to get at the patient. "You may have heard a lot of romantic things said about a dignified, natural death," said one, "but I'm telling you there's no such thing." Or there was the physician who came into Mother's hospital room to argue her into accepting treatment at 11 o'clock at night. When the patient, paralyzed in her bed, said she was tired and wanted to sleep, the doctor responded, "You know sleep is sometimes a form of escape."

Some weeks ago, Mother decided she would prefer to pop off, as she often refers to her death, via a pill. Four or five times she's brought up the subject of suicide by pill, but in our culture children usually can't bring themselves to give their parents the means to do that.

You have to get your pill for yourself, when you're still healthy. Only rarely will a loved one have the moral self-confidence, the ethical certainty to help you.

Maybe none of us would contemplate taking our own lives if there were institutions for dying. My mother has loved the hospital, but the hospital couldn't keep her. In her advanced state of illness—she is so feeble she can't turn over on her side without assistance—a hospital with a high standard of nursing care can make her reasonably comfortable.

But hospitals aren't places designed to make dying people comfortable. They are treatment institutions. Moreover, under pressure from every side to cut costs, hospitals feel a special obligation to toss out Medicare patients like my mother who will not take any medicine. "Will you let me stay if I take an aspirin," asked Mother, her sharp tongue undiminished by age and illness. Actually, if the family can afford \$250 plus a day, the guest may continue to abide on the premises.

For patients like Mother, the solution may be the hospice, a new kind of institution expressly designed for the dying. These

are low-tech places where the physician and spiritual comfort of the patient comes first. Whether we can find enough of the right kind of people to work in hospices is problematic. So many of us have been trained to believe the only people worthwhile are those who can perform the miracles of science; we accord little prestige to those who work the less brassy miracles of comfort, compassion and the charity that surpasses understanding.

"I feel like a ball being bounced from one place to another," Mother said of the vicissitudes of finding a peaceful and moderately comfortable Medicare-approved place to die. She is a woman who has composed her soul, she has made her peace with all of us who love her and is leaving us with her blessing, but meekness and forgiveness can be carried too far. "I want you to promise me," she said the other day, "that after I pop off, you'll make sure my body isn't given to medicine."

Mother died on April 28 and it wasn't. ●

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS NEED REEVALUATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, deep and justifiable concern is being registered by the administration and Congress over renewed campaigns by the Soviet Union to expand their influence in the Third World and strengthen their positions in Eastern Europe.

As we grope for the reasons for this new Kremlin aggressiveness we see that their actions are based in part as a reaction to years of appeasement policies by the United States. Whether they be cloaked under terms such as détente, they translate into an inadequate U.S. response to the Soviet Union.

Where are we today? Let us start with Africa. The Soviet Union has embarked upon a concerted, conscientious, and consuming campaign to expand their influence over the continent of Africa. They are doing it themselves with commitment of funds and arms. They have the help of their ally, Cuba, which has tripled its number of troops in Africa from 15,000 in 1977 to more than 42,000 at present. The problem in Zaire occupied center stage with respect to Africa. In Zaire, Communist-backed rebels operating from bases in Marxist Angola launched a surprise attack against the southern province of Shaba on May 11. These insurgents armed with Soviet-made weapons and trained by Cubans made their second effort in 14 months to bring down the prowestern government of President Mobutu Sese-Seko.

World tension mounted as troops from other nations, primarily France, went in to rescue some 2,500 foreigners including 14 Americans, caught in the midst of the turmoil. U.S.-based paratroopers were alerted to take part in a rescue mission but they were not used. The Zaire strife did have its casualties. At least 40 foreigners were killed and there were reports of widespread torture of hundreds of others.

Zaire is by no means the only nation

where the Soviet-Cuban alliance is working. Cuban troops are stationed in the following 11 nations of Africa: Algeria, Angola, Benin, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Libya, Mozambique, and Sierra Leone. In addition, according to U.S. News & World Report, the Cubans and Russians were involved in five of eight so-called bush wars ongoing in Rhodesia, Namibia, Angola, Eritrea, and Ethiopia. The following chart prepared by the U.S. News & World Report discusses the true extent to which Russians have moved in Africa since the onset of détente.

WHERE RUSSIANS HAVE MOVED IN DURING DÉTENTE

Richard M. Nixon's May, 1972, talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow set the stage for détente—a policy aimed at avoiding military conflict between the superpowers. Americans thought détente also meant neither nation would try to take advantage of the other in troubled parts of the world.

What the record shows:

1972. Soviets sent 55 million dollars in arms to Africa, 970 million to the Mideast.

Egypt was the major recipient until the Soviet military mission was ousted in July.

1973. Arms worth 2.655 billion dollars were consigned by Russia to the Mideast to replace Arab losses in the 1973 war with Israel. Syria received much of this aid. Arms to African nations were valued at 75 million.

1974. U.S.S.R. arms shipments to Africa went up to 235 million dollars while aid to Mideast nations dropped to 1.785 billion. Contracts were signed for a billion in sales to Libya. Algeria and Somalia also received important shipments.

1975. Africa received 600 million dollars' worth of arms, much of it going to Moscow's new clients in Angola. Soviet shipments to Arab nations fell to 850 million dollars.

1976. Soviet arms shipments to Africa for the first time surpassed those to the Mideast—1.07 billion dollars against 830 million. Also signed: a billion dollar arms agreement with Iraq to include MiG-21s and 23s. Libya received jet fighters and bombers under a deal made in 1974, and fighting in Angola absorbed Soviet warplanes, tanks and guided missiles. Moscow made its first offer of large military credits to Ethiopia.

1977-78. In another startling shift, the Soviets poured an estimated billion dollars' worth of arms into Ethiopia for use against Somalia. The Soviets lost air, naval and missile storage bases in Somalia.

In addition, Moscow since 1972 has paid all expenses of thousands of African and Arab pilots, gunners and technicians that were trained in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it represents the practical fallacy of this ill-conceived element of U.S. foreign policy.

The administration has reacted albeit somewhat late to the Soviet-Cuban moves in Africa. Perhaps the strongest attack was made by the President's National Security Adviser Mr. Brzezinski. The President himself has charged Cuba with assisting in the turmoil in Zaire.

Yet, mere strong reactions will not quell this storm. The Soviets see an opportunity for exploitation and are prepared to take full advantage. The United States has ignored Africa for too long, thus permitting the Soviet Union to plant its seeds. The result, the United States is placed in the position of responding to Soviet acts instead of initiating strong relations with the African

nations themselves. Yet our failure to adequately respond to Soviet pressures and aggression has permitted it to continue and grow. We must be prepared to meet the Communist challenge in Africa or wherever else it is generated. We must maintain a strong defense and avoid being party to concessionary arms agreements. We must remember that the Soviets are vulnerable. A not yet released NATO study indicates that by the 1980's, the economic deterioration of the Soviet Union will have reached a critical level. The report also indicates that Moscow may be forced to seek economic help from the West. Already the Soviet Union is heavily reliant on U.S. agricultural products. We and our western allies can employ meaningful economic sanctions against the Soviets as a means of halting their advances around the world. We should not be reluctant to impose these sanctions, for it represents a real area of U.S. strength.

Congress as well, must not lose sight of the Soviet challenge. We must not resist those programs in our defense budget which are made to keep us strong. We must not cripple the President's ability to act by questioning the credibility of policy statements. A policy of trust must be established and maintained. It is mutually beneficial.

The Soviet buildup in Eastern Europe occupied much of this week's NATO summit. In a recent interview, Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr., Supreme Allied Commander of Europe expressed concern over this buildup and cited the fact that—

They (Soviets) have overcome a roughly 10 to 1 inferiority in the central strategic balance to the point that today they are at parity or essential equivalence with us.

More specifically in this decade alone, the Kremlin has added some 100,000 troops and an increase of some 40 percent in the numbers of tanks provided to Warsaw Pact nations. Their naval strength has also been beefed up considerably.

The end result is an increasing threat to the NATO nations, a threat which cannot be overlooked or ignored. The response must be a reaffirmation of the basic partnership which exists between the United States and NATO with an adequate commitment by all member nations to guarantee NATO's abilities to counter any Soviet adventures in this region of the world.

The Soviet influence does not end in these areas. Their hands are in virtually all areas of the world. It is more subtle for example in the Middle East. While Egypt renounced its former associations with Moscow, they have not been deterred. They have been conspicuous in their silence with respect to the peace talks and they are working behind the scenes with other Arab States who play a less critical but important role in the future of the Mideast. Here again, the Soviets must be watched.

Finally we must examine Latin America. The Soviet-Cuban influence is more subtle but it does exist. This was a deep concern of mine and a number of my colleagues who oppose the Panama Canal

treaties of 1978 which calls for us to turn control of the canal over to Panama in the year 2000. It is a veiled invitation for the Soviet Union to almost move right in and plant a new Communist threat in our backyard.

Of course we cannot overlook the closest of all Communist threats—Cuba a mere 90 miles off the U.S. shores. There was talk early in this administration about working to normalize relations with Cuba. This brought about a groundswell of opposition from many in Congress and a good percentage of the American people. Their recent military aggressiveness has resulted in a complete rethinking of the situation by the administration. If relations are to improve with Cuba it must be on our terms not theirs. Our terms do not include allowing them to engage in adventures in Third World nations.

Another factor to consider is the continued repressive nature of the Soviet Union's policies as they relate to Jews in their own nations and the millions they hold in the captive nations in Eastern Europe. Their failure to respect basic human and civil rights is barbaric and indicative of their continued totalitarian type of rule. The President has made human rights an integral part of our foreign policy. We must bolster this and make it a precondition for any agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. Foreign policy tends to be more glittery than practical at times. We must yield our hand firmly in our insistence on respect for human rights. Anything less would be hypocrisy. The captive peoples of the world felt betrayed by détente. They must be provided with new hopes.

The Soviet threat is real not imagined. It does not call for hysteria or overreaction. It does not call for renewed military actions by the United States. However, we must keep ourselves strong militarily, and not be overly hasty in progressing on the SALT talks. We cannot give the Soviet Union the impression that they can have their cake and eat it too. We will not settle for agreements limiting arms while they expand their sphere of influence around the world.

No one wants to see a renewal of the cold war. Peace and cooperation with the Soviet Union remains a desirable goal. However, the road has obstacles which must be removed before the journey is completed.●

THE COLORADO PAYS OFF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during this past year, there have appeared a number of magazine and newspaper articles concerning Federal reclamation policy. The Denver Post article I am placing in the RECORD clearly presents the issues as we are aware of them out West.

Although there is no area of Federal law or policy that cannot stand im-

provement, I believe much of the recent analysis has been excessively negative and contains a strong no-growth assumption.

The experience of the State of Colorado confirms that intelligent, well planned water development projects are necessary for an area's ability to provide an acceptable standard of living while maintaining environmental quality.

Congress and the Western States have not invested resources in these reclamation projects as some kind of boondoggle or pork barrel. We build these projects, because if we do not save the water that roars through our State for about 60-90 days, there will not be any water for the rest of the year. Consequently, reclamation, water projects, and water programs are absolutely essential and critical to the future of our area.

THE COLORADO PAYS OFF

(By Zeke Scher)

A few blocks off the main street through Montrose, Colo., is an unpretentious group of low-level buildings neatly concealing a gigantic role it plays in the daily life of the Rocky Mountain empire.

The structures house the nerve center of a major federal project that 20 years ago was condemned as a waste of money with no hope of success. A more recent appraisal is savior of much of the arid West—creator of a land of opportunity—as well as a money-maker.

Its name, Colorado River Storage Project, is still clouded by the controversy and confusion that surrounded its birth in 1956. But controversy and confusion have been a hallmark of the Colorado River since 1540 when Spaniards explored upstream from its mouth in the Gulf of California.

Exploration from the upper reaches waited 330 years—until John Wesley Powell's first trip from Green River, Wyo., through the Grand Canyon in 1869. Almost another 100 years passed before the river was harnessed sufficiently to turn "the menace" into a national resource.

Mentioning Montrose in the same sentence with the Colorado River may add to the confusion. The Colorado is no closer than 60 miles from Montrose (at Grand Junction). The river extends 1,360 miles from Rocky Mountain National Park in northern Colorado to Mexico on the Pacific Coast. How does Montrose (pop., 6,496) get in the picture? That is our story.

By the early 1920s it became apparent to booming California, Arizona and Nevada that the natural flow of the Colorado River couldn't be depended upon to supply year-round water demands.

At the same time the slower-developing upstream states—Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and New Mexico—watched with great concern the increased demands on the river by the lower states. The upper states which contained the sources of the river's flow feared permanent loss of the water for development because of first claims on use by the lower states.

In 1922 a U.S. Reclamation Bureau report recommended construction of a huge dam at Boulder Canyon on the lower Colorado, specifying priorities in water use for (1) river regulation and flood control, (2) storage for irrigation and (3) development of power. The upper states objected.

Each group of states wanted their water rights protected, and that is what drew them to Santa Fe, N.M., in November 1922 for a meeting chaired by the U.S. secretary of commerce, Herbert Hoover. The Colorado River Compact resulted. This divided the river into two basins with Lees Ferry, just

south of the Utah line in Arizona, as the dividing line.

The compact guaranteed the lower states 7.5 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually (not less than 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period).

In 1930 Hoover, then president, signed an appropriation act to start construction of the long-recommended Boulder Dam (completed in 1936 and now named for him). It provided huge storage (31 million acre-feet) and power facilities (1.3 million kilowatts).

Development was non-existent on the river in the vast 113,496 square miles drainage area of the upper basin—one-twelfth of the contiguous United States. Part of the problem was the upper states couldn't even agree among themselves on apportioning the river.

Finally in 1948, avoiding a court fight, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact was negotiated to divide the water: Colorado, 51.75 percent; Utah, 23 percent; Wyoming, 14 percent; New Mexico, 11.25 percent, and a flat 50,000 acre-feet to Arizona for the area above Lees Ferry.

The Upper Colorado River Commission was created to represent the upper states—headquarters is now in Salt Lake City—and a move began immediately to authorize a Colorado River Storage Project. A bill introduced in Congress in 1950 got nowhere.

In late 1952 a basinwide development plan was endorsed by the U.S. Interior Department. More bills followed but failed to get executive support until January 1955 when President Eisenhower backed the project in his State of the Union address.

Being proposed was a series of big dams and reservoirs on the upper Colorado and its major tributaries—some \$700 million worth—which would store more than 33 million acre-feet and produce more than 1.4 million kilowatts (kw) of electricity (which would be sold to pay for the project).

Also included was the concept of including Congress-approved irrigation districts as "participating projects"—11 originally, 10 more added later. These also would be paid for from project revenues but without interest (power and storage costs would be repaid with interest).

Key parts of the project were a dam on the Colorado in Glen Canyon, 14 miles upstream from Lees Ferry; Flaming Gorge Dam on the Green River in extreme northeastern Utah near the Wyoming-Colorado borders; three dams on the Gunnison River east of Montrose, and Navajo Dam on the San Juan River at the Colorado-New Mexico line.

Screams of protest inundated Congress—from lower basin power and water interests, conservation groups, Eastern anti-reclamation Congressmen and private utility companies. They went like this:

—Power from the proposed hydroelectric power plants—it would be more than the production then of the private utilities in Utah, Colorado or Arizona—"will never be sold."

—Cost of producing the water-generated power is more expensive than using "cheap" coal or even the "unlimited" supplies of "cheap" oil to run generators.

—Problems will be great and costly in constructing transmission lines across the wide expanses of the mountain West.

—Stored water upstream will evaporate, cause losses to the lower basin and eliminate all surplus water.

—Reservoirs will inundate scenic areas, degrade the environment with artificial lakes and threaten at least one national monument (Rainbow Bridge).

The State of California submitted a formal statement, ticking off 14 objections and questioning whether the project was "justified or needed."

Even the Public Service Co. of Colorado, noting that the power would be sold to public authorities and not private companies, attacked the new policy as discriminatory

and un-American. Private utilities also objected to federal transmission lines when the project could pay to use their lines.

The validity of those claims—or lack of same—will become evident.

In Congress compromises were made—plans for a dam at Echo Park on the upper Green River were dropped—and on April 11, 1956, the Colorado River Storage Project became part of reclamation law. There were unique features in the act.

The federal government should be totally repaid within 50 years after each unit begins operation. Public authorities, like rural cooperatives and other non-profit associations, will be "preference customers" for wholesale power. Some costs attributable to recreation development and aiding Indian reservations will be "national investments" and don't have to be repaid.

Reclamation Bureau officials moved quickly to get construction started on the two largest dams. The first contract was awarded at Glen Canyon six months after the law was signed. The prime contract was let April 29, 1957, for a 710-foot-high dam to create a 27 million acre-foot reservoir (186-mile-long Lake Powell) that would run eight generators with a capacity of 950,000 kw. Cost: \$235 million.

Flaming Gorge work began in January 1957 with the prime contract awarded in June 1958 for a 502-foot dam, 3.8 million acre-foot reservoir and three generators with capacity of 132,000 kw. Cost: \$78 million.

Navajo Dam construction began in 1958 on a 405-foot dam for a 1.7 million acre-foot reservoir (no power). Cost: \$44 million.

The three dams on the Gunnison River, called the Curecanti unit, didn't break ground until July 1962. Blue Mesa Dam was first—390 feet high for a 940,800 acre-foot reservoir (60,000 kw power plant). Cost: \$43 million. Morrow Point Dam was next: 469 feet high with a 117,000 acre-foot reservoir (120,000 kw plant). Cost: \$41 million. Curecanti's third dam, Crystal, was begun in 1973 and is expected to begin operation this year. Its 323-foot dam has one generator (28,000 kw) fed by a 26,000 acre-foot reservoir. Cost: \$27 million.

As the first buckets of concrete went into Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon dams in the summer of 1960, the Reclamation Bureau was pondering where to locate the headquarters which would control power operations for the entire project. Denver? Salt Lake City? They seemed likely choices.

An electrical engineer who was chief of the transmission division of the Parker Davis Project near Phoenix, Ariz., Leo Allen DeGuire, was named a consultant for locating the power office. He toured the upper basin.

"I was convinced the operations and maintenance divisions should be kept together," says DeGuire. "The geographical center of the upper basin was Montrose, and there would be three of the dams nearby. That's why I recommended Montrose."

The Bureau went along with DeGuire's recommendation and at a Montrose Chamber of Commerce meeting in October 1962 revealed power dispatching and far-flung communications would originate at the foot of the Uncompahgre Plateau. The chamber was equally impressed with the influx of about 130 project employees and their sizable annual payroll.

Temporary offices were set up in a small building on the north side of town while bids were accepted for constructing a specialized center to house the computerized operation. A \$1 million contract for the main building was let in July 1963, just as water storage began in Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge. (Plant and equipment at Montrose are now valued at more than \$5 million.)

DeGuire, the recommender, was back in Montrose in mid-1963—as maintenance division chief. After 1968 he would be power operations manager, the top post.

Flaming Gorge got one of its three generators "on line" Nov. 11, 1963, to produce the first Colorado River Storage Project (CRSP) power. Glen Canyon's first generation was Sept. 4, 1964. Montrose dispatchers, in their new center at 1200 S. Rio Grande Ave., had something to dispatch.

Bureau transmission lines went up to make the first connections between Utah and Arizona and between Utah and New Mexico. These were 230,000-volt lines. Other Bureau lines—from 115,000 to 345,000 volts—formed a CRSP system linking Flaming Gorge to Cheyenne and northern Colorado; Glen Canyon to Shiprock, N.M., and southern Arizona; Curecanti units to Salida and Midway (between Pueblo and Colorado Springs); all of them to the Montrose headquarters. That amounts to some 1,500 miles of transmission lines (now tied into the entire Western power network).

In the Montrose center, dispatchers and schedulers see that the customers get the power they contract for. Computers scan the performance of each generator every six seconds—around the clock—and send out corrections automatically in trying to match the load to the demand.

They also lend and borrow power, keeping track of "what we owe the world and what the world owes us." The "world" is anywhere outside the CRSP system. Exchanging or buying available power permits the project to conserve its water since "keeping water in the river" is another obligation. Borrowed power may be paid back at peak daytime periods.

Under the project law, first call for water goes to irrigators, with any leftover being sold to municipal and industrial users. There are 18 water district contracts. Power customers number 75, including 19 in Colorado.

Contrary to the dire predictions of the protesters, all of the project's power was sold out by 1969—and has been sold out since. (Twice as much could be sold now but Congress hasn't authorized any expansion to meet the demand.) Twenty percent goes to Arizona in summer (less in winter); the rest goes to the upper states; none goes to California.

As for claims that hydroelectric power would be more expensive, cost of project energy from the start has been lower than any coal-fired generation (six mills, or .6 cent, per kilowatt hour in 1963 and only 6.55 mills now; that is less than half of some private utility wholesale rates; the retail average cost to a Denver resident is 3.6 cents per kilowatt hour).

Marketing the project's wares is the job of John W. Mueller, power manager in the regional office at Salt Lake City. He makes the contracts that the Montrose office executes.

Mueller has seen power revenues rise from \$5 million a year the first two start-up years to a peak in 1976 of \$61.9 million. Last year's drought—the runoff was 27 percent of average—curtailed power income to \$41 million.

The first 14 revenue-producing years shattered another doubt of the 1950s about future success. Since 1964, CRSP revenues have totaled \$397 million. From this, \$230 million have been returned to the U.S. Treasury in principal and interest. The rest has paid operational expenses. Mueller says that by any standard, CRSP stands for success.

The telephone rang at 6:30 a.m. last Feb. 2 at Richard Schlosser's Montrose home. Paul Hughart, a dispatcher on the early shift at the CRSP operations center, was on the line.

"We're having some system problems," Hughart said.

Schlosser, chief of the power dispatching and operations branch, could have guessed as much. His electric alarm clock, set for 6:15 a.m., didn't go off.

Normally, Hughart and Larry Burke, the other dispatcher, could handle most situations—switching power sources, making gen-

eration match fluctuating loads, adjusting customer schedules. But a power outage followed by a flood of puzzling information led to a call for help.

There had been a break in power from the Delta-Montrose Electric Association which serves most needs of the center (CRSP buys electricity like any other customer). The outage triggered the center's auxiliary generators (computers and microwave communication facilities have an uninterruptible supply from DC batteries).

Schlosser and his colleagues assimilated facts gathered from other dispatching centers—PSC at Table Mountain in Golden, Lower Missouri Region at Loveland, Utah Power & Light at Salt Lake City, Arizona Public Service at Phoenix.

A sudden outage had occurred at 6:02 a.m. when "something"—still unknown after three months—caused a 230,000-volt line between the Dave Johnston power plant near Casper and the Stegall substation on the Nebraska-Wyoming line near Cheyenne to open. It stayed open (line remained in fault, the engineers say).

When the high voltage sought another avenue—like water, seeking a path of least resistance—it overloaded a series of interconnected lines, in domino fashion. An early report of a faulty breaker at Stegall substation was wrong; it operated under overload as it was supposed to.

But then 115,000-volt lines between Cheyenne and two southern Wyoming plants, Seminoe and Kortez, also opened. Next came CRSP lines—138,000 volts between Vernal, Rangely and Hayden; 115,000 volts from Shiprock to Durango; 230,000 volts from Shiprock to the Curecanti unit lines.

"We could conclude from our instruments in the control center that our problems were caused by overload conditions," says Schlosser. "It was a cascading action from some place else. There would be several stages in solving the problem."

Almost all of Colorado plus parts of Wyoming, North Dakota, Nebraska, Utah and Kansas became an energy-deficient island. The complex system of interconnected lines maintained power to most people on the "island"; 160,000 customers lost power.

At that early morning hour Colorado was importing energy from outside the region and the outage to the north was felt immediately. As generation dropped, interruptible loads were shed automatically.

Within minutes all available CRSP generators were put in service to help replace declining power. (Coal-fired plants can require days to get a generator to peak capacity.)

Attempts to close the open lines and restore the power network seemed to succeed, but three times the overload tripped the breakers again. When a generator at Hayden tripped out, a major loss to the system of 250,000 kw compounded the problem. (It took this "happening" to disclose faulty wiring in the Hayden unit.)

Schlosser and his men realized what was happening and stopped trying to close the Shiprock and Curecanti lines. As engineers throughout the region worked feverishly to restore the network, one from Gering, Neb., by passed a breaker at Stegall and the system was put back together—at 9:11 a.m.

The CRSP couldn't stop or prevent the outages but it could—and did—within minutes switch on extra units at Blue Mesa, Morrow Point and Flaming Gorge to provide all available hydroelectric power—nearly 1 million kw—to help restore power wherever it was needed.

"We put on all we had in the area and loaded up," says Schlosser. "It was a real bad breakdown in a way because it happened so many times. No one person can see it all in an interconnected system. The East is ahead

of us with their coordinating center and super dispatching office."

He emphasized that with loads building up in many areas, like in Denver, the energy suppliers are "at the mercy of the transmission system."

"Generation is not keeping up because of the long delays in approval and red tape," he says, "The environmental type plugs in his appliances and then goes out to protest. Leadtime on a steam plant is seven or eight years."

Ivan Smith, power operations manager at the PSC Table Mountain center, compiled a minute-to-minute report on the Feb. 2 outages. Experiences of power agencies throughout the area might help the Western Systems Coordinating Council, an industry advisory organization, find new operating standards to minimize future outages.

"We're still undergoing a learning process," says Smith. We had a lack of information to the dispatch centers on overloads, particularly the loading on the major ties. There was inadequate communication between the Bureau and the utilities. But we are reinforcing our facilities with a minimum of two paths of communication."

While the exact cause of the outage may never be known, Smith and others noted a high north-to-south power flow that morning totaling 600,000 kw over limited transmission facilities. By agreement, the maximum now is 450,000 kw.

Despite the Western drought in 1977, California and the lower basin got their water as CRSP reservoirs permitted the release of 8.2 million acre-feet. As of last Oct. 1, an estimated 19.6 million acre-feet were still in storage. A big runoff this spring should approach capacity (31.4 million).

Although generation was down last year because less water was available (4.9 billion kwh compared to 5.7 billion kwh in 1976), and power income dropped to \$41 million, the U.S. Treasury still got \$12.4 million in CRSP payments. That leaves an unpaid balance of "only" \$650 million.

If all authorized participating projects are completed, like the Dallas Creek, Dolores and West Divide in Colorado, the reimbursable investment will rise to \$2.4 billion. CRSP financial statements say payment of power investment that carries interest will be completed by the year 2000, and that all irrigation investment will be paid by 2050, as required.

As if the water and energy business of the West weren't complex enough in the Reclamation Bureau, it was divided in two last Oct. 1. President Carter created the Department of Energy (DOE) which, among other things, took over power marketing functions from the Bureau "to promote efficiency" in the national energy program.

This meant most CRSP facilities at Montrose were transferred to the new department, including 90 of the 130 Bureau employees. The same operator at the same phone number now answers, "Department of Energy," instead of "Bureau of Reclamation."

In December DOE created the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) to supervise its new 14-state domain with its 16,235 miles of lines and 7.4 million kw capacity. Headquarters will be in Denver—somewhere. Functions are still being performed in the Reclamation Bureau at the Federal Center, with an acting administrator in Billings, Robert L. McPhail, awaiting confirmation by Congress.

Reclamation Bureau personnel still run CRSP dams. But with construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines under DOE authority, a score card is needed to determine which team is up. Ex-Bureau veterans—DOE newcomers—just shake their head and continue doing what they have always done—more efficiently, according to Washington.

The next great quagmire—it is already here—will be restructuring rates for power and energy. What is the proper charge for the capital investment in making generation available, and what is the proper charge for energy used at different hours?

In Montrose where the "world" is outside, the CRSP personnel continue providing water and energy to some 2 million Westerners, keeping water in the river to make the lower basin happy and staying alert for the next outage. There will be no letup.

"It will get a lot worse before it gets better," says DeGuire. "People can't depend on natural gas or oil. So they will turn more and more to electricity."

The CRSP power—just a byproduct of an irrigation and water-control project 20 years ago—gets more attractive daily. What other type of generation starts quickly, runs on a renewable resource, never pollutes the air or water, rarely breaks down and even contributes to the recreation, water and food supply of millions?

Yes, they are looking for some more CRSPs. If they find any, I wonder what the objections will be. ●

A CRITICAL MESSAGE FOR AMERICA FROM GEN. JOHN SINGLAUB

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the most profound, and most profoundly alarming, message I can remember on the critical condition of our national security has just been made public through an interview with Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, who ironically takes off his uniform and enters retirement from the Army today.

His vastly knowledgeable candor is in such stark contrast to the silence and evasion of his professional comrades, which I have decried in recent weeks, and the Nation is deeply indebted to him and to Spotlight, the publication of Liberty Lobby, for the great public service this represents. Combine Paul Revere and Billy Mitchell and all the other patriots who have alerted their fellow citizens to impending calamity, and you cannot begin to equal the import and the impact of this tremendous warning.

I do not merely call it to your attention, or commend it to your reading. I urge you, I implore you, for the sake of this Republic and freedom everywhere, study General Singlaub's words, take them to heart, and make them a part of your prayerful decisionmaking in the critical days ahead:

GENERAL SINGLAUB SPEAKS OUT . . . AND IT IS A GRIM WARNING TO AMERICA

(By George Nicholas)

"A fine military officer and a great patriot" was how Sen. Barry Goldwater described Major General John K. Singlaub (Spotlight, May 22, 1978).

This week we are pleased to bring our readers, in the form of an exclusive interview with staff correspondent George Nicholas, the first public statement of this distinguished commander since his summary and vindictive retirement from the crucially important post he held as chief of staff, U.S. Army Forces Command at Ft. McPherson (FORSCOM).

The circumstances in which General Singlaub abruptly ended one of the most re-

markable and promising Army careers in American military history are well known today; in fact, they have made him a national figure with a rapidly growing following.

"What we have here," Sen. Goldwater commented, "is a brave and courageous man willing to stand out alone among his fellow officers and declare what he feels to be right."

In fact, General Singlaub sought to arouse no public attention or response with his remarks, which were uttered at a private talk, before a military audience, in answer to a direct question from one of the ROTC cadets in the audience. But once challenged to state his own personal view of recent administration decisions to give away our Panama Canal, shelve the neutron bomb and scrap the B-1 bomber, General Singlaub would not equivocate, waffle or dissemble in the approved manner we have become accustomed to hearing from the political guardians of our national security; in a few simple and candid words, the general told the truth. By this act itself, General Singlaub stands alone, in a special place of honor, gallantry and exceptional merit, amid the evasiveness and cant of our vast defense bureaucracy, who were startled to hear the truth if only because they had so long ago lost the habit of uttering it.

MANY PERILOUS MISSIONS

General Singlaub has always been a "soldier's soldier," a fighting officer and combat leader who put honor and duty to the nation above bureaucratic caution. Commissioned a second lieutenant at the outset of World War II, he was posted to the European Theater where he parachuted deep into enemy territory and organized French resistance forces behind German lines as an OSS team leader. In 1944—having demonstrated exceptional ability and gallantry, as well as outstanding qualities of leadership in the performance of this singularly hazardous assignment—the young officer was transferred to the China-Burma-India Theater where he jumped behind Japanese lines to rally and direct Chinese guerrilla formations in a series of highly effective special operations under the very noses of the enemy.

World War II ended in 1945, but the shooting did not stop for John Singlaub, who found himself occupying a risky intelligence command deep in Manchuria, in the thick of the Chinese civil war. Then came the fierce, bloody Korean action: Singlaub fought it on the front lines as an infantry battalion commander. Only with a temporary lull in worldwide hostilities did he find himself stateside in the more conventional sort of post: on the faculty of the Command and General Staff College at Ft. Leavenworth; an alumnus of the Air War College; another tour in Europe, then a stint with the Army staff in Washington.

When the Vietnam crisis grew hot in the early 60s, General Singlaub found himself in yet another risky and responsible unconventional warfare command in Indochina. Then came a tour in Germany; another one in the office of the secretary of defense in the Pentagon; a stint as readiness region commander in Denver, involving work with the Army National Guard and Army Reserves; then a tour as chief of staff of the United Nations Command in Korea, 1967-77.

CRITICIZED WITHDRAWALS

After giving voice to personal doubts concerning the Carter Administration's unilateral decision to withdraw the bulk of U.S. forces from Korea—doubts which are fully spelled out in the general's own words for the first time in the interview which follows—Gen. Singlaub was recalled from Korea but given a key command: that of chief of staff, FORSCOM. When, however, he was overheard—somewhat against his own intentions—expressing honest and realistic views on the perilous state of our national

security a second time—albeit before a strictly military audience—Gen. John Singlaub was abruptly summoned to Washington. What happened next the general related to The Spotlight in his own words:

"As a result of answering some questions on a military subject from ROTC cadets—and answering then truthfully—as my own personal opinion, I encountered some dissatisfaction from the administration, which created enough embarrassment to the Army that I felt the only honorable thing to do was to submit my request for voluntary retirement."

These are the mild and generous words of a great general who voices no grievance and seeks no redress for the irrational and hysterical pressures generated by a few, measured and well-phrased reservations concerning the catastrophic state of our national security—reservations voiced before a closed military audience and disclosed only by utter inadvertence. But for all of General Singlaub's modesty and reticence, the nation knows where the truth stands and where the real guilty parties lie.

"I say the wrong man resigned," commented Sen. Goldwater on hearing of General Singlaub's retirement. But let the Carter Administration's ruthless bureaucratic enforcers note that General John Singlaub—combat infantryman, master parachutist, Army aviator, Ranger and leader of American soldiers in five separate shooting wars—has merely resigned from the Army's active list; he has not retired from public affairs, nor ended a lifetime of service to the nation. In coming months and years his voice will be heard and his presence felt wherever the vital questions of our dangerously enfeebled, disastrously neglected national security are discussed and decided.

Henceforth, if the American people demand to know the facts about the sellout of their interests and the betrayal of their national security, there will be the fearless voice of General Singlaub to tell them the truth. And soon enough—sooner than the politicians and politicians of the Carter clique think—the American people may decide to retire forever from public life the real culprits of our national betrayal.

THE INTERVIEW

Although your abrupt "retirement" last month from one of the Army's top force commands has been attributed by the establishment media to your "outspoken" remarks concerning the Pentagon's troop withdrawal from South Korea and the shelving of the neutron bomb, in reality your public comments on these and other defense matters have been brief and guarded so far. But now that you have an opportunity—the first one in a lifetime of dedicated service to the nation—to speak out without restraint, would you tell The Spotlight's readers whether recent administration policies have in fact relegated the United States to a position of military inferiority vis-a-vis the communists? Is it true that America has become a second-class power?

General SINGLAUB. "Yes, an alarming strategic imbalance in favor of the communist bloc known as the Warsaw Pact alliance has arisen as the result of our disregard of vital strategic interests, our neglect of required force structures and our unrealistic levels of defense spending. Speaking as an Army officer with long experience, I must say that Soviet armaments are now not just quantitatively but also qualitatively superior to our own—an unprecedented humiliation for the U.S., whose past hegemony was based in part on our uncontested technological leadership. Viewed in the aggregate, our defense posture over the past two or three years can only be described as unilateral disarmament. There is no question that in terms of military strength and strategic re-

sources, the communists have risen to first place over us.

But Administration spokesmen suggest that only by adopting this sort of conciliatory and deferential approach can we hope to soften the Soviets to espouse detente—that is, a relaxation of cold-war tensions—and enter productive arms-control negotiations with us. Have you noticed any signs of Soviet responsiveness along these lines?

General SINGLAUB. "No, there are no visible indications that our attempts to humor and appease the Soviets are producing any reciprocal gestures of communist pacifism. In fact, the contrary is true: our misguided and illogical defense policies are encouraging the Soviets and their surrogates to stage ever more aggressive and expansionist global scenarios in Africa, the Middle East, and elsewhere. Of course, it cannot be otherwise. The example of history tells us that when you allow one side among potential adversaries to acquire a decisive military edge, you cannot hope to preserve peace: this is how wars are started. Our irrational and inadequate defense policies, our hesitancy in asserting our vital strategic interests, our appeasement-minded giveaways are leading our opponents to the belief that they can get away with murder. This is the certain road to global conflagration and thermonuclear war."

Fidel Castro, foremost among the surrogate Soviet shock troops, has been allowed—by U.S. absenteeism—to score heady victories in Angola and Ethiopia. Will Communist Cuba now renew the demand that we hand over our naval base at Guantanamo?

General SINGLAUB. "By every report, Castro is greatly stimulated by his African exploits and by the U.S. giveaway of our historic Panama Canal command. He may well decide that the time is ripe for another grab at the American naval base on Guantanamo Bay. And if Castro does, for all I know, the White House may decide, in the spirit of detente, that he should have it."

Do the Joint Chiefs agree with these policies, and if not, do they have the freedom to make their dissent known?

General SINGLAUB. "Well, I cannot speak for the views held by the Joint Chiefs, but I can tell you that according to Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, senior officers who dissent do have one freedom: to resign."

We hear incessant rumors, and as often as not from knowledgeable and trustworthy inside sources, that behind the Pentagon's "consensus curtain" there is a great deal of concern and dissent among senior service commanders. The American public, instead of being told the truth about our critical situation, is being fed a stream of propaganda, slogans and myths by administration publicists. What is the truth?

General SINGLAUB. "Well, one thing I can confirm is the existence of widely propagated 'defense myths' that do a lot of harm whatever their origin. One of these myths is that the Soviets, like ourselves, consider all-out nuclear war 'unthinkable'—an option only a madman would invoke. But in reality—although the American public has not been told of this—we have hard information indicating that the Soviet high command by no means views all-out thermonuclear conflict as an 'unthinkable' contingency. They think about it a great deal; in fact, they don't merely meditate on it, they are devising strategic scenarios for the launching, fighting and winning of a nuclear campaign against the U.S."

"Another defense myth sold to the American public is the assumption that chemical-biological warfare—involving poison gas and deadly germs—has been abandoned by all major powers. We here in the United States have done so—foresworn the use of chemical or biological agents in combat and destroyed the bulk of our existing stockpiles of such

substances. Research and development on CBW projects was cancelled in toto by presidential order. Having set a moral example with all this, Washington fully expected the Soviets to follow suit. But our adversaries did nothing of the sort. There are reliable intelligence indicators that the Soviets have sharply stepped up their CBW research and development programs and that they are stockpiling deadly bacteria and viruses for "use against the Soviet Union's enemies" in case of war. Here we have the result of a widely disseminated defense myth: an entire branch of warfare in which Soviet superiority is absolute and U.S. inferiority total."

Do such "defense myths" arise spontaneously, or with the aid of administration and media propagandists?

General SINGLAUB. "You only have to trace the genesis of such a defense myth to realize that it does not spring spontaneously from the heavens. Take the myth that "We cannot ever again become involved in an Asian land war." When this myth first began to circulate, toward the end of the ill-starred Vietnam war, it was endorsed, not by just the usual coterie of establishment "defense analysts" and "policy scholars" but by an unexpected dove, North Korea's Communist dictator Kim Il Sung. Neurotic and megalomaniac, Kim Il Sung has long been known as the proponent of a single war doctrine: that South Korea must be reunified as a single communist peninsula under his personal control. But in early 1972 we suddenly began to hear strange, soothing sounds from North Korea. Detente was in the air. The Communist North Koreans opened a series of negotiations with the anti-communist, U.S.-backed South Koreans. These negotiations, Kim Il Sung declared, would generate a mutually satisfactory settlement to the Korean problem so that the U.S. need never become involved in an Asian land war again. Well, Washington was pleased as punch. In early 1971 we had withdrawn the U.S. 7th Division from South Korea, and now the buzz went around U.S. policymaking circles: "Here it is! The Communists are responding to our peace overtures! Detente is going global! There'll be no more major wars in the Far East!"

Unfortunately for all this official optimism, Kim Il Sung never meant a word of it. While he lulled Washington with a series of "peace talks" he was secretly preparing for war—by all signs, offensive war. Beginning in 1972, the North Koreans embarked on an intensive, immensely costly rearmament program that concentrated on military hardware required only in wars of aggression. The North Korean high command moved up its heavy artillery units into concrete-hardened emplacements right along the frontier, for maximum reach into South Korea. They doubled the number of their fighter aircraft and tanks, tripled their mobile armor and increased four-fold the number of amphibious assault craft—a purely offensive piece of equipment. Having deployed their 120 mm howitzers and 130 mm siege guns and FROG missiles along the border, Kim Il Sung backed them up with many military airfields moved up front and concealed in reinforced underground hangars and with hardened tank sites dug deep in mountains along the border. He built 12 ocean-going attack submarines—South Korea has not a single one—and emplaced them in forward berths shielded by concrete and anti-aircraft batteries. He vastly expanded the war production capacity of North Korea; almost all of the weaponry we have discussed here, even the subs, while designed in the USSR were actually built in North Korea. Finally, the North Koreans began digging tunnels under the DMZ. They also sent teams of secret agents to South Korea to stir up the kind of trouble that would eventually touch off an armed conflict. You can see why I said that withdrawing our

forces from South Korea might lead to war. In fact, it is an act of folly."

Does the presence of strong and combat-ready U.S. defense forces make a crucial difference in such a situation?

General SINGLAUB. Indeed it does. First of all, Kim Il Sung, for all his compulsive power-drive, might himself hesitate to push the button for all-out war that instantly embroils him in a shoot-out with the U.S. Moreover, his patrons—the Soviet Union and Red China—may well restrain him for the time being from triggering total war—something Moscow might decide to set off by its own actions, when the moment is ripe, but not by proxy. The same reasoning holds in Europe, where our NATO forces have been seriously undercut by the withdrawal of their support echelons. Here the currently prevailing official myth is that if an emergency hits, we can always summon up the reserves. But the real-time, lightning-fast scenario of modern nuclear conflict will allow no time for old-fashioned mobilization; it will erupt over our heads like thunder and lightning. Thus it is essential that we maintain adequate force structures, both in the Far East and in Europe.

Does that include deployment of the neutron bomb?

General SINGLAUB. It does. That production of the enhanced radiation weapon, the so-called neutron bomb, can be put off indefinitely, is another myth. What the American public is not told is that in heavy tanks, as well as other armored fighting vehicles, the Soviets hold a 5-to-1 superiority over us. The neutron bomb is our best anti-tank weapon right now; it should become part of our defense arsenal without a day's delay.

5-to-1 sounds like an awesome edge for the communists to be holding over our heads. Have things come down to this sorry state?

General SINGLAUB. They have. I feel certain the American public doesn't even suspect the real deterioration in our defenses—our defenses, to use the apt term for them. Our main battle tank, the M-60, is hopelessly outdated; its Soviet counterpart, the T-72, is technologically almost three generations ahead. We have a projected new battle tank, the XM-1, and it's a good piece of armor. But its production is being dangerously delayed—just like the neutron bomb, only even more so. It is indispensable for our army's combat capability that the XM-1 be committed to full-scale production without further foot-dragging. We are also in dire need of a new generation of infantry fighting vehicles. The M-133 was a good armored troop carrier 20 years ago, but now it's way outclassed by comparable Soviet-bloc equipment. And it's not just the rolling stock that's outdated. At Ft. Bragg some troops are still housed in wooden sheds built during World War II—for that matter, here at Ft. McPherson we use buildings dating back to the 19th century—and with construction lagging nationwide, the time has come to modernize our accommodations.

Where do our most urgent priorities arise—abroad or here at home?

General SINGLAUB. In global terms, we face a grave crisis. Our failure to act in a consistent and logical way in Africa, our unwillingness and unpreparedness to live up to our historic role—that of the leading power and champion of the free world—in Europe and elsewhere, has encouraged the Soviet Union and its surrogates, mainly Cuba and East Germany, to their present level of aggressive and expansionist activity. They are following reckless policies, moving military forces into areas of the world where the communist bloc has had traditionally no influence to speak of. That, in my opinion, is the fatal road to World War III. But our key priorities and most crucial challenges lie right here at home. We must not merely

revise our defense appropriations but our thinking in the vital area of national security.

Now that you are free to explain the facts to all Americans, and perhaps assume your preordained role in the process of rethinking our national priorities, may we hope that you will do so, General?

General SINGLAUB. Right now, I can only say that I do intend to take a hand in this urgent national reappraisal. I hope to be able to continue to serve our country, perhaps at first working with organizations that share my concern over that state of our national security.

THE PRESIDENT'S DILEMMA IN AFRICA

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, conflicts which have been simmering in Africa for several years are now claiming global significance culminating in a new and dangerous chasm between the superpowers. Events in recent days have the sense of a growing, if not imminent, crisis, threatening both detente and the administration's efforts to establish a new and viable African policy. African countries are also confronted with the grim prospect of East/West frictions being played out in places like Eritrea, Angola, Zaire, and Zimbabwe at the expense of African interest, often with the shedding of African blood. Americans are being told that our country has suffered important policy reverses in countries which few knew existed a short time ago. How significant these reverses are to vital U.S. national interests is difficult to ascertain in the present emotionally charged atmosphere.

The President faces a dilemma, partly of his own making. He must appear to be strong and effective in countering Soviet and Cuban designs in Africa but not in a way which will alienate relations with important African Countries and with no apparent show of force to back up his rhetoric. And the choices before President Carter are not all that attractive. Nor does the United States have a tremendous amount of leverage in coping with sporadic crises in that continent. Fiery statements from administration spokesmen only increase the possibility of the United States overreacting at some point, which could precipitate another Vietnam commitment. We wisely avoided that mistake in the Horn of Africa, but who is to say it will not happen in other African hotspots. CIA Director Stansfield Turner's visit on Capitol Hill to explore the possibility of supplying military support (through third countries) to guerrilla factions in Angola, supposedly to keep the Cubans occupied there, is one grim example. This is an ominous reminder of the CIA of old, but it certainly is no way to conduct foreign policy.

In addition to lambasting the Russians and the Cubans, the President has also openly worried about so-called congressional restraints on his ability to respond effectively to recent events in Africa. One

can admittedly share President Carter's frustration over his inability to respond to Russian-Cuban initiatives in Africa, but Congress is not the problem. To date there has been no legitimate reason or circumstance that could justify our direct involvement in Africa; even if there were, it is doubtful the administration would commit us to matching Russian-Cuban adventurism with American adventurism on an endless "tit for tat" basis. Communist countries do not have public reaction to contend with in their foreign policy and besides it is unlikely the American people will again support extensive U.S. involvement in a remote and vast continent.

The major problem of U.S. policy in Africa is not congressional restraints on Presidential action (which, for the most part, make extensive allowances when U.S. national security is involved), but the absence of a clear sense of what our Government's goals are in Africa or a well-articulated vision of what the U.S. role should be on the continent.

U.S. policy in Africa today is still in a state of transition—from the post-colonial era of identifying with our European Allies (most of whom happened to be the colonial powers) to a more African-oriented policy of supporting liberation efforts, particularly in southern Africa, which the Soviets have been doing all along.

In the midst of all the rhetoric emanating from the White House, thus far the United States has pursued prudent and well-measured actions in responding to conflicts in Africa. But the President could also do much more to respond to the destabilizing consequences of the Soviet-Cuban presence in Africa while minimizing the likelihood of that continent becoming a battleground for East/West proxy wars. U.S. policy should be directed to helping these countries band together and develop a capability of responding collectively to common threats.

There is an impressive body of testimony which suggests that the United States could offer a viable alternative to countries with a significant Cuban presence rather than simply writing them off as lost causes. Russia's scorecard in Africa is not all that impressive, despite the media's preoccupation with Russian gains there. Former Russian clients like Sudan, Egypt, Somalia, and North Yemen all have a bitter dislike and distrust of the U.S.S.R. Africa may well turn out to be Russia's Vietnam.

A few years ago, the National Security Council warned Congress that Russia's two African surrogates, Somalia and Guinea, posed security problems for the United States. At the time, both of these coastal states had Soviet-built port and air facilities that were used for their naval and reconnaissance missions. It turned out to be a poor investment for the Russians as they were thrown out of Somalia earlier this year and are on their way out of Guinea.

Another possibility would be for the United States to focus more on the Soviet rather than the Cuban presence as a source of concern. Africans are finding the Russians can get pretty arrogant, if

not outright racist, in their dealings with Third World countries. One wonders whether the Soviet presence in Africa would be that significant if somehow the United States would not be so paranoid about the Russian-Cuban axis and concentrate on the social and economic forces that logically bring us together.

At the very least, the administration should refrain from foreclosing some of these options by playing so heavily into the knee-jerk reactions which have surrounded the Soviet and Cuban presence in Africa. Let the United States be on the African side and pursue those policies that will benefit Africans and not over-react to Communist-inspired activities, they represent no serious threat to our national security.

The Communists, for their part, will eventually be recognized for what they really are—neocolonialists—and will soon discover that Africans do not make good Marxists. When all the politicking and fighting have subsided, Africans are going to be Africans regardless of what the superpowers do in that continent. ●

AMENDING THE IMPACT AID PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer an amendment regarding the impact aid program reauthorized in title X of H.R. 15.

Since I have been in Congress I have been a consistent opponent of the impact aid program. In my view, much of the program has no economic justification. I refer particularly to those portions of the act authorized in section 3(b) of Public Law 874 which make payments to school districts on behalf of children of civilian Government employees.

Let me make it clear, however, that I, too, support payments to school districts on behalf of military personnel who either live on military property or in an adjacent community. The Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act through its provisions essentially denies States and communities from benefits or significant tax revenue for military personnel, thereby imposing a burden on the educational system in those areas.

However, these same facts do not exist with respect to civilian employees. They live exclusively in private residences which generate property taxes. They do not have access to commissaries and PX's (which are exempt from sales taxation), and they are not excused from the payment of State income taxes. In short, civilian Federal employees do not impose an economic burden on the communities in which they reside or work.

As a matter of fact, it is my view that Federal employees bring to a community a considerable number of advantages as evidenced by the struggles which go on within this body over the location of Federal offices. For the most part, Fed-

eral personnel are much more highly paid than the average State and local worker and, in many cases, more highly paid than those in private industry. They, therefore, generate a considerable amount of revenue for the States and communities where they are located.

Because I do not feel that it is possible to eliminate payments for these civilian employees overnight, the amendment which I have offered would reduce payments over a 6-year period, beginning with fiscal 1979. Each year the payments would be reduced by one-sixth so that by fiscal 1984 payment would be entirely eliminated for these students.

According to cost calculations done by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, this amendment would reduce entitlements an estimated \$129 million in fiscal 1979 and by the time of its full implementation in fiscal 1984, would reduce entitlements under Public Law 874 by \$1.2 billion. However, even with these reductions, payment levels through tier 2 would be almost identical with estimated payments under the current law in fiscal 1979.

I commend the amendment to my colleagues and urge its adoption:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15

Page 270 strike out lines 14 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Absorption;
Sec. 1004. Subparagraph (A) of section 3(d)(2) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) (A) For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the number of children determined under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) shall, for any fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1978, be deemed to be a number which is equal to the following fraction of the number actually determined under such paragraphs:

"(i) five-sixths of such actual number for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979;

"(ii) four-sixths of such actual number for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980;

"(iii) three-sixths of such actual number for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981;

"(iv) two-sixths of such actual number for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982; and

"(v) one-sixth of such actual number for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, and for any fiscal year beginning on or after October 1, 1983, the number of children determined under such paragraphs shall, for purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, be deemed to be zero. ●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY BOB HOPE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Bob Hope has been called an American institution and as such I believe it is appropriate to have him in Washington to honor him for his 75th birthday. It is indeed refreshing to have a national institution come to this city without asking for Federal funds. To list all of Bob Hope's accomplishments is a

task we should leave to those who have the time to publish many tomes. More important than his accomplishments though, Bob Hope retains a spot at the core of every American's affections and especially the millions of servicemen to whom he selflessly gave his time, spirit and heart during Christmas for so many years. He is a man who not only fulfills the promise of his name but who throws a large measure of generosity and charity along with it. In fact, Bob Hope hoards only one thing, his eternal youth.●

RICE FOR LAOS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the administration announced its intention to donate 10,000 tons of rice to Laos under title II of the Public Law 480 program.

The administration states that this \$5 million of aid is being granted as a humanitarian gesture to a country which has been stricken by a severe drought. It is estimated that Laos needs 112,975 tons of foodstuffs to offset their drought losses; 80,00 to 90,000 tons already having been pledged by private organizations and governments, our donation will come close to fulfilling the Laotian needs.

This grant demonstrates the continuing commitment by the United States to human rights and basic humanitarian aid. The United States has consistently fulfilled its international obligation to aid in emergency situations. However, the Laotian Government has failed to fulfill its international obligation to give a complete and accurate reporting of any MIA's in their country.

Our Nation has repeatedly requested such information, and have sent to the Laotian Government files on 49 MIA's in Laos. We have received no reply.

It is hoped that the Carter administration will take into account the humanitarian aspects of the unresolved MIA issue in considering any future aid to Laos and insist that any improvement in our relations with that nation and any aid beyond that which addresses emergency needs, be contingent upon a full accounting of our MIA's and adherence to international agreements on human rights.

The Congress has recently expressed its wholehearted concern for our MIA's in H.R. 538, a resolution which I authored, calling upon the President to request a U.N. investigation of the MIA problem. In addition, the Congress has refused aid to Vietnam due to its lack of cooperation on the MIA problem.

It is my hope that our foreign policy and aid commitments to countries such as Laos and Vietnam, which have withheld information on our missing servicemen, will in the future reflect the high priority which we place on a full accounting.●

THE ROAD TO PROSPERITY—PART V—ONE MORE ANALYSIS OF THE INVESTMENT INCENTIVE ACT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's RECORD contained an economic analysis of the Investment Incentive Act by Merrill Lynch Economics. It is one of four analyses that have been done on the act. Today, I want to include in the RECORD the fourth analysis.

This analysis has been prepared by Norman Ture, Dr. Ture has been working with the National Association of Manufacturers to develop an econometric model for analyzing and measuring the effects of taxes and changes in the tax laws on our economy. The NAM Tax Impact Project Task Force has been working since 1974 to construct this model.

The work by Ture and TIP is perhaps the first to measure the direct effects of tax changes on the supply of labor and capital services. People do not engage in economic activity for purely altruistic motives. There have to be rewards and incentives. In economic terms, the greater the reward, the more people would be willing to expend on a particular activity. On the other hand, disincentives will discourage economic activity.

Whether we like it or not, taxes are a disincentive. If people feel their labor is subject to a high tax, they will not work as hard. If individuals feel that their savings—their capital stock—is subject to a high tax, they will consume, not save. Or, they will invest in any available tax shelter, even if it is uneconomical, merely to avoid paying high taxes. If the tax burden is relieved, the opposite effect occurs. People will work harder and save more.

These are facts of life which are not measured in the revenue estimates which are done by the Treasury Department on tax legislation. These facts cannot be ignored. At least some attempts are being made to provide a realistic basis for legislating on taxes. For instance, Chase Econometrics, DRI, Merrill Lynch Economics and Ture-TIP have sought to develop objective measures of the economic impact on a change in the capital gains tax. Economics is still an art, not a science, so the effort is not the final step in the process. At the moment, it is the best we have. I hope the Members will find this information useful when we consider the Investment Incentive Act.

The analysis follows:

Subject: Effects of H.R. 12111 on the Economy and on Federal Tax Revenues.

Enactment of H.R. 12111, restoring the pre-1969 alternative tax treatment of net long-term capital gains and eliminating capital gains as a preference item for minimum tax, would have a significant expansionary effect on the economy and would modestly increase Federal tax revenues. Assuming the bill's enactment as of the beginning of 1978, full-time equivalent employment would increase by 90,000 over the levels projected under present law for 1978 (although the provi-

sions of the bill would not be effective until January 1, 1980, the saving and investment response by both individuals and corporations would initiate with enactment of the legislation); in 1987, there would be 150,000 more full-time equivalent employed persons than the projected present-law level.

This increase in jobs would reflect both the increase in the demand for and supply of labor services resulting from the net additions to the stock of business capital in response to the reduction in the overall marginal rate of tax on capital income effected by H.R. 12111. The estimated response would be an \$8 billion increase in gross capital outlays in the first year, increasing to \$19 billion in the fifth year as adjustment to the lower cost of saving and of capital was completed; on the new, higher growth path of the economy, gross capital outlays would be \$13 billion more than under present law 10 years hence; net capital additions would be \$6 billion more (measured in constant 1977 dollars).

These larger additions to the amount of business capital would increase the productivity of labor and real wage rates—by \$90 a year in the first year, increasing to \$150 a year 10 years later (in constant 1977 dollars). Together with the increase in the gross returns to the larger stock of capital, the increased labor income resulting from the expansion in employment and in real wage rates would raise GNP by \$12 billion over the present-law level in the first year and by \$27 billion 10 years later (measured in constant 1977 dollars). Of this increase in GNP, the increase in total real wages would amount to about \$10 billion in the first year, rising to about \$19 billion in 1987.

In response to the reduction in tax on the returns on investment, individuals would increase their saving by increasing amounts during the first five years. In the fifth year, as the adjustment was completed, consumption outlays would be slightly less than under present law, although greater than in the previous year. Thereafter consumption would increase; 10 years after enactment, consumption spending would be about \$14 billion greater than under present law.

The initial-impact revenue effect would be to reduce Federal tax revenues by about \$2 billion in 1980 and by about \$3 billion in 1987 (constant 1977 dollars). These estimates, however, are grossly misleading; they assume no economic effects from enactment of the bill. Taking those effects into account, there would be an immediate revenue gain of \$3 billion in 1978. The increase in revenues would taper off thereafter; in 1987, the net effect on Federal tax revenues would be a gain of about \$1 billion.

These revenue estimates ignore the possible effects of H.R. 12111 on the extent to which taxpayers would choose to realize capital gains. The present tax treatment of capital gains not only increases the total tax on the returns to saving and investing, it also acts as a transfer tax on the disposition of capital assets. Reducing the capital gains tax rate, particularly for taxpayers with large amounts of capital assets, would in all likelihood induce an increase in the volume of realization. The data on gain realization, however, afford no basis for reliable estimation of the increase in realization in response to a reduction in the capital gains tax rate in any given period of time.

Our revenue estimates also do not take into account the effects of H.R. 12111 on capital asset values. Reducing the marginal rate of tax on capital gains should tend to raise the market value of capital assets; the magnitude of this effect is difficult to estimate. Insofar as H.R. 12111 resulted in a significant increase in realization, this would tend to curb the increase in the market value of assets. Hence, the larger the estimate of the feedback revenue gain from additional

transactions, the smaller is the likely revenue gain from increases in the market valuation of assets. If one were to assume that the combined effect of additional realizations and increase in market value is a 10 percent increase in the amount of gains reported and included in taxable income, the net effect on Federal tax revenues would be an increase of about \$1 billion over the amounts shown in the attached Table 1.

In any event, our estimates of the new revenue effects should be seen as lower limits. Actual revenue gains are likely to be modestly greater than shown in the attached Table 1.

TABLE 1.—ECONOMIC AND FEDERAL TAX REVENUE EFFECTS OF H.R. 12111

[Dollar amounts in constant 1977 dollars]				
Increase or decrease (-) in—	1978	1980	1982	1987
Employment (thousands of full-time equivalent employees).....	90	100	110	150
Annual wage rate.....	\$80	\$90	\$110	\$150
Gross national product (billions):				
Total.....	12	15	18	27
Business sector.....	10	12	14	21
Capital outlays (billions):				
Gross.....	8	12	19	13
Net.....	8	11	16	6
Consumption (billions).....	4	3	(1)	14
Federal tax revenues (billions):				
Initial impact.....	0	(2)	(3)	(3)
Net of feedback.....	3	1	0	1

Note: The figures are the differences between the estimated amount of the respective economic magnitudes under the tax change and under present law in each year.

Amounts shown in parentheses are decreases from present law in that year, not from the preceding year under the tax change.

Estimates of employment effects are rounded to the nearest 10,000; estimates of annual wage effects are rounded to the nearest \$10; estimates of effects on GNP, capital outlays, consumption, and Federal revenues are rounded to the nearest \$1 billion.

Table 2. Effects of H.R. 12111 on Real Wages and Returns to Capital¹

	Returns	
	Real Wages	to Capital
	(billions of 1977 dollars)	
First Year.....	10	3
Third Year.....	11	4
Fifth Year.....	13	4
Tenth Year.....	19	6

¹Returns to capital exclude income imputed to owner-occupied houses and income from abroad.●

CARTER ADMINISTRATION FUZZY ON GUN CONTROL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, press accounts this weekend have convinced me that President Carter may have given his personal endorsement to the Treasury Department proposed regulations of March 21, which provide for registration of gun sales.

By permitting confusing press accounts to be circulated over the wire services during the Memorial Day recess, the administration has convinced many that it will rescind the proposed Treasury regulations of May 22. This is not necessarily the case. It could be a ruse.

Because many of my colleagues may be confused as to the present signals. I am inserting in the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post: the first appeared May 27, 1978, and is written as follows:

GUN FRIENDS SHOOT DOWN TREASURY NUMBERS PLAN

The Treasury Department dropped stiff new gun control proposals yesterday under pressure from thousands who believed the government was trying to make them register their guns.

President Carter had proposed regulations on March 16 designed to make it easier for the government to track guns used in a crime. They would require any gun made or imported in the United States to have a unique serial number and require that all gun thefts be reported.

The problem comes over the increased reports, required from the gun manufacturers, importers and dealers.

The regulations did not have to be approved by Congress, but the Treasury's Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division (ATF) needed between \$4 and 5 million to put the program into effect.

At least 200,000 people, led by the National Rifle Association and other pro-gun lobbying groups, put on the pressure. ATF officials said. Letters were running 18-to-1 against the proposal. Congress passed a resolution dropping \$4.2 million from the ATF budget.

The Treasury gave in yesterday. "The whole business is dead," said a spokesman.

"The Treasury Department has informed Congress that the proposed firearms regulation, which is the subject of some controversy, will not be implemented unless Congress provides the funds beforehand."

When the rules were announced, Assistant Treasury Secretary Richard Davis said they would "allow us to trace firearms used in crime in a much more efficient and effective manner."

Opponents felt this was a first step toward gun registration—a highly emotional issue. The file would be computerized, they said, and a future administration could easily add the requirement that gun owners' names be added.

As one opposing letter said, "History has proven that gun registration is generally followed by gun confiscation and the enslavement of free people."

The other article which I am inserting appeared the very next day, Sunday, May 28, 1978, and reads as follows:

TREASURY DENIES IT HAS DROPPED PLANS FOR GUN-CONTROL RULES

(By Harold J. Logan)

The Treasury Department yesterday denied that it has dropped a set of proposed new gun-control regulations, but conceded it is not likely they will be implemented in 1979 as originally proposed.

The department's statement came after news reports indicated that it had dropped the proposals in the face of pressure generated by the National Rifle Association, a powerful pro-gun lobby.

The regulations would require quarterly reports of all gun sales, unique 14-character serial numbers on each gun and immediate reports of thefts from dealers.

"The Treasury Department has not withdrawn or revised the proposed regulations it published on March 21," Assistant Treasury Secretary Richard J. Davis said yesterday.

"Because of great public interest in the issue, and because of the widespread incorrect information about the nature of these proposals that have been generated by some groups we have extended the comment on them until June 30," he said.

President Carter proposed the new regulations March 16 in an effort to make it easier

for the government to track guns used in crimes.

At least 200,000 people wrote to Treasury's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms protesting the proposals. Almost immediately, Congress passed a resolution dropping \$4.2 million—the amount needed to implement the regulations—from ATF's fiscal 1979 budget.

In a May 23 letter to Sen. Lawton Chiles (D-Fla.), chairman of the Treasury appropriations subcommittee, Deputy Treasury Secretary Robert Carswell wrote, "If a decision is made to implement any of [these regulations], it would be necessary to seek either a supplemental appropriation for 1979 or include a request for such funds in our 1980 submission.

"We will not implement these proposals without receiving from Congress the funds to do so."

NRA officials had raised the objection that the regulations were an attempt to "end run" Congress with administrative rules that exceeded Treasury's legal authority.

I should like to emphasize for my colleagues that the first news item was a United Press International dispatch, which may likely have carried in many newspapers throughout the country. The second "clean-up" article was written by a Washington Post staff writer, and carried no UPI dispatch identification. Because some constituents may honestly believe that the Treasury Department has dropped its proposals, I believe it incumbent upon those of us in the Congress to inform the public of the following facts:

First. The Treasury Department has extended public comment until June 30, but states, as a reason that "because of great public interest in the issue, and because of the widespread incorrect information about the nature of these proposals * * *" the period for public comment is being extended. Clearly, this is a case of the tail wagging the dog. Because a Treasury Department official believes that opponents of the regulations are incorrectly informed, we can only assume that he is hoping that by leaving the doors open for public comment beyond the May 22 original deadline, many gun control groups will rally to the support of the officials who proposed the regulations.

Second. While developments in the House and Senate Appropriations Committees give us heart that the data bank system will not be implemented during fiscal year 1979, there is no assurance that the BATF will not continue to implement the structure. The agency may not fully promulgate the regulations until it receives full funding from the Appropriations Committees. During hearings in the House and Senate, the BATF was severely reprimanded for not having sought advanced authority. There are some Members, however, who, while agreeing with the regulations in principle, voted to strike down funding at this time because the Treasury Department had failed to consult the proper committees. This means that the Department could quietly incorporate the data collection system in future budgetary requests, at such a time when the public sentiment would not be running at such a high level as today.

Third. The Department has clearly

stated that they have not withdrawn or revised the regulations, and have shown no inclination to do so.

Fourth. More than 200 of our colleagues in the House and the Senate have joined Senator JAMES MCCLURE and me in pursuing our legislative efforts to gain disapproval of the registration plan.

Fifth. The BATF regulations have been endorsed by the National Coalition to Ban Handguns as so valuable that "if adopted, they could represent the most important victory for handgun control since the 1968 act."

Sixth. The Treasury Department itself has stated that it has a 90 percent effectiveness on tracing firearms. No need for the regulations has been demonstrated.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF CONTENTS OF GUN REGULATIONS IS NEEDED

As ranking minority member of the committee charged with oversight of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, I have insisted upon full disclosure of the nature of this proposed rulemaking since the first day I knew of the plan. At our subcommittee briefing of March 16, the BATF first advised us of their intentions. After studying the proposal, I issued a statement that "A broad sweeping plan for gun control is being pushed by a Federal agency without the consent of Congress. This sneak attack is the Carter administration's way of getting gun control without public knowledge."

Since that statement was carried by the news media, the BATF has carried on an aggressive lobbying effort to discredit the opinions of Members of Congress who have determined to stop the implementation of these proposals.

Because many gun owners and other freedom-loving people from across the country have asked whether the BATF actually intends to pursue their rulemaking, I submit the following information for the benefit of my colleagues and interested citizens. The report contains a listing of contradictions which show, at a minimum, that the Agency has misrepresented the nature of its proposals.

CONTRADICTIONS BY THE BATF REVEALED IN SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME OVERSIGHT HEARINGS—MAY 4, 1978, AND MAY 18, 1978

First. The BATF stated, during congressional briefings, that the cost of implementation of this project would be \$4-\$6 million. However, a document published by that Agency April 1, 1977, entitled "Critique by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, U.S. Treasury Department, of the Police Foundation Report on Firearms", stated that "it would take 4,432 positions and would cost \$104 million." If we are to believe BATF's report of April 1, the cost of implementing this project would be astronomical.

Second. The BATF did not disclose their intentions to create a Federal firearms data bank to the Appropriations Committees, even though they had completed their drafts prior to their own appearances before the committees for fiscal year 1979 appropriations. A belated letter of May 23 to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee with appropriations authority over BATF was cited in the Washington Post article of May 28 as follows:

If a decision is made to implement any of [these regulations], it would be necessary to seek either a supplemental appropriation for 1979 or include a request for such funds in our 1980 submission.

We will not implement these proposals without receiving from Congress the funds to do so.

During our hearings, when confronted with a "90-percent tracing success" press release of April 1, 1978, BATF Director Rex Davis disclaimed the accuracy of that figure, and claimed the need for improved firearms tracing capability.

The latter, taken in tandem with other erroneous press announcements, casts serious doubt upon the BATF's credibility by stating one thing to the media, and another to the Congress, they have succeeded in creating an atmosphere of doubt and mistrust.

Third. They stated during briefings and oversight hearings that they had the authority to implement these regulations. Yet, they now promise to return to us for authority to spend the funds to implement their plan. Just what has the BATF said? Do they intend to rescind the regulations, or do they intend to put them on the books? Put them on the books and wait for funding?

Fourth. The agency has stated, in correspondence with congressional offices, that the regulations would not amount to registration of individual gun owners. However, the regulations on their face will permit massive cataloging of names and addresses of citizens who purchase firearms as follows:

From a firearms licensee who goes out of business (23,000 yearly);

Purchases of more than one handgun in a period of 5 days from the same firearms licensee;

Military personnel who desire to purchase firearms while on duty for later return to the United States, and

Firearms that are imported by a firearms licensee.

There is a likelihood that a "political agreement" made by certain Treasury Department officials (as revealed by Assistant Secretary Richard Davis during a March 16 briefing session), may well call for later total inclusion of the identity of all purchasers of firearms.

HEARINGS REVEAL BREACH OF FAITH BY CARTER ADMINISTRATION

During our committee hearings on the 1968 Gun Control Act, and subsequently on the proposed Federal Firearms Act of 1976, administration spokesmen said that centralized records would not be maintained under the then existing legal authority of BATF. The law has not changed, but the administration has.

Our hearings revealed that people are concerned that their Government can, in 1978, reverse commitments made in 1967 and 1975. To paraphrase the words of one of our subcommittee witnesses of May 18, Mr. Robert Cherry, a director of the National Sporting Goods Association, the public has a right to some consistency in Government policy. He said, in part:

Now, to me when a current government official—say, Mr. Davis, Rex Davis—who is currently—or Mr. Richard Davis, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and Mr. Davis who

is the Director of the BATF—when either of those gentlemen give me an assurance or tell me something, it is more than Mr. Davis speaking to me. It is the voice of my government. And when my government assures me that something will not be done or will be done, I take that as a very definite obligation from my own government. I then, therefore, believe that it certainly should be binding because I have been assured as all of the gentlemen who are in my position in the past many times that this is not an attempt at registration, that it is something that we do not intend to do. And yet at some later date some different gentleman tells me that, "Well, we've changed our minds. We think we are going the other way." I regard that a breach of faith by my government.

I believe this sums up the feeling of those of us who are puzzled by the Carter administration's conflicting pronouncements. As Members of Congress, we, too, expect to be told the truth. We deserve to know exactly the nature of this administration's plans for gun control. Will they rescind the regulations or will they quietly implement them as they quietly work their way through the Halls of Congress? If we do not demonstrate to the people in this country that we will "hang tight" to protect them against the arrogance of Government run afoul of previous pronouncements and previous congressional limitations, I fear that we are not fulfilling our duties to serve as the closest link between the people and the Government.

WHAT CAN A MEMBER OF CONGRESS DO?

I should like to urge my colleagues who believe that the history is clear . . . that Congress has spoken loudly against Federal registration on at least 16 previous occasions, in both Houses and in the committees of the Houses, to join me in my efforts in the battle against the implementation of these regulations. I am asking our friends to redouble their efforts, and for those who have not yet joined us to do so. You may aid by doing the following:

First. Write to the BATF, expressing your concern with the implementation of such regulations. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 1978, page 10138 contains many of my criticisms of the proposed regulations. The deadline for public comment has been extended to June 30. The agency, in counting responses to the proposal, has cataloged letters in separate categories, listing congressional comments separately from the other nine categories.

Second. Speak with Members of Congress who have not yet joined in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 558 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 79. These resolutions serve to place BATF on notice of congressional disapproval. They reiterate the legislative history, and set forth the clear and concise argument that the attempts to implement these regulations exceed statutory authority.

Third. Plan public meetings in your congressional districts to inform constituents as to the present status of these regulations, advising of the danger of silence. In not opposing the regulations, they may permit this agency to reject the tremendous responses already received. The agency may very well attempt to implement its plans at a later time when

it can quietly obtain congressional funding. The threat of this cannot be over-emphasized, as the agency views persons who dissent from their own position as having "widespread incorrect information . . ." (May 28, Washington Post article).

PRESIDENT CARTER MUST CLARIFY HIS POSITION

This proposal has come home to roost on the doorstep of the President. Some press accounts would lead citizens, and perhaps Members of the National Legislature to believe that the administration has rescinded its gun control proposal.

By permitting the Federal bureaucracy to cloud public thinking as to the exact course of these regulations, the administration is casting serious doubt as to its integrity.

The President should immediately inform the public as to the plan to either implement this new system of Federal gun control, or rescind the proposal. The American public has the right to know this answer. People are deluging the Congress, asking whether their Government is going to continue its plans, rejecting prior congressional intent, or withdrawing the regulations.

Vague and inaccurate press accounts only lead to misunderstanding and, ultimately, a general lack of confidence in the functioning of Government. Who is governing whom, and by whose will are we being controlled, Mr. Carter?

I am hopeful that the developments of late will not lull us into complacency, but rather, will underscore the dire urgency of prompt and decisive action. ●

AUDIT IS STILL AWAITED

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the following news account by Jerry Landauer staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal. I believe the story speaks for itself—but will there be answers?

AUDIT IS STILL AWAITED OF CARTER'S OUTLAYS IN THE 1976 CAMPAIGN

WASHINGTON.—Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford didn't have to knock on the doors of rich people, hat in hand, while jousting for the presidency in 1976. For the first time, taxpayers picked up all the campaign expenses.

In theory, the Carter-Ford contest marked a turning point toward cleaner government: For the victor there are no hefty donors to reward and for the loser no heavy debts to retire. But the returns on taxpayer-financed presidential politics still aren't all in.

More than a year after Mr. Carter moved into the White House, the six-member Federal Election Commission hasn't issued an audit, as required by law, of how he spent the \$21.8 million in tax funds to get there. In fact, the commission hasn't even finished auditing Mr. Carter's primary campaigns, which two years ago launched him on his path to the presidency. (The primaries, too, were partly financed by tax dollars for the first time in 1976.)

The delay is noteworthy because the commission's actions will set a precedent for how closely it intends to scrutinize the details of a President's campaign, especially when some of those details may be embarrassing to the White House.

Carter campaign officials say they have met all requirements of the law. Still, a look at spending reports that the Carter campaign filed with the commission raises certain questions.

THE ULTIMATE RECIPIENT

For one thing, the Carter campaign often listed large expenditures to campaign workers—\$10,000 to John Billet in New Jersey, for instance—so that the ultimate recipients aren't identified. According to commission regulations, campaign treasurers are supposed to report the "particulars" of all expenditures exceeding \$100, giving the public a "sufficiently detailed description as to establish their relationship to the campaign."

Whether Mr. Carter's reports always met this detailed disclosure standard seems questionable. All told, his campaign spent nearly \$500,000 for otherwise unspecified "get-out-the-vote" activities to beat Mr. Ford. Another \$279,000 went for "miscellaneous office expenses." And \$603,000 more isn't described in any way on the ground that all was spent in sums of less than \$100; in contrast, Mr. Ford's campaign reported unitized expenditures of \$90,000.

So far, though, the commission hasn't acted even in what seem to be clear cases of inadequate compliance with the election laws. In October 1976, Mr. Carter's managers placed \$338,000 in federal funds in Trust Co. Bank in Atlanta. The sole stated purpose: to "get out the vote." In April the Carter people finally filed an amended report, not in response to demands for proper disclosure by the election commission but after requests for clarification by this newspaper. The bulk of the \$338,000 assertedly was spent in sums of less than \$100; thus, most recipients haven't been disclosed.

APPARENT ERRORS AND DISCREPANCIES

The Carter reports also contain numerous apparent errors and discrepancies.

One involves a listed expenditure of \$10,703.54 to a subsidiary of Ruder & Finn Inc. in New York. Chairman David Finn says his firm billed the Carter campaign \$703.54 for designing some brochures. What happened to the other \$10,000 remains a mystery. "We have absolutely no record of billing or receiving that ten thousand," Mr. Finn says, after checking twice.

In Cleveland, an officer of Hexter & Associates Inc. sounds similarly mystified by Carter statements showing that the campaign paid the company \$1,700 for polling, \$2,345 for telephone canvassing and \$9,365 for miscellaneous office expenses. President John Hexter says his firm didn't poll anybody, didn't canvass voters and incurred just \$60 in expenses in connection with various printing jobs.

John E. Mathews Jr. of Jacksonville, Fla., is listed as the recipient of \$2,000 from the Carter campaign; Mr. Mathews says he merely cashed a check, as a favor for the local Carter coordinator.

Besides, should taxpayers pick up the tab for \$395.70 paid by the Carter campaign to the Utah State Liquor Commission just before Election Day? Or for the \$1,000 paid to the Shrine of the Black Madonna in Detroit to help turn out black votes? Or for \$1,000 paid to Gino's Restaurant in Manhattan plus \$301.51 to Bird of Paradise Liquors in Albuquerque for "miscellaneous office expenses"? Or for \$1,575 sent to Jimenez Food Products Inc. in San Antonio for "vote getting and other"?

Spokesmen for the Carter campaign committee sound confident that violations didn't occur. "Our committee has made every effort to comply fully with all requirements of the federal election laws," says Douglas Huron, now senior associate counsel at the White House. The Carter spending reports on file with the commission may contain some unintentional omissions, Mr. Huron says, "but all our expenditures are fully documented in our internal files."

At the election commission, a spokesman

says the \$50,000-a-year commissioners (three Republicans and three Democrats, including three former Congressmen) are working hard. The agency has finished auditing 10 of the 15 contenders in the presidential primaries. And in April the agency finally published an audit of Mr. Ford's general election campaign. Except for \$700 to pay parking tickets, the former President's government grants were all spent for "qualified"—that is, legitimate—political purposes, the audit found; Mr. Ford's people refunded the \$700.

By contrast, a tough-minded audit of the Carter campaign could retrieve many thousands of dollars for the Treasury because Mr. Carter's managers evidently can't produce receipts for all the "walking around money" sent to ward politicians in certain cities to turn out a big Democratic vote; an outlay that can't be documented, including those for less than \$100, must be refunded.

Still another sticky issue is candidate Carter's free use of an airplane owned by National Bank of Georgia in the spring of 1976. This favor could be deemed an illegal corporate contribution because the Carter people didn't pay for four campaign flights on the bank's plane until the summer of 1977; that's when the facts became known during the investigation of the President's friend and then Budget Director, Bert Lance, who had headed the bank. White House aides worry that the press would pounce on an unfavorable finding to belabor the President again.

The election commission also has been slow to act on questionable outlays involving some other candidates. The commission hasn't yet moved to investigate a possible violation more than two years ago in the financing of Democratic Sen. Henry Jackson's 1976 presidential primary campaign.

Under the law, no political committee can give a candidate for federal office more than \$5,000; any further spending on his behalf must be "independent"—that is, without the candidate's cooperation and certainly not at his request. In early 1976 the political arm of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association gave Mr. Jackson's campaign \$5,000. Then on the same day in April 1976, the Marine Engineers gave \$5,000 to each of five political clubs in Baltimore.

One of the Baltimore clubs, the Fourth District Democratic Organization, reported the income as coming not from the Marine Engineers but from Sen. Jackson himself—a clear indication that this \$5,000 and perhaps the \$20,000 to the four other clubs weren't spent independently, as the law requires.

At times, however, the election commission moves fast. On Dec. 30, 1977, the Democratic National Committee asked for a waiver of existing legal limits on political contributions so that the Democrats could deploy the fund-raising prowess of the presidency one more time, to wipe out old party debts totaling \$2 million.

It took the commission just a couple of days to process the necessary paper work. Then, without taking time to publicize the request in its official publication so that outsiders could object the commission unanimously yielded to the Democratic desire early in 1978.

ARE THE PRESIDENT'S HANDS TIED IN AFRICA?

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering the Export-Import Bank reauthorization bill shortly. This bill is of major importance to U.S. exporters, to

U.S. workers, and finally, to all the rest of us who suffer from the inflationary effects of a severe balance of payments deficit.

However, within this bill are amendments which are addressed more to this Nation's foreign policy than to our economic predicament. Like many members on the Banking Committee, and in the rest of Congress, I continue to have reservations about the inconsistencies which characterize this Nation's foreign policy with regard to countries which violate internationally recognized human rights.

For some time I have believed that the United States should champion the cause of human rights, and that the best way to do so is by our own good example. What this means is that we should show ourselves to be supporters of those countries whose policies allow citizens fundamental democratic rights and freedoms. Governments can lean left or right, but as far as I am concerned, when they move against the liberties of their citizens they are in the wrong.

Our foreign policy is determined for the most part by the President, and this is how it should be, for such a system prevents special parochial interests to interfere with the consistency and the administration of that policy. Congress has stood as watchdog of the President, intervening when it feels that the President has erred. Yet I have reached the conclusion that the executive and legislative branches of this Government are beginning to work at cross purposes, and the confusion of our foreign policy, probably as much the cause as the effect of the current congressional involvement in foreign policy affairs, is mounting to dangerous proportions. The ongoing turbulence in Africa and our role there serves as an explicit and eye-opening case in point.

The present danger and our exposure in Africa is a subject which too few Americans fully appreciate in that they do not see the relationship between Africa and the rest of the world in a large enough perspective. A close examination of the crisis in Africa can tell us a great deal about a crisis that may be developing here.

The current tussle over whether or not the President's hands are tied in Africa is a legitimate one. In this post Vietnam/post Watergate time, the United States is quite obviously going through a period of adjustment and readjustment over who has what authority. The country has gone through similar periods of adjustment in the past—the post Civil War era, and the period following the stock market crash of 1929 are two examples that come to mind.

In the election of 1976, we saw the electorate select a President based, not on what he knew or on what experience he had, but on how honest he appeared and how he said what he said. The primary issue in that election was as much the integrity of the Nation and its institutions as it was anything else . . . and what has resulted might well have been expected. A President with little experience in national or world affairs has illustrated to the world a foreign policy

that at best can be described as inconsistent, and at worst may be exceedingly dangerous . . . and a Congress, bent on preventing abuses of executive power, has legislated its way into the foreign affairs arena to a point that may be equally dangerous.

Are the President's hands tied in Africa? Yes—to a degree they are; just as they potentially could be in half a dozen other global hot spots.

Given two facts of life—that the primary concern of "foreign policy" is strategic; that is, the security of the Nation in the face of other nations' competing interests, and that the primary concern of "domestic policy" is the welfare of the citizenry—and recognizing that the two are not always so easily defined, then a constant balance must be sought between interpretation of domestic policy and strategic concerns. Nowhere is that argument more self-evident than in the current debate over human rights policies. The most effective device at our disposal, in that area, is to provide the very best example here at home. We cannot, through any method short of invasion, enforce such a policy within the borders of other nations. It is true that we can effect the internal policies of those nations we do business with, within limits—as the House Banking Committee intended to do when we agreed to prohibit Export-Import Bank dealings in South Africa. That action, while directly affecting an extremely small percentage of the South African economy, would carry the message to that country's government that we do not condone their apartheid policies.

At this point it should be clear, even to a young and in some respects naive administration, that the entire continent of Africa is of immense strategic importance. And it should be clear to the Congress that legislation which prevents the President—any President—from having the flexibility to respond rapidly to foreign policy developments, within logical limits, is strategically dangerous. If Angola, 2 years ago, and Ethiopia, more recently, did not impress upon us the extent of the Soviet-Cuban threat on that continent, then surely the most recent bloody incursion into Zaire by Angolan rebels should have.

Just as domestic policy and strategic needs must constantly be balanced, so must the relative power of the Presidency and the oversight role of Congress be constantly balanced. An out-of-control Presidency, overawed with its military and diplomatic powers, has to be guarded against—recent history has shown that. But so must a tendency of the Congress to arbitrarily inject legislation that interferes with the constitutional role of the Presidency. Both needs can be protected while still allowing the President to respond rapidly to calls for help from our strategically important friends. The role of the Congress in such situations must be to keep the President honest—to question him, and his motives, at every opportunity—and perhaps to limit the type or extent of assistance it is his to give. But the role of Congress must not be to "tie the President's hands" by injecting the ponder-

ous legislative process into every foreign policy decision. ●

WILLIAM SAFIRE ON THE "NEW POOR" IN AMERICA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the nationally syndicated columnist, William Safire, had a commentary in this morning's New York Times which not only merits the attention of every Member of Congress but, by the severity of what it says, also demands this Congress address itself to the issues raised. I refer to the unconscionably high rate of inflation and tax rates on the backs of American workers and savers and the refusal of the administration to deal with it by even admitting its true cause.

There is an ill-wind blowing from the economic policymaking circles of the administration on how it probably intends to deal with inflation. And that ill-wind sounds and feels like the rhetoric voiced and the subsequent programs put into place by the Nixon administration in 1971 and 1972. That administration started by jawboning, which is what the present administration is doing. Then it proceeded to voluntary wage and price controls, which is what the present administration is talking about. Then it slapped on mandatory wage and price controls. That led to an inevitable slowing of the economy, brought on by the worst shortages in peacetime history and by confusion and lack of confidence among producers and consumers, and that then led to the worst recession since the Great Depression and chronic unemployment.

Has this administration learned nothing?

What, then, is the answer?

The prescription offered by Mr. Safire for the Federal Government ending the prospects of double-digit inflation are a cut in nondefense spending and a tightening of the money supply. Both are certainly the right steps. But the only real way we can tighten the money supply is to restore incentive to the economy for work and production by a dramatic and permanent tax rate reduction. Aggregate savings would rise by more than enough to cover the short-term deficit, and because of those savings and greater after-tax income, the Federal Reserve would not have to buy any additional Treasury bills, thereby increasing the money supply. That is how I believe Mr. Safire's proposal would work to stop this assault on the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, in order to do what Mr. Safire proposes, this country must have permanent tax rate reductions. It is the only effective way to get us off the horns of the inflation vs. unemployment dilemma, for the economic growth which would flow from such reductions would both reduce the rate of inflation and the rate of unemployment, thus allowing real income growth to combat the problem of the new poor.

Mr. Safire's column follows:

THE NEW POOR
(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—If you are making more money now than you ever made before, but inflation and the "tax bracket creep" have reduced the purchasing power of your take-home pay, then you are a member of The New Poor.

If you used your life savings to buy a home, and rising property taxes are forcing you to sell and move to a neighborhood where houses are cheaper, you are a member of The New Poor.

The growing resentment of The New Poor will make itself felt next week in a taxpayers' revolt in California; a chain reaction is likely to follow in other states, as voters turn on their bureaucratic tormentors.

The source of this resentment is a combination of furies. Not only do The New Poor believe that Government programs have become too bloated and expensive, they also believe that Government policy is directed against their interests. Carteromics stimulates the economy to reduce unemployment and help the "old" poor, while it causes runaway inflation that creates legions of the new poor.

The Consumer Price Index released today, showing a 10.8 percent yearly rate of inflation, will be explained away as temporary, caused by flukes or greedy capitalists or bad weather. But double-digit inflation (a phrase coined in March 1974 by Times economic writer Leonard Silk) is wiggling its victory sign, and the Administration in power cannot pass the buck.

Although Government statisticians claim that the cost of living has risen by only 28 percent in the past four years—an average of 7 percent a year—they are living in an unreal world. Raymond DeVoe, Jr. of Loeb Rhoades Hornblower has compiled a half-facetious "trivia index" that shows what has been going on beyond the price of hamburger:

Since 1974, the cost of a can of Coca-Cola has doubled, from 20 cents to 40 cents; in that time, a milkshake at McDonald's has risen 47 percent; Band-Aids are up 75 percent, dog biscuits up 67 percent. Laundering a shirt cost 50 cents then, 91 cents now; a Beefeater Martini that cost \$1.75 then is \$3.00 now, and a dime's stay at a parking meter is now a quarter. (Panhandlers now ask for a quarter instead of a dime, a 150 percent increase.)

The price of Time, Newsweek, Playboy, TV Guide and The New York Daily News has gone up 100 percent since 1974, as has a stein of beer in a singles bar and a packet of Kleenex in which to cry. (The New York Times has risen 33 percent, but now offers new sections and a conservative columnist.) New rubber heels cost twice as much, as do basketball tickets, and a check bounced by your bank now costs \$5.00 instead of \$3.00. (The salary of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers has risen 35 percent in two years.)

The point is that the "real" cost of living—including all those non-necessities that we cannot do without—has risen at a rate twice that of the official inflation rate. And not because of the weather, or corporate greed; the reason is that public policy demands stimulation to reduce unemployment.

How do we stop double-digit inflation and the creation of tens of millions of new poor? At the local level, as in California, force the reduction of the bureaucracy and accept fewer services; at the Federal level, cut non-defense spending and tighten money to put the brakes on the rise in the cost of living.

But Mr. Carter has not the stomach for this. When he replaces his token woman in-house liberal, Midge Costanza, he keeps her on the bloated White House payroll; to make way for her successor's staff, he puts the un-

needed Costanza crew on the Labor Department payroll for over \$100,000 a year. When the latest save-the-cities boondoggle was announced, it included a budget to employ the President's son at \$26,000 a year; to offset this sort of petty patronage graft, Mr. Carter's budget calls for 495 fewer F.B.I. agents.

Instead of attacking Government-caused inflation, Mr. Carter seems destined to take the Nixon route: he will exhort for a while, perhaps add his own antibusiness finger-wagging, and then—in the third year of his Presidency—impose wage and price controls, which will be popular and make him seem activist.

The controls may come in the form of the Wallich-Okun scheme, using the tax system to subsidize "reasonable" price and wage increases. This is wage-price control in sheep's clothing, and might hold down the lid until the 1980 elections, after which organized labor would blow it sky-high.

To deflect the resentments of The New Poor, Mr. Carter will jawbone at selected villains until failure is apparent, and then will treat only the symptoms of inflation with disguised or direct controls.

That's a sad scenario. If the Carter men had the courage to apply the brakes now—and thereby gain the productivity increases that a mild recession brings—we would be able to avoid a crippling inflation this year, a loss of economic freedom next year, and a major recession after that. ●

FBI INDICTMENTS

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, Senator HAYAKAWA and I introduced a concurrent resolution calling for the dismissal of the indictments against three high-ranking officials of the FBI: former Acting Director L. Patrick Gray, former Acting Associate Director W. Mark Felt, and former Assistant Director Edward S. Miller.

I would like to commend to my colleagues' attention two very recent and timely articles on this subject—one that appeared in the New York Times by William Safire and another by Kevin Lynch and Richard Brookhiser which appeared in the National Review. These articles deserve serious reading.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1978]

RUNNING AGAINST HOOVER

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—The ill-considered decision of the Carter Administration to prosecute former F.B.I. officials, and to discipline present F.B.I. agents, for using questionable but long-tolerated investigative techniques in order to stop the terrorist bombers of the Weather Underground, has begun to backfire.

The accused lawmen and threatened agents have refused to cop the plea offered them; they will not plead to a misdemeanor and take a suspended sentence. On principle, they say they operated within then-recognized guidelines in upholding public safety, and that current operations of the Justice Department are not that much different today.

What worries Justice most is the accused officials' right to "discovery"—finding out about past and current practices similar to those they are accused of—which would then be taken before a jury in open court.

For nearly a year, people inside and outside

Justice have been nervous about "cooperating with the law," when such cooperation may later be deemed illegal.

For example, after Vice President Mondale made a speech in August of 1977 supporting a bill outlawing all warrantless wiretapping, the telephone company—which does the tapping for the Government and is worried about civil damage suits arising therefrom—threatened to refuse to do any foreign intelligence work without a court order.

On Sept. 29, 1977, Attorney General Griffin Bell wrote American Telephone and Telegraph "to assure you that it remains the position of the Executive Branch that the foreign intelligence surveillances . . . are a lawful exercise of the President's constitutional power."

Nervousness about being sued or prosecuted tomorrow for what the A.G. says is legal today extends to agents on the beat. The longest floating investigation in existence is the F.B.I.'s surveillance of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., begun in 1938. In 1976, Attorney General Levi—recognizing that the surveillance of a political party could no longer lawfully be conducted under the rubric of "domestic security"—simply switched the case's cover sheet, giving that investigation the legal rationale of a foreign intelligence probe.

"Discovery" will show that F.B.I. agents have been following certain officials of the Communist Party in the United States, looking at the outside of their mail and examining their roll calls, at the very least. (Properly, Judge Bell refuses to confirm even the existence of this particular investigation; he tells me, "I never signed a wiretap authorization on the Communist Party U.S.A." and that no surveillance is being used which, if used in a criminal case, would require a warrant. He adds obliquely, "we just keep up with people.")

Someday, however, the question will arise: Is this legal? When the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party was the object of the F.B.I.'s "Cointelpro" surveillance only a few years ago, it rightly hollered bloody murder and the F.B.I. was denounced for police-state tactics.

If the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an agent of a foreign power, or if its leaders are engaged in conducting espionage here, Justice ought to prove its case and close the sham party down; if you cannot make a case after forty years, you're not really trying.

On the other hand, if the long-suspected, closely watched leaders of the Communist Party here are not demonstrably agents of a foreign power, then it is the "foreign intelligence" excuse for keeping them under surveillance that is the sham, and we should extend to our card-carrying friends the same protections accorded members of any other party.

One day, what the F.B.I. is now doing will be challenged. Put yourself in the shoes of the F.B.I. agent taking pictures from across the street of visitors to Communist Party headquarters; will future interpreters of the law find him guilty? Put yourself in the shoes of the Attorney General: "I cannot be certain that I won't be prosecuted someday for doing what I think is legal today."

That's not right; a person's actions should be judged in the context of the time those actions are taken, and not ex post facto. Of course, if "discovery" should turn up a memo dated only last spring directing F.B.I. agents to work in certain gray areas with the assurance that what seems illegal is really permissible counterespionage, that would be an even more vivid example of hypocrisy.

At a time when Soviet expansionism and espionage are gaining strength, Mr. Carter ought not to be looking for scapegoats to satisfy our consciences for yesterday's practices, or blowing an uncertain trumpet at today's troops. Justice should drop its politically inspired indictments before "discov-

ery" destroys what little spycatching capacity we have left.

HUNTING DOWN THE FBI

(By Kevin Lynch and Richard Brookhiser)

In May of 1970, Miss Bernadine Dohrn, leader of the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society, announced a shift in policy:

"Now we are adapting the classic guerrilla strategy of the Vietcong and the urban guerrilla strategy of the Tupamaros to our situation here in the most technically advanced country in the world. . . . Within the next 14 days we will attack a symbol or institution of American injustice. This is the way we celebrate the example of Eldridge Cleaver and H. Rap Brown and all black revolutionaries who first inspired us by their fight behind enemy lines for the liberation of the people."

Miss Dohrn's organization had inadvertently tipped its hand two months earlier when a nail-packed anti-personnel bomb exploded in a Greenwich Village townhouse, shredding three Weatherman manufacturers. Subsequent bombs were better built, and, over the next two years, the Weathermen—later known as the Weather Underground—claimed credit for explosions in Cambridge, Chicago, Marin County, Calif., and, in Washington, D.C., the Capitol building and the Pentagon. Thereafter, their activities fell off, though as late as 1975 they acknowledged bombings of the State Department, a New York bank, and the Kennecott Copper Building in Salt Lake City.

On April 10, 1978, a federal grand jury indicted a lawyer from Stonington, Connecticut, and two other former government employees in connection with the Weather Underground episodes. Later that day, the Justice Department dismissed related charges against an executive of Wells Fargo. What made the government's actions interesting was that the four men were not ex-bombers, but ex-members of the FBI; and they had been charged with infringing the civil rights of friends and acquaintances of the Weathermen.

The Justice Department has been pursuing the FBI angle of the Weather Underground case since the spring of 1976. The assignment to track the terrorists down had originally been given to FBI Squad 47, based in New York; in the course of its investigations, the civil rights division of the Justice Department found that Squad 47 had tapped the phones of 12 persons and opened the mail of 16. Grand juries were impaneled to investigate the Bureau, and agents of the Squad found themselves haled for questioning.

The lawyers of the Justice team were more interested in FBI higher-ups than in Squad 47, however, and so they employed the use-immunity law, by which witnesses before grand juries can be forced to testify against themselves, with the assurance that their testimony will not be used against them. The tactic worked until the investigation reached John Kearney. Kearney had been supervisor of Squad 47 from late 1970 to June 1972, and Justice offered to let him plead guilty to minor charges of civil-rights violations if he would finger his superiors. But Kearney, believing himself innocent of any wrongdoing, refused to cooperate. Justice squeezed but Kearney wouldn't budge. On April 7, 1977, he was indicted on two counts of conspiracy, two counts of obstruction of correspondence, and one count of unlawful wiretapping. The statute of limitations would have run out two months later.

The Kearney indictment—the first indictment of an agent in the Bureau's 54-year history—stirred both the FBI and the Justice Department. Former and current agents leapt to Kearney's defense, while some Justice lawyers accused Attorney General Griffin Bell of not pushing the investigation high

and hard enough. The lawyers were answered on April 10, 1978, when former Acting Director L. Patrick Gray, former Chief of Counterintelligence Edward Miller, and former Acting Associate Director W. Mark Felt were indicted for conspiring to deprive citizens of their civil rights. At the same time, Bell announced that the FBI would undertake disciplinary proceedings against 69 of its members, including J. Wallace LaPrade, head of the New York field office. In a postscript, the prosecution of Kearney was dropped.

The case against Kearney rested on two basic charges: unlawful wiretapping and unlawful mail-opening. Until 1972, the FBI, with the blessing of several Attorneys General, had routinely conducted wiretaps on domestic organizations without getting warrants. Appearing before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee a few weeks after Kearney's indictment, Attorney General Bell acknowledged that what Kearney did "has been going on for forty years in this country." In 1963, for example, no less a civil libertarian than Attorney General Robert Kennedy, when informed that an advisor to Martin Luther King Jr. was suspected of having Communist ties, suggested to J. Edgar Hoover that the FBI should begin wiretapping King. In 1972, the Supreme Court ruled that warrants were required for taps on domestic organizations, but the Court didn't require warrants if the tapped organizations had "significant" ties with a foreign power, its agents, or its agencies. Lest there be any doubt about whether the Weather Underground had such ties, the FBI has compiled a four-hundred-page report detailing its relationships with foreign powers, particularly Cuba, a frequent host to the Weather Underground ever since the group's founding in 1969.

The mail-opening charge was as securely based as the wire-tapping charge. Mail-opening, like wiretapping, had long been a routine FBI tool. In a memorandum to Attorney General Bell, Kearney's defenders noted that former Attorney General Levi, when forced to make a decision on whether to prosecute agents for opening mail, chose not to: "Whatever can be said about the law now, the Department believes at the time the potential defendants acted, there was substantial basis for thinking that the law was otherwise."

In order to avoid such confusions, the Justice Department rephrased its second batch of charges. Gray, Miller, and Felt are accused of conspiring "to injure and oppress citizens of the United States"; the indictment cites as "overt acts" break-ins at the homes of eight relatives and friends of the Weathermen. Justice's new argument was deliberately modeled on *United States v. Ehrlichman*, another case involving a high federal official and a break-in; and it seems tailored to outflank several defenses along the lines of those that Kearney's lawyers were planning.

The Justice Department charges, new and old, have caused unprecedented consternation in the Bureau. Agents, normally as vocal as door-jambs, are speaking out singly and *en masse*. When Kearney made his pleas in Manhattan a year ago, three hundred agents greeted him—the first public demonstration, the *New York Daily News* noted, in FBI history. On April 20 of this year nearly a thousand people, most of them agents, gathered outside the District Court in Washington, D.C. to applaud Gray, Miller, and Felt as they went to make their pleas; among them were two hundred agents who had come from New York on pre-dawn buses.

Meanwhile, in private, individual agents have been accusing the Justice Department of vendetta—or of ambition. "There are certain lawyers in Justice," commented one, "who want to see our heads roll so they can take credit for rooting out so-called corruption in the FBI. It's a big career-builder at

the expense of men who honestly thought they were acting within the law."

Against all this, the Justice Department would surely maintain that it is striving to right old wrongs. The FBI overrated in its pursuit of the Weathermen, they would say; "the risks to national security in this case," Benjamin Civiletti of the Department's Criminal Division told the *Washington Post*, "were ephemeral." Others, with longer memories, support the FBI. As Representative John Rousselot (R., Calif.) reminded the House,

"It would be naive to presume—in those troubled days of the early Seventies—that the Department of Justice, the Federal Government, and the investigative news media had no inkling of the extraordinary efforts and measures employed by the FBI to apprehend these threats to national security. Yet there was no public outcry during the emergency. But now, in a different era, when the challenge has been met and the nation is no longer at the mercy of this little band of bombers, an entirely new viewpoint—and an entirely new set of rules—is being applied."

The new set of rules enables the former quarry to turn on their pursuers. So far, five civil suits have been filed against Kearney, Miller, and Felt, all spawned by allegations made in the original Kearney indictment. Also named in the suits are half a dozen other present and former FBI and Justice Department personnel.

Among the first to bring suit was William A. Price, whose phone Squad 47 is alleged to have tapped and whose leftist credentials range from a 1956 appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, where he refused to answer questions about his relationship with the Communist Party of the United States, to a 1971 trip to Cuba with a contingent of the *Venceremos Brigade*. The law firm handling the suit is Rabinowitz, Boudin, and Standard, and it must be deriving as much pleasure from the suit as Mr. Price. The firm is the New York counsel of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a legal arm of the CPUSA and a leader in the campaign against U.S. intelligence agencies. Leonard Boudin, whose leftist credentials are in even better order than Price's, is, in addition, the father of Kathy Boudin, a member of the Weather Underground who is still being sought by the FBI (recent speculation places her well beyond the Bureau's reach: in the Soviet Union).

Though civil suits against federal employees are not a new phenomenon, they have never been as popular as they are now. Since the civil suit is a relatively easy way to gain free publicity, many leftist organizations, in particular, are going this route. Of such suits, the one generally recognized as posing the greatest threat to U.S. intelligence services is the one brought by the Socialist Workers Party. The SWP, the major Trotskyist organ in the United States, pledged itself at its founding to the defense of the Soviet Union, and reaffirmed that commitment in 1972. From 1938, when it was first organized, until 1976, when Attorney General Levi issued guidelines that barred the FBI from further investigations of it, the SWP was under government surveillance. It learned of that surveillance through the theft, by persons still unknown, of documents from the FBI office in Media, Pennsylvania. In July 1973, shortly after that theft, the SWP filed suit against 22 members of the FBI, the CIA, the Postal Service, and the Treasury, Justice, and Defense Departments. Although the suit is still in the discovery stage, the Trotskyists have already scored several significant victories: 1) access (as a result of favorable discovery rulings by Federal District Judge Thomas Griesa) to fifty thousand FBI documents relating to the Bureau's investigation; 2) proof that the CIA collected information on SWP offi-

cial and members when they traveled abroad; 3) evidence that the civil suits were reducing FBI intelligence collection (an agent has testified that even before Levi's guidelines were issued, the Bureau had reduced its investigation of the SWP because the "agents don't want to be put in a position where they are accused of harassment"); 4) a warning by Judge Griesa that he would consider imprisoning FBI officials or other persons who defied a court order to disclose the names of informers still in place.

To gain some idea of how great the boom in civil suits against federal employees has been, one need only look at the Justice Department's annual bills for private counsel. In 1974, the Department paid \$12,000 for private attorneys to represent government employees; in 1975, it paid \$47,800; in 1976, it paid \$554,306; and in 1977, it paid over \$2 million. The cost of private counsel has risen so astronomically—the bill for the SWP suit alone is expected to reach almost \$2 million—that the Department has had to request supplemental appropriations from Congress, some of whose members have been extremely recalcitrant. Speaking of one intelligence-related suit, in which the defendants range from several GIs to the Secretary of Defense, Senator Lowell Weicker told Attorney General Bell, "Brother, if you think I want to go ahead and pay any portion of their legal defense, I sure don't." Weicker informed Bell that he looked with a "very, very jaundiced eye" on requests for money to defend "unlawful" intelligence actions; such requests were based, he said, on reasoning—that the defendants were following orders—rejected "at the Nuremberg trials."

Weicker must be relieved, then, to know that the Justice Department is not bearing the costs of Kearney's defense, for which he should thank Attorney General Levi. Shortly before the end of the Ford Administration, Levi issued guidelines strictly defining the areas of federal obligation. According to the guidelines, government employees would have to bear the costs of their own defense: 1) if, as in Kearney's case, a federal indictment had been filed against them; 2) if investigation indicated such an indictment was likely; 3) if investigation revealed evidence of participation in a crime; or 4) if the employees' action did not reasonably appear to have been within the scope of their normal duties.

Although he has not chosen to amend the guidelines, Levi's successor, Griffin Bell, has expressed his dissatisfaction with them. Bell told a Senate Appropriation subcommittee that he thought it was a "great shame" that these men—Kearney and the other FBI agents who are facing civil suits—will be stripped of "their money, their life savings, to pay their lawyers when they thought they were doing something in the interest of their country." Bell was undoubtedly aware of what the threat of civil suits has done to FBI effectiveness—to say nothing for morale. "I feel I should consult a lawyer before carrying out an assignment," a New York agent said. "How can I know if my superiors are acting properly? Or, even if they are, that some lawyer in Justice isn't going to interpret something as a crime that previously was standard procedure?"

Some members of Congress have, accordingly, introduced legislation to make federal employees less vulnerable to bounty hunters. One bill, proposed by the Carter Administration, would grant federal employees immunity to civil suits by substituting the government as defendant whenever the Attorney General determines that the original target of the suit was acting within the scope of his normal duties. In the event that the government lost the case and damages were assessed against it, the employee in question would be subject to disciplinary and administrative action—or, if his actions were found to be criminal, to prosecution.

The bill stipulates, however, that a "good-faith reliance on a court order or legislative authorization shall constitute a complete defense to any claim or suit arising under the Constitution." Introduced in the Senate by James Eastland and in the House by Peter Rodino—the chairmen of their respective Judiciary Committees—the bill's chances for passage are considered good.

In the meantime, the more than one hundred active and former special agents who have been summoned before grand juries to testify about the FBI's Weather Underground program have had to rely for their legal defense on the fund-raising abilities of two organizations, the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI and the Ad Hoc Citizens' Legal Defense Fund for the FBI. The former group is 41 years old and, until the plague of litigation hit, functioned mainly as a charitable and benevolent organization; it also undertook, since active FBI agents are by law forbidden from Capitol Hill, to present the FBI viewpoint there. But at present, most of the Society's energies are consumed in raising funds (\$300,000 so far) to defend the accused agents. The other organization, the Citizens' Legal Defense Fund, is much younger (founded in May of last year) and owes its existence solely to the character of John Kearney. By April 8, the day after his indictment, one of his colleagues at Wells Fargo (where he had gone to work after he retired from the FBI), James Brustman, had already launched a campaign to defend him. Out of Brustman's efforts evolved the Citizens' Legal Defense Fund.

Headed by Clare Boothe Luce, James Buckley, and William Simon, the Legal Defense Fund has most certainly struck a chord; it has been deluged by letters expressing a heartfelt bitterness toward the Weather Underground—and toward the U.S. Government for prosecuting a loyal employee. So far, about fifteen thousand people have made donations including Barry Goldwater, Leon Jaworski, and a retiree who, along with his donation, offered to take Kearney's place in jail. Enough money came in to enlist the services of Edward Bennett Williams, the noted trial attorney, on Kearney's behalf.

Since the Legal Defense Fund was also providing money for the other agents who had been summoned before grand juries in New York and Washington, its resources, like those of the Society of Former Special Agents, were strained. Now, with the indictments of Gray, Miller, and Felt, they will be strained even further. More money, in larger donations, would undoubtedly come in if contributions were tax-exempt, but the Internal Revenue Service has denied the Defense Fund's request for status as a tax-exempt organization. That decision is being appealed on several grounds—perhaps the most interesting being that, while the IRS has denied the Legal Defense Fund tax-exempt status, it has seen fit to grant it to Mr. Boudin's National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which is supporting one of the civil suits against Kearney.

Even more important than the injury to individual agents is what litigation does to FBI effectiveness, as demonstrated in the SWP suit. An intelligence organization that is unable to protect its sources gets very little intelligence; if Judge Griesa's decision to compel the Justice Department to disclose the names of the FBI informants inside the SWP is upheld by higher courts, the FBI will be dealt a paralyzing blow. Even without the help of Judge Griesa, the FBI, like the CIA, is already getting much less intelligence than it did just a few years ago.

Stuart Knight, director of the Secret Service, has testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures that his organization is only receiving about 40 to 50 per cent of the intelligence information it received two years ago, primarily be-

cause of the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act. The FOIA, which was widely greeted as a legislative watershed, gives individuals and organizations the right to obtain information about themselves in the possession of government agencies. The Privacy Act prevents the Federal Government from releasing information about anyone without his consent. Knight said that—as a consequence of these laws—he has been forced to recommend that President Carter not visit certain cities because of the erosion of police intelligence on radicals and terrorists in those cities. The police in most cities now routinely withhold intelligence information from the FBI and the CIA out of fear that the agencies will be forced to disclose the information under the FOIA. Meanwhile, because of the Privacy Act, the FBI no longer provides police and other local law-enforcement agencies with the information it once did.

As the intelligence agencies weaken, the morale of their organized opponents rises. In January of last year the National Lawyers Guild convened a meeting to address the "need for unified action around the country to stop political spying." Out of this meeting, the Campaign to Stop Government Spying was born. Headed by Morton Halperin, the CSGS is an umbrella group composed of 45 member organizations and 33 "cooperating organizations." Its membership ranges from soigné organizations like the Americans for Democratic Action and the Friends of the Earth to groups that, in a bygone era, were referred to as Communist fronts—the National Lawyers Guild and the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. The CSGS sees no need for subterfuge. Recognizing that the intelligence agencies have been stunned by the law suits, by the various state and federal laws sharply restricting intelligence gathering, and by the increasing pressure from a generally hostile media, it hopes to close in for the kill—to terminate all intelligence surveillance. To this end it is on record as favoring legislation that confines the FBI solely to criminal investigations of persons reasonably suspected of having committed a federal crime.

Meanwhile, although the Carter Administration hasn't yet issued its promised regulations for the CIA and the FBI, Vice President Mondale has gone on record as stating that the guidelines would prohibit the FBI from investigating political organizations in the name of "domestic security." Mondale also promised that the Senate and House Intelligence Committees would receive "the full facts about intelligence programs, including timely notice of all covert operations."

Curiously, while the U.S. intelligence agencies have an abundance of overseers, on Capitol Hill and in the rest of the country, the activities of other intelligence services go largely unmarked. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, for example, devoted the bulk of its first annual report to the activities of the CIA and the FBI; it also briefly discussed the operations in the U.S. of the Chilean, Iranian, Taiwanese, and Filipino intelligence services. The report failed to mention, however, the Soviet bloc's intelligence operations in the U.S., compared to which the efforts of Chile et al. are strictly Little League. Last year, Soviet agents were expelled from Norway, Sweden, West Germany, Switzerland, Spain, and Zambia. At the same time, the FBI arrested: a Soviet émigré in New Jersey, on charges of attempting to transmit space program secrets to a KGB agent; two Americans in California, on charges of plotting with a Soviet official in Mexico; and an American and a West German in Florida, on charges of conspiring to smuggle cruise missile components to the USSR.

Since there are reliably reported to be at least one thousand full-time Soviet-bloc spies in the U.S., it is probably safe to assume that a major share of their activities are proceeding free of interference. An aide

to a Republican senator recently said he takes it for granted that there is a Soviet presence on Capitol Hill. Given the fact that spies have been discovered inside virtually every major Western government, he says it is naive to think that they wouldn't make a special effort to penetrate the government of their major adversary—and that they couldn't succeed, especially when the adversary is preoccupied with the fumigation of its own intelligence agencies.

Dangerous in a different way, though equally unnoticed these days, are the anomic madmen of the terrorist underworld. The relation of international terrorism to the Soviet bloc is complicated. Many terrorists get arms or training from Communist countries: Weathermen and Black Panthers used to travel to Cuba; Italy's Red Brigades carry guns from Czechoslovakia. It is difficult, however, to call the terrorists Communists in any meaningful sense. The FALN, the Baader-Meinhof gang, the Japanese Red Army group, have no programs, no coherent ideas, no motives, seemingly, beyond boredom and a kind of fierce pettiness. This is irrelevant to their foreign patrons. Terrorists turn to "Communism" for a semblance of intellectual coherence, and to Communists for infusions of supplies and expertise; Communists, for their part, are quite willing to support terrorists, in order to depress the public spirit of enemy nations. By sapping the FBI, the United States sets itself up as an inviting target. "The real question today," observed J. Wallace LaPrade, "is what we are saying to members of terrorist groups in this country and throughout the world."

Judging from its behavior, Washington seems to find LaPrade's observation irrelevant—as irrelevant, in its own way, as Bernardine Dohrn's outdated ravings. May Washington reconsider the warning, before America is forced to reconsider the threat. ●

FLAG DAY

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1978

● Mr. RISENHOVER. Mr. Speaker, the Flag Day Committee has invited

Dr. Oral Roberts of Oklahoma to be special speaker in this Chamber at noon, June 14, when we commemorate the 201st anniversary of the birth of our flag.

The U.S. Air Force Band and the Singing Sergeants will perform. The joint services will provide the color guard. Our colleagues, Mr. LE FANTE, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. BEARD, who serve on the committee, will join in the ceremonies.

Our speaker is an evangelist who has taken his healing ministry to all continents and most countries. He says his parish is "the world of suffering humanity." To help that work, he established and is president of Oral Roberts University. He has lived with controversy but is one of the most forthright, sincere people that I have ever met.

About his healing by faith ministry, he once wrote:

Many things contribute to the healing process. A look, a word, a communication of the spirit helps. Surgical skill, medication, nursing care, play their part. And it is absolutely amazing what prayer can do when offered in a positive manner for a person who cooperates by releasing his faith at the same time. Miracles can and do happen.

In that respect, Dr. Roberts is now building "the city of faith," where medicine and faith will be practiced together.

I also want to share some of his other views, about our country and the flag it symbolizes. Dr. Roberts once addressed a group of freshly naturalized citizens and I ask unanimous consent to reprint part of that talk:

FLAG DAY

Today we are on a new kind of frontier in America. There are no more land runs. Most of the ethnic groups are here. We worked out many of our problems but now we face a Frontier of the Mind and the Spirit, which is the most difficult area of all.

It is hard to develop a new land. You know what it means to leave your old country and cross the ocean coming to a new land. It is hard. But now we are on a new kind of frontier that challenges us and will challenge you.

The Frontier of Economics. We have a

problem of feeding, not only ourselves, but our world. Every farmer in America produces the average food supply for thirty other people, whereas in many lands the farmer is hard pressed to produce food for himself and two other people. We have a problem, an economic problem, of feeding the world. Only new creative processes will help us solve the food problem of the world.

We have labor problems; capital problems. All of it can be summed up in an economic problem that challenges every person in America to find ways and means of solving it.

Another problem is the educational problem. You know, in most other lands education is only for the privileged few, but our forefathers believed that every child should receive an education. But now it is the dream of this country that every boy and girl should receive a college education.

I came up in this state. I was born the son of poor parents, of an itinerant preacher, but I believe that it was in this state that something was bred in me where by faith in God, by initiative and hard work, I could accomplish whatever God had put in my heart. Oral Roberts University is one example.

Another frontier is in religion. A new spirit of ecumenicity, or a new spirit of family is coming into our country where we are not divided as we once were by sectarianism. Where each man can worship God and respect the other man as he worships God, eliminating bitterness and prejudice. We respect one another, but still keep our faith in God.

I am very happy about this development. That does not take away from your faith or from your relationship with your church, but it does mean that we respect the other man.

Another frontier is in the realm of healing. I mention that because of man's illnesses. The illnesses of his body, the illnesses of his mind, and most of all those in spirit. Finding new ways in medical healing, in spiritual healing, in the healing that comes to people by love and understanding. We are on a Frontier of Healing.

We are on a Frontier of Finding New Ways of Peace, because we have not found the way to live in peace, and if there is a prayer that any of us should pray, I think the prayer should be:

"Oh, God, give me peace in my heart and help me share that peace with at least one more person in my world." ●

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 2, 1978

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Jimmy Swaggart, Assembly of God Church, Baton Rouge, La., offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we have come to You in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We thank You for all of Your many and gracious blessings. We realize America's might, power, and strength are only because of the blessings bestowed upon our great and good land. We thank You for this.

We pray for those who are in positions of authority. We realize in these trying times their load is heavy. We must depend upon You for guidance and strength. The decisions made affect the lives of multiple millions. Only You can give the guidance needed to make these types of decisions.

Again, we thank You. Again, we appreciate You; and again, we love You.

We say all of this and ask it in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen and amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

REV. JIMMY SWAGGART

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to have one of my constit-

uents, Brother Jimmy Swaggart, open our session with prayer today.

Brother Swaggart leads one of the largest evangelical ministries in the world. Each year through his efforts, the Word of God is brought to millions of homes in every corner of the globe.

Jimmy Swaggart preaches on a network of 300 TV and 600 radio stations each week. This year his ministry will take him to over 130 cities and towns, and he will travel more than 140,000 miles.

Also, he is an accomplished gospel singer and last year his albums sold more than 1 million copies.

Brother Swaggart's work is not confined just to this country. His works are heard in 15 foreign countries and in addition to his many missionary activities overseas, he is now building an evangelistic training center in Mombasa, Kenya.