H.R. 15

By Mr. CORRADA:

—On page 106, revise section 136(a) to read as follows:

"SEC. 136. (a) WITHHOLDING.—Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any assurance set forth in the application of that State approved under section 52 or 101, the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall reduce or terminate further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies or State agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, (1) no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or (2) payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies and State agencies not affected by the failure, or, (3) payments to particular local educational agencies shall be reduced, as the case may be. Where partial payments to a local educational agency are continued under this subsection, the expenditure of those payments shall be subject to such conditions as the Commissioner deems appropriate in light of the failure which led to the partial withholding. Pending the outcome of any proceedings under this subsection, the Commissioner may suspend payments to such agency, after such agency has been given reasonable notice and opportunity to show cause why such action should not be taken.

—On page 108, in section 136(c) of title I, insert the following between lines 5 and 6: "In any case in which a State educational agency desires to enter into a compliance agreement, but alleges that full compliance with the requirements of this title is genuinely not feasible until a future date, the Commissioner shall hold a hearing at which that agency shall have the burden of demonstrating that immediate compliance is not feasible. The Commissioner shall provide an opportunity for parents, their representatives, and other interested parties to participate in that hearing. If the Commissioner determines, on the basis of all the evidence presented to him, that immediate compliance is genuinely not feasible, he shall make written findings to that effect before entering into such a compliance agreement with that State educational agency."

H.R. 12928

By Mr. EDGAR:

—Page 6, line 22, strike out the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for land acquisition, construction, and planning for the following projects: Bayou Bodcau and Tributaries; Yatesville Lake, Meramec Park Lake; Lukfata Lake; and LaFarge Lake and Channel Improvements."

Page 12, line 9, strike out the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for land acquisition or construction of the Narrows Unit."

Page 12, line 24, strike out the period and insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended for planning the following projects: Savery-Pot Hook and Fruitland Mesa."

H.R. 12931

By Mr. MATHIS:

—Beginning on page 15, line 10, strike everything through line 3 on page 19.

—On page 17, line 18, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That no such payment may be made while the Articles of Agreement of the Bank contain no provision denying or limiting membership or assistance to any country in violation of basic individual human rights, including but not limited to freedom of the press, freedom of expression, universal adult suffrage, and freedom to own and exchange private property."

—On page 23, add the following new section:

"SEC. 510. None of the funds appropriated under this Act for the international financial institutions shall be used to meet any call, or successive calls, on unpaid capital in excess of the United States pro rata share of such call, notwithstanding the failure of any other country to respond to a call."

—On page 23, line 19, add the following new sentence:

"The Secretary shall instruct such executive directors to oppose and vote against any assistance by such institutions, including but not limited to loans for the production of palm oil, sugar, citrus, tobacco, grains, oilseeds, and steel that would, directly or indirectly, tend to lessen employment opportunities or potential employment opportunities in any industry in the United States or would tend to lessen sales or potential sales, in either the domestic or international markets, of any commodity produced in the United States."

H.R. 12936

By Mr. BROWN of California:

—On page 19, line 6, strike "$806,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "815,400,000", and on line 8 strike "$48,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "57,100,000", and on line 11 strike "$17,-" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,-".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LINKAGE WITH SALT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today the editorial pages of the Nation are filled with a lot of thoughts concerning our relations with the U.S.S.R. These center about the blatant aggressions of communism in Africa. Some persons have suggested there is a linkage with the SALT II talks and that perhaps we ought to break off the SALT II talks as a gesture of our displeasure with Soviet behavior or until some change is indicated in Soviet policy toward Africa. This trend of thought, of course, all presupposes that the U.S.S.R. values the SALT II talks as highly as we do. This is debatable. However, it is predictable that the Department of State and others in the "establishment" will insist that SALT talks stand by themselves and we should ignore Soviet aggressions elsewhere. This, of course, is the same old tired rhetoric we have been hearing for a long time that ongoing negotiations take precedence over everything else. Yesterday, my friend and colleague, the Honorable SAM STRATTON, who has 20 distinguished years of service on the House Armed Services Committee, had an excellent letter in the Washington Post (June 12). In this letter he succinctly points out that on the basis of SALT I violations, plus recent Soviet behavior, there is little hope for "trusting the Russians," as some insist we should in SALT II negotiations. Significantly, the Wall Street Journal of June 12 echoed the same sentiments in an excellent editorial entitled: "Linkage Rigmarole" pointing that we can best judge nations by their deeds not their words. Thus SALT II should be looked upon with suspicion. The items follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1978]

AND LINKAGE WITH SALT II

In the past couple of weeks Washington has witnessed an unusual flurry of contradictory policy pronouncements on what should be our response to continued Soviet and Cuban meddling in Africa. After several false starts the final official position, it appears, is that "linkage" is out, concluding a SALT II treaty is "in the national interest" and, as The Post [May 30] and others have put it, SALT therefore stands on its own merits and must not "become a pawn in an internal argument over Kremlin policy."

Such a view, however, is dangerously blind to one overriding consideration. The proposed SALT II treaty is anything but a document of extreme precision. We all remember the omissions and ambiguities in SALT I. Not only were they responsible for an intense national debate over whether the Soviets did or did not violate its terms, but they enabled the Soviets, while adhering to the numerical limits of SALT I, to achieve a clear superiority over us in deliverable nuclear power.

So if SALT II is to achieve anything useful, it must provide us with the opportunity of redressing this imbalance and, at the same time, to the maximum extent possible, eschew similar ambiguities and inexactitudes. However, this has by no means been achieved in the current draft.

Perhaps perfect precision can never be achieved in such a document. But that is just the point. There are many things in SALT II—and there will be even more in a comprehensive test-ban treaty, if that comes about—that can never be fully verified. "Trust us," the Russian high command told our committee last Easter in Moscow, when we asked for proof of their claim that the Backfire bomber, even refueled, could still not reach the continental United States. They just quoted Leonid I. Brezhnev to us.

But if the success of SALT II must depend to some appreciable extent on trust in our Soviet friends, then their recent conduct in Africa, their actions in Afghanistan and their bugging of the U.S. embassy in Moscow, are all highly relevant factors in determining whether such trust is warranted.

Surely, when concluding an agreement on

Statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor will be identified by the use of a "bullet" symbol, i.e., ●

strategic arms—no less than in signing a lease, or buying a second-hand car—the overall performance of the other party is every bit as important to the informed consumer as the exact text of the document he is asked to sign.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1978]

LINKAGE RIGMAROLE

We have been watching with some amusement as the disarmament lobby and the administration try to persuade us that there is no "linkage" between the strategic arms talks, the centerpiece of U.S.-Soviet relations, and the behavior of the Soviets everywhere else in the world. Yes, we are now solemnly told, it's obvious that the Russians will grab anything they can reach, but SALT must be considered on its individual merits.

We are amused because for years those of us skeptical about the strategic arms talks have been trying to start a debate on the narrow merits, only to be shouted down with the cry of "detente." Why should we sign an agreement that has equal numbers of missiles, but far larger ones for the Soviets than for us, an advantage directly translatable into a far more effective missile force? Why should we sign an agreement that so severely curtails our cruise missile it cannot be effectively developed to defend Europe, while the agreement ignores the Soviet Backfire bomber and SS20 missile that mount an increasingly overwhelming challenge to our allies there? Why should we sign an agreement on which it is nearly impossible to detect Soviet cheating, when on current agreements they have demonstrated a willingness to cut any corner they can get away with?

To these questions, the answer has always been, well, this is "a first step." The agreement may not be perfect, but it is "the best that can be negotiated"—i.e., that the Soviets will let us have. Anyway, the answer continues, we need to maintain the "momentum" of detente. If SALT were rejected, we have been told a nauseating number of times, it would mean "the end of detente." And without detente, the Soviets might, say, go on a rampage in Africa.

Now we are instructed to forget all that. We are no longer to believe that SALT is a finishing school for the Soviets, and that once they learn the correct table manners they will habitually use them everywhere. Instead we are asked to believe the opposite. That the Russian national character is schizoid. That in Africa the Soviets may be Mr. Hyde, but at the SALT table they are Dr. Jekyll.

While the administration is by no means the worst offender in this regard, listen to President Carter's speech last week at the Naval Academy: "To the Soviet Union, detente seems to mean a continuing aggressive struggle for political advantage and increased influence in a variety of ways." And "the Soviets' military buildup appears to be excessive far beyond any legitimate requirements to defend themselves or defend their allies." And "The Soviet Union attempts to export a totalitarian and repressive form of government resulting in a closed society." But "We and the Soviets are negotiating in good faith almost every day." And "I'm glad to report to you today that the prospects for a SALT II agreement are good."

What needs explaining here is how Mr. Carter can believe these two contradictory things simultaneously. There are two possibilities. One is that the administration is in fact turning around its policy toward the Soviet Union, and naturally this cannot be done at a stroke. The transition leaves Mr. Carter offering a disjointed assessment of Soviet behavior and intentions. The other possibility is that the new tough line is a fraud, with no other purpose than to persuade the Senate and the country that Mr. Carter is "tough" and that therefore the SALT agreement he signs must be an honest bargain. That the new toughness is so far all rhetoric and no action supports the latter view, but only time will tell. Our own hunch is that the administration itself hasn't decided which of the two lines it is playing.

Now, the notion of "linkage" is subject to caricature. It would be silly to "slow" or "speed" the negotiations as punishment or reward for what the Soviets do in Africa. If the Soviets continue to push in Africa but are willing to agree to an honest and even-handed arms treaty, surely we ought not to refuse it. But this hypothesis strains credulity. If the Soviets are conducting an "aggressive struggle," building "excessive arms and trying to "export" totalitarianism, then we have to assume that these purposes and not "good faith" dominate their approach to SALT. When we come to examine a resulting agreement we must examine it in this context. With their negotiators seeking military advantage and our negotiators seeking a mutually beneficial agreement, we need not be surprised if the supposed merits evaporate under scrutiny.

Of course there is linkage. If someone sells you a house with a leaky roof, cheats at golf, propositions your wife, steals his brother's inheritance and comes to you offering a used car cheap, you need not automatically pass up a bargain. But you will probably want to kick the tires before you hand over the check.●

HEW ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE IX—A GROTESQUE DISTORTION OF THE LAW

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1978

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been administering title IX—relating to discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs—contrary to the express language of the legislation and the clear intent of Congress. Three U.S. district courts which have considered the issue have come to this conclusion, yet nothing has been done to make HEW obey the law. It does as it chooses in contempt of the law. The result is the most brazen, costly, and widespread Federal interference with the administration of America's schools and colleges in history.

We have seen HEW dictate the conduct of extracurricular activities; interfere with collegiate sports programs; regulate employment practices and compel health and leave benefits for pregnancy disability—including abortion—even after the Supreme Court held it is not covered under title VII of the Civil Rights Act; mandate the kinds of locker room and other facilities available to boys and girls; attempt to require coed off-campus living facilities for students; attempt—before the law was amended—to ban sororities and fraternities from our campuses and prevent boy scouts and girl scouts from using our schools; attempt to ban mother-daughter, father-son activities in our schools; and even control the volume of cheerleading in boy's and girl's sports—none of which was remotely intended by Congress in enacting title IX. The detailed and voluminous reports required to be filed have cost millions of dollars which should have been spent on education, and have added to the sea of Federal redtape in which our schools and colleges are drowning.

And all of this has been done through regulations which make a mockery of the plain meaning of the law and the intent of Congress in enacting title IX in 1972. Yet virtually nobody except outraged citizens and the courts have had the gumption to say HEW is wrong, and HEW will listen to neither. The Congress thus far has acquiesced in a grotesque distortion of its intent, apparently because it fears that to insist HEW obey the law would be regarded by some as anti civil rights or anti women's lib. The law itself is easy to understand.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is modeled on title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It begins with this statement:

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Note the precise reach of the prohibition, Mr. Speaker:

> Any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

It does not say:

> Any program or activity of any institution receiving Federal financial assistance.

The words of the law do not cover extracurricular activities, physical education programs, employment of personnel, intercollegiate sports, social organizations, or any activity or program not receiving Federal financial assistance. And every Federal judge who has directly considered this issue agrees that the words of the law mean only what they say. Moreover, the entire legislative history of title IX, and of title VI before it, confirms that interpretation.

Yet, from the very beginning, upon the issuance of sweeping and clearly excessive title IX regulations in 1974, HEW has read the language as though it applied not just to federally assisted programs and activities, but to all the programs and activities of entire school systems and higher education institutions receiving Federal funds. On June 18, 1974, HEW Secretary Weinberger issued a statement of his Department's intent to publish title IX regulations:

> To enforce the law banning sex discrimination by educational institutions which receive Federal financial aid.

That emphasis on institutions receiving Federal aid, rather than "program or activity" receiving Federal aid is absolutely critical; and HEW is absolutely wrong. Under the correct interpretation HEW could examine for sex bias only programs receiving Federal help; under their "institutional" interpretation they can poke their nose into everything in American education so long as one penny of Federal aid is going for any reason to the school system or institution.

Not only is HEW wrong, but they knew they were wrong in their 1974 regulations. They undoubtedly knew it by a reading of the unambiguous wording of the statute or even the most casual reading of the congressional debate and reports on it. But they most certainly knew

they were wrong because a U.S. circuit court of appeals had told them so in August of 1969.

In *Board of Education of Taylor County, Florida* v. *Finch*, 414 F2d 1068 (1969) the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in no uncertain terms told the then Secretary of HEW that his Department could not interpret the language of title VI of the Civil Rights Act barring racial discrimination in "any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" in such a manner that they could cut off the Federal funds because of discrimination elsewhere in the school or institution. The court clearly and emphatically held that the statutory language—exactly the same as that in title IX and after which title IX was patterned—applied only to federally financed programs and activities, and not to entire institutions. It described HEW's attempt to stretch its reach as—

> The action of an administrative agency that is (1) in excess of statutory authority . . . (2) likely to result in individual injustice . . . (3) disruptive of the legislative scheme . . . and (4) contrary to an important public policy extending beyond the rights of individual litigants.

Yet HEW pursued its own course, and on the most flimsy and dishonest of pretexts. In telling HEW that it must make findings of fact that a particular federally funded program was discriminatory before it could cut off funds, the court in the Taylor County case added, almost as an afterthought and in what a Federal judge later would describe as "largely dicta," that HEW might also make a finding of fact that a federally funded program "is so affected by discriminatory practice elsewhere in the school system that it thereby becomes discriminatory." HEW seized upon these few words to concoct what it called an "infection theory" whereby all of the school system's activities come under HEW's scrutiny and power.

Any Federal court given the issue should be able to see through that argument and label it a subterfuge for exercising powers not conferred by law. The first Federal judge to consider the validity of HEW's sweeping title IX regulations did just that. He not only rejected the "infection theory" but every other basis for HEW's asserted authority.

The case was *Romeo Community Schools* v. *United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*, 438 F. Supp. 1021 (1977). HEW had tried to force the school district to treat pregnancy of teachers equally with sickness and disability for purposes of leave and compensation benefits in contravention of a collective bargaining agreement with the teachers. The Romeo Community Schools refused to comply and questioned HEW's authority to issue regulations on this subject. On April 7, 1977, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, after an exhaustive study of the statute and its legislative history, agreed that HEW has no such authority.

That court noted not only the direct limitation of title IX to "any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance", but also noted that the enforcement section of the title is limited to termination of Federal assistance to the particular program and further that the statute specifies such action "shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been found." Then the court ruled:

> This limitation on HEW's enforcement power is implicitly a limitation on HEW's authority to regulate as well. HEW cannot regulate the practices of an educational institution unless those practices result in sex discrimination against the beneficiaries of some federally assisted education program operated by the institution. The focus of section 1681—elimination of sex discrimination in federally funded education programs—must be the focus of HEW's regulations as well. To this extent, HEW's regulatory power is also "program specific".
>
> * * * * *
>
> This coverage [of the regulations] is patently overbroad. HEW could not enforce its regulations as to employment practices in Romeo's non-federally funded education programs except by terminating aid to those programs which are federally funded, and this would constitute a clear violation of the programmatically specific limitation on HEW's enforcement powers contained in section 1682.

In brief, the court found no legal basis for the whole structure of HEW's regulations under title IX. Almost as astonishing as the extent of this power grab is the audacity with which it has been pursued. Here was HEW attempting through title IX to dictate the employment practices of education institutions in 1977, when they were already covered under title VII of the Civil Rights Act with enforcement powers in another agency. But that is not all, Mr. Speaker, HEW was attempting not only to regulate sex bias in employment but to force a school system to take an action which the U.S. Supreme Court in 1976, in *Gilbert* v. *General Electric Company* 429 U.S. 125 (1976), had declared was not even required under title VII.

And HEW still will not desist They are sticking by their illegal regulations. And they are still trying to enforce their rules on pregnancy disability for teachers despite the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in the Gilbert case. Now a second Federal judge has slapped them down on that. In the case of *Brunswick School Board* v. *Califano* the U.S. District Court for Maine in circumstances virtually identical to those in Romeo issued an almost identical opinion. That case was decided April 13 of this year.

But even before the Brunswick School Board decision, the U.S. District Court for the western district of Washington ruled that HEW does not have authority under title IX to issue regulations covering sex bias in college faculty salaries, where the faculty members are not the beneficiaries of a federally assisted education program. Again, the reasoning was the same as that cited in the Romeo case. Again, the court specifically rejected the HEW "infection theory" by which it has extended its reach to a point never contemplated by the Congress. And again, by necessary implication it attacks the whole basis of the sweeping title IX regulations. The case is *Seattle University* v. *HEW*, 16 FEP Cases 719, decided January 20, 1978.

If these three cases are not appealed by HEW—which would demonstrate how little interest it has in establishing what the law really permits it to do—they will not be applied beyond the judicial districts in which they were decided. But the analysis of the law they provide should encourage school systems and colleges and universities all across the country to resist the invasion of their rights under the guise of title IX.

Seemingly, the Office for Civil Rights in HEW will go to almost any lengths to extend its reach, however unjustified in law. Mr. Speaker, I know of one instance recently of a college being told by the Director of OCR that it had to file an assurance of compliance with title IX even though the only Federal program it was involved in is the guaranteed student loan program. This odd contention was supported by a staff memorandum of the HEW Office of the General Counsel.

No mention was made of the fact that the General Counsel of HEW had obtained earlier a written opinion from the Department of Justice on September 23, 1977, which stated that the term "Federal financial assistance" as used in section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in the same context as it is used in title IX "does not include programs of insurance or guarantee." More specifically, the Department of Justice opinion, signed by Assistant Attorney General John M. Harmon, made direct reference to title IX, as follows:

> Neither title VI nor title IX, the two models for section 504, prohibit discrimination in programs receiving Federal aid through insurance or guarantee. Indeed, *each expressly excludes such programs*, albeit in an elliptical way." (Emphasis added.)

Obviously, neither HEW nor its OCR arm is an agency interested in administering the law. Rather, each plays the role of the zealous advocate who will use any weapon to bludgeon institutions into submission to purposes it conceives of as good.

Mr. Speaker, no constructive public purpose is served by the kind of reckless disregard for the law I have detailed. Neither the cause of civil rights nor that of equal educational opportunity for women is served by HEW literally taking the law into its own hands. A "good cause" does not excuse lawlessness—or should not if we are to preserve a government of laws. I find it somewhat depressing that some of the same people who applaud the indictment of FBI agents for allegedly violating the rights of suspected terrorists also applaud with equal vigor the freewheeling contempt for the law by HEW's Office for Civil Rights. It can at least be said that the FBI was trying to protect American citizens against the kind of terrorist savages who kidnapped and slaughtered Aldo Moro in Italy—a danger somewhat more threatening than the practice of conducting separate physical education classes for girls and boys.

The only responsibility of HEW is to faithfully administer laws as they are written, consistent with express statutory language and congressional intent. If some interest group—however noble its purposes—wants the law changed, and wants HEW or any other agency to exercise powers not authorized by stat-

ute, it should come to the Congress and ask to have the law changed. Legislation by regulation is not consistent with our constitutional structure, or with a scheme of representative democracy, or with good government. The administration of title IX is a textbook example of legislation by regulation. The result is an unprecedented and dangerous Federal intrusion into education at all levels. It is a disgraceful performance which even a liberal Congress—perhaps particularly a liberal Congress—should find the courage to correct.●

MORE ON MYTHICAL LAWNMOWER CASE

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have sought to dispel the myth of an alleged case where a man won a huge product liability award after using a lawnmower to trim his hedges. This story has been spread far and wide by insurance companies and others seeking to blame American juries for the massive increases in product liability and other insurance premiums.

The story has never been confirmed. Despite intensive efforts to ascertain its source, it still appears to have been made of whole cloth.

Several months ago, for example, a reporter for an insurance trade publication tried to trace its origin; despite an intensive effort, he was unsuccessful in his effort to find substantiation for it.

Nevertheless, the president of the American Bar Association repeated the story again in a recent speech. Esquire magazine, intrigued by the story, asked the ABA where the story came from. The result? Again, no substantiation.

I am pleased to see this myth being deflated in the national media—although I am, of course, discouraged that it is still being circulated. The area of product liability insurance is laden with misinformation and, of course, even untrue statements can gain credibility if they are repeated often enough, particularly by prominent people.

Esquire is to be applauded for its efforts in seeking the truth, and I would like to share the article they published with my colleagues:

RIGHT FROM WRONG

American Bar Association president William Spann Jr. recently delivered an interesting speech on the growing tendency of people to claim various benefits and pleasures as "rights" to be won in court. Disturbed at the trend, Spann cited as a prime example a man who "lost a finger operating his power lawn mower and sued the manufacturer." Spann explained, "It didn't matter to him—and it apparently didn't matter to the jury, either—that his injury occurred when he was using the lawn mower to cut a hedge."

Intrigued by the case, I asked the ABA for a citation. "We don't know where it came from," explained spokeswoman Lynn Taylor. "You know, you hear a story from a friend who's heard it from someone else. It's a hearsay type of thing. I'll check it." The next day Taylor assured me that "even if that case isn't real or if we can't find it, I'll be happy to give examples of other horror stories that we know are true. Two days later she reported that the ABA's researchers had traced the lawn mower case to a pamphlet printed in 1971 attacking trial lawyers but that they still had no cite for a real case, nor could the group that wrote the pamphlet find one.

Spann's speech was entitled "Telling 'Rights' from Wrong."●

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ENERGY STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION ON PROPOSED BUDGET

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy was created pursuant to House Resolutions 508 and 509 on April 21, 1977, to consider and report to the House on the legislation submitted by the administration known as the National Energy Act. This legislation subsequently was engrossed as H.R. 8444 and passed by the House on August 5, 1977.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Energy held hearings on the goals of the National Energy Act; coordinated the work of five standing committees on various portions of that legislation, and adopted amendments which were recommended to the House.

The Senate acted on five separate bills, which make up the National Energy Act and correspond to H.R. 8444.

On October 15, 1977, the Speaker appointed House conferees to meet with Senate conferees and reconcile differences between the two bodies. All 25 of the House conferees—17 from the majority party, 8 from the minority—were members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy.

Since the conference has been meeting, staff of the Ad Hoc Committee have been monitoring the proceedings. Requests for information on the conference have been filed by the Ad Hoc Committee staff. This is a continuing process. In addition to having prepared summaries of agreements reached by the conferees, the Ad Hoc Committee staff responds to substantive questions regarding provisions of H.R. 8444 and the Senate-passed versions of their corresponding bills.

By June 30, the staff of the Ad Hoc Committee will have been reduced from its original complement of eight (four professionals, three clericals, one research) to three (staff director, office manager, one clerical). On July 1, an energy specialist—Mr. Mark Bisnow—will join the committee staff as counsel to the minority. This position has been unfilled since the departure of David Swanson to join the staff of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The ranking minority member, Mr. John Anderson, has indicated a serious need for counsel during the forthcoming deliberations and floor action on the National Energy Act.

It is proposed that this staff continue to be funded until the original premise of the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy, as described in House Resolution 508, has been realized. It read:

The Ad Hoc Committee on Energy shall expire upon completion of the legislative process, including final disposition of any veto message, with respect to all legislation referred to the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Ad Hoc Committee was authorized the sum of $212,833 pursuant to House Resolution 531. During calendar year 1977, $124,000 of that was expended.

By authority of House Resolution 1051, passed by voice vote on March 15, 1978, the sum of $90,000 was authorized for the period January 3 to June 30, 1978. The request budget that is being made is for an additional $50,000, for the remaining 6 months of 1978.●

ERA EXTENSION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the Illinois House of Representatives failed to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment by only six votes. That vote represents the third time that Illinois has approved ratification of the ERA by a substantial majority of the legislature. Yet Illinois, alone among all other States, requires a three-fifths majority to ratify constitutional amendments. Thus the measure failed.

Only 9 months now remain for the necessary three additional States to ratify the amendment. However, of the States which have not yet ratified, several will not meet in legislative session at all until next year, thus leaving a woefully inadequate time to consider and debate the ERA ratification. This means that a time extension for ratification is essential if we are to extend to American women the same constitutional protections that men in this country receive.

The following editorial from the Los Angeles Times argues for an extension to the ERA ratification time period and I recommend it to my colleagues. Since the editorial was published the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, of which I am chairman, has voted out a resolution extending the ratification period. Two days after the editorial the Illinois legislature failed to ratify and another vote on the issue is planned for this week. However, regardless of the outcome in Illinois, there should be no doubt that if full constitutional rights are to be extended to women in this country, an extension of time for State ratification of the ERA is essential.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 5, 1978]

IT IS RIGHT, IT IS TIME

It is time to talk about equal rights for women.

It is time for the Illinois Legislature, which may take up the Equal Rights Amendment before its scheduled June 30 adjournment, to stop listening to Phyllis Schlafly and start listening to reason. Likewise, Illinois Democratic political leaders need to start doing what they do best: delivering the votes.

ERA backers, who have had to learn to play

political hardball even with right on their side, must win one for a change. They need the momentum to bring two more states beyond Illinois into the ratification column before the March 22 deadline next year.

In any event, the deadline should be extended. We do not agree with the argument that extending the ratification date is "changing the rules in the middle of the game." Equal rights for any segment of our population—particularly when it is half the population—are *not* a game. They are reality, and must be reality.

The House judiciary subcommittee that considers extension today should not fret that it will set any precedent. After all, no deadlines were set for the first 17 amendments. Congress only established the seven-year limit in 1917; no such period is mentioned in the Constitution.

The subcommittee should consider the bloc of states in which ERA has not been ratified: basically, the Southwestern and intermountain bastions of political conservatism and the Southern redoubts of religious fundamentalism. Some people simply need more time.

It is time for the men of this country to insist that their mothers, wives, sisters, daughters and friends be accorded the same constitutional protections that they receive. Those men and those women must lend their skills, money and support to unratified states while convincing Congress to extend the deadline so that equal rights can become a matter of national policy.

It is time. And that time will pass too soon.●

WHY I'M PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for insertion into the RECORD the following essay which was written by Miss Annette Stojkovich, an 8th grader at the Eisenhower Junior High School in Darien, Ill.

Miss Stojkovich's essay won first prize in my annual essay contests, "Why I'm Proud To Be an American," which is run in DuPage County.

I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that when the Members read this essay, they will have a greater understanding of what being an American means to many of our young people. It is most appropriate that this essay appear on Flag Day, 1978. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

WHY I'M PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

My mother was born and raised on a farm in Yugoslavia. When she was a young girl of fourteen, she came home from school one day, and to her horror, she discovered her mother had been taken away from her by the communists. She was scared to death! She was left home alone, without her parents. Her father was in Germany, and her mother was in jail. She had to manage the farm, go to school, and try to survive at the same time. A cold shiver ran down her back. Would her mother ever come home? Who would take care of her? What would become of her?

After three months of hardship and work, her mother came home. Her mother was thrown in jail because she mocked the communists. A joke got her in jail. If she had been a man she would have been killed.

My mother also had a hard time with some of the communist teachers. When she was a senior in high school, she was failed because one of her teachers was communist and she knew my mother and her family were against communism. She had gotten straight A's through the whole semester and then this teacher had failed her.

Once, my mother and the friends in her class went out for recess, and noticed the bishop was giving crosses out to the people. They got a cross and returned to class. When the teacher found out, she punished them and kept them after school. Communists don't believe in God, and punish people who do.

I feel safe in this country. I'm secure. I'm not afraid that the police will march to my door and take my parents away. I'm not afraid I'll be abused in school for being a Republican or Democrat, Buddhist or Baptist, Jew or German, black, white, green or brown. I'm proud of what I am and no one has the right to hurt me because of the color of my skin or the country from which I came. I'm free to go to Siberia, Japan, the North Pole or the Congo if I can pay the price.

A person can come to America from any country of the world and America will give him the opportunity to become a doctor or lawyer, if he has the ambition to work.

America gives me the choice of religion. I can be a Baptist, Orthodox Christian or Catholic and I won't be discriminated against.

Our country is the only country in the world that gives the people a choice to choose their own president and then turn around and impeach him. We, the people choose whom we wish to lead us and represent our country.

Our lives are full of choices every day of our lives. We choose our religion, our president, mayors, congressmen, and other government officials. We choose what place we'll live in, what school we wish to go to, and what job we want.

This is why I'm proud to be an American.

I'm proud to know our country was the first to send a man to the moon. I'm proud to know we are so advanced in our sciences. I'm proud our forefathers fought not only for our cause, but for many other countries also. I'm proud we fought for truth and justice for all. Equality and freedom are our country's backbone. I'm proud our country gave aid to less fortunate countries when they were in need of it. But most of all I'm proud of this belief. ". . . And, at the heart of the democratic philosophy is the belief that man can control his own destiny and improve living conditions through his own actions."

I sincerely hope our country will live for many, many, happy, peaceful and prosperous years. I hope every generation to come has a love for our country, for if we learn to value and treasure what we have, we shall never lose it.●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS—II

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, in this, my second of a series of remarks on the violation of human rights in Turkey, I would like to convey some of the more specific details of a case involving the two U.S. citizens which were mentioned in the first letter I included. My more exact purpose and ultimate goal in continuing this series would be the negotiation of a treaty with Turkey, seeking their cooperation in a sort of prisoner exchange program, similar to that recently concluded with both Mexico and Canada. U.S. citizens would be transferred from jails abroad, to serve their sentences in U.S. jails and in this way, avoiding at least some of the inhumane conditions which exist in jails located in the countries where they have been convicted of an offense.

The letter which is included today, and of which I am the author, was written to the two prisoners who are currently serving 24-year sentences in Turkey. Originally, however, the sentences which were extended these two young women were the death penalty, but it was later commuted to life imprisonment, an incarceration period of not less than 36 years. The 1974 amnesty lowered the penalty to 24 years.

One of the inherent abuses which the women are forced to tolerate is sex discrimination. While men are assigned only two to a room, a room which has a sink, toilet and cooking and bathing facilities, women are denied such luxuries. Turkey, however is not the only foreign nation guilty of such discrimination, but it is certainly one of the most flagrant violators. We cannot allow the bureaucratic delays to continue at the expense of these two women. While we have Turkey in such a favorable negotiating position, it is adamant that we take advantage of this situation and insist upon a prisoner exchange treaty in exchange for the elimination of the arms embargo which has been imposed on the country. I urge your support for this action:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. January 24, 1978.

Miss KATHY ZENZ and Miss JOANN MCDANIEL,
c/o American Consulate, New York.

DEAR KATHY AND JOANN: I have your letter of November 23 which because of the Congressional recess has only recently come to my attention. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship and International Law of the House Judiciary Committee. Our subcommittee drafted the implementing legislation which was required to make the treaties with Mexico and Canada functional. In the drafting of the legislation, we very carefully kept other countries in mind also, and so drafted the legislation that it would accommodate future treaties with other countries such as Turkey, without the necessity of new legislation. We believe that in this legislation, we have taken care of most, if not all of the objections foreign governments have to the subject matter.

The bill was drafted, passed the full Committee, the House of Representatives and the Senate, and was signed into law by the President, at which signing I was present.

Some years ago, perhaps either in Time or Life magazine, I read a most disturbing story about your sentence and subsequent incarceration for what appeared to me to be an horrendously excessive period of time. During the drafting of the legislation, I had your situation in mind and requested and received from the State Department a detailed report on it. I have subsequently been in touch with both Mr. McDonald in Oregon and Miss McDaniel's parents. I also talked with the congressional liaison office at the State Department who advised me that Turkey was one of five other countries interested in negotiating a similar treaty to that of Canada and Mexico. He advised me that the negotiations would be in the hands of Ambassador Spiers and that they would expect a treaty could be negotiated as early as March of 1978 with a return of prisoners to the United States by about midyear. Since

then, of course, the Turkish government has changed and I do not know what if any impact this will have on the situation.

As to your release upon return to the United States, you would come under the parole and probation laws of the United States as opposed to Turkey. This would insure your release within two years, but I expect from observing the handling of Mexican prisoners that it would probably be accomplished virtually immediately on straight parole as opposed to a work release type program. This would mean that except for certain minimal actual restrictions and a periodic report to a parole officer, you would be totally free to do as you wish.

I am at this point again writing to Ambassador Spiers to inquire as to the progress of negotiations and for your information, I am enclosing herewith, a copy of the treaty with Mexico and a copy of the implementing legislation which is now law, and to which I refer above.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD S. SAWYER,
Member of Congress.●

FOURTH DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL CLASSROOM

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to your attention an event that has made Flag Day, 1978, especially meaningful for a group of high school students from South Carolina, who, as of this evening, will be completing a 4-day pilgrimage to their Nation's Capitol as participants in the 10th Annual Fourth District Congressional Classroom.

When they return to their homes, these students will become veterans of a program that has been responsible for introducing over 150 young people to the realities of their Government—as it exists today, and as it has evolved over the years since our forefathers fought and won for us the right to govern ourselves. It is a right that is ours only so long as we protect it through the practice of enlightened citizenship—and that is precisely what the Fourth District Congressional Classroom was designed to encourage and promote.

Every student who participates in the program has but one obligation—and that is to share their experience with as many of their friends and neighbors as they can back home in their schools and communities. We cannot bring everyone to Washington, but with the help of these students, we can bring Washington to everyone within the sphere of their influence, and in the process preserve and strengthen for their own as well as future generations of Americans the principles of good self-government.

Mr. Speaker, this program would not be possible without the support of the community, and at this point, I would like to recognize the civic clubs, businesses and service organizations in the fourth district who have sponsored this year's congressional classroom scholars. From the Greenville area, they are: The Greenville Lions and Sertoma Clubs, the Greenville Kiwanis, the Liberty Corp., and J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. From the Spartanburg area, they are: The Spartanburg Lions Club, Hoechst Fibers Industries, Jones Tractor Co., M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc. and the Spartan Radiocasting Co.

Their generosity has made it possible for the following students to participate in this year's congressional classroom program: Keith Bailey, son of Mr. and Mrs. Eber A. Bailey of Wellford; Chuck Duncan, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Duncan of Lyman; Charles F. Duvall, Jr., son of Rev. and Mrs. C. F. Duvall of Spartanburg; David Hodge, son of Mr. and Mrs. George R. Hodge of Greer; Joey Hudson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jimmy Hudson of Greer; Terry Livingston, son of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Livingston of Greenville; Mark T. Moore, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph D. Moore of Roebuck; Nicky L. Nelson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Nelson of Greenville; Barry Nodine, son of Mr. and Mrs. Boyce Nodine of Lyman; Bobbie Oglesby, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bobby Oglesby of Cowpens; Steve Pynne, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dwight I. Pynne of Mauldin; and Terri Ann Taylor, granddaughter of Mrs. Mary Foster of Inman.●

FORMER PRESIDENT ARNULFO ARIAS RETURNS TO HIS NATIVE LAND

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of exile in the United States, former President Arnulfo Arias of Panama returned to his native country on June 10, 1978, and was greeted by what was probably the greatest demonstration in Panamanian history estimated to have been between 200,000 and 300,000.

Although given minimal treatment in the press of the United States, his arrival was featured on major television networks. Experienced observers familiar with Isthmian history report that the acclaim was tremendous.

In his arrival speech, Dr. Arias "attacked the depressed state of the (Panamanian) economy, high taxes and food prices, the corruption of the regime, the personality cult surrounding General Torrijos and the recently approved canal treaties" and was "wildly applauded."

It is is significant that during the demonstration President Demetrio Liakas, who was placed in the Presidency by Torrijos, watched the cheering throngs from a seventh floor window of the Hotel International.

The most extensive story of the return of Dr. Arias so far published was a two part series by Alan Riding in the New York Times, which I quote here as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1978]

PANAMA—IA— WHO COSTS A SPELL

(By Alan Riding)

PANAMA, June 12.—"A leader should be aloof," Dr. Arnulfo Arias Madrid told a visitor in Miami recently. "He should be untouchable. They carry the Pope on a bier so you can't get too close. That's how a political leader should be."

When the 76-year-old former President returned to Panama from exile in Florida last Saturday, some 100,000 supporters who were viewing him for the first time in a decade danced and crowded round him. Yet it was evident that the mystical spell that he cast over Panama almost 40 years ago remained.

A heavy storm broke over the city shortly before his plane landed. "It's all right," a middle-aged woman remarked with conviction. "The gods always bless the land before the doctor arrives." Later, downtown, a young lawyer said of the thrice-deposed and exiled leader, "It's the fourth coming."

The messianic quality of Dr. Arias' return was evidently heightened by the growing dissatisfaction of Panamanians with the 10-year-old regime of Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera and the deep frustration of opposition groups at being unable to depose the country's military rulers.

THE MYTH OF EL HOMBRE

Sensing this, Dr. Arias in his arrival speech Saturday night attacked the depressed state of the economy, high taxes and food prices, the corruption of the regime, the personality cult surrounding General Torrijos and the recently approved Panama Canal treaties. His remarks were wildly applauded.

But his appeal apparently does not stem from his political position; even his closest aides can rarely predict his views on specific issues. Rather, Panamanians seem to respond to the myth of El Hombre—The Man—that they have created and helped sustain.

Seven years ago, when General Torrijos was at the height of his popularity and Dr. Arias was a seemingly forgotten figure living quietly in Miami, a Panamanian politician told a visitor, "It's inexplicable, but if you put 100,000 people in a square, with Torrijos at one end and Arias at the other, everyone would be turned toward Arias."

As Dr. Arias drove through May 5 Plaza in downtown Panama City yesterday, the man whom General Torrijos placed in the presidency, Demetrio Lakas, could be seen watching the cheering crowd from a seventh-floor window of the Hotel Internacional.

AGING LEADERS STILL ADMIRED

The phenomenon of Dr. Arias is not unique in Latin America: The late Juan Domingo Perón returned to the Argentine presidency in 1974 after two decades in exile; Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra, five times President of Ecuador and last deposed in 1972, has been barred from running in this year's elections for fear he would win again; the octogenarian Victor Haya de la Torre remains a charismatic figure in Peru, and Victor Paz Estenssor is again bidding for the presidency in Bolivia, 15 years after he was ousted.

Some analysts maintain that the attraction of these aging populists reflects the political immaturity of much of Latin America. Yet the pull of these leaders is one that no amount of propaganda or advertising could buy. Dr. Arias's supporters had few resources to spend to publicize his arrival and the Government-controlled press barely mentioned it. Yet, quite literally, the word spread through the city, "The Man is coming."

Dr. Arias lives up to his image as a father figure. Erect, formal and ceremonial, made more distant by the dark glasses he wears to protect his poor eyesight, he is a moralist who frequently scolds his followers, both in person and in speeches.

"The Panamanian people are like oxen," he said in an interview today, relaxing in the home of supporters. "You have to keep prodding them with a stick to keep them moving." On another occasion, he remarked: "Panama is like a village. What it needs is a mayor, not a president."

"ENORMOUS FORCES" GUIDE HIM

Although Dr. Arias admits to being a poor public speaker—"partly because I'm shy, I

don't like crowds," he explained today—his pronouncements contain a strong philosophical strain that appeals to many Panamanians.

"I'm not religious in a formal sense," he says. "I'm guided by forces, enormous forces, although I don't know what they are. I just follow principles that I know are right. If a country has no principles, it has no salvation."

Meditative by nature, Dr. Arias seemed content in exile. "You develop your internal life, you read a lot, you develop friends with a philosophy similar to your own," he explained. "Exile and jail are good for you. Don't be scared of them." In his 47 years of political activity, he has spent much longer in exile and jail than in office.

Born into a middle-class family in Penonme, Cocle Province, on Aug. 15, 1901—two years before the United States promoted Panama's independence from Colombia in order to build the canal—Dr. Arias attended high school in Binghamton, N.Y., graduated with a degree in science from the University of Chicago and as a physician from Harvard, doing his internship at Boston City Hospital before returning to Panama in 1925.

LED COUP IN 1931

In 1931, he led a successful coup against President Juan Demosthenes Arosemena, then spent most of the 30's in Europe studying and representing Panama as a diplomat. In 1939, he returned here and ran successfully for the presidency the following year.

Although suspected of pro-Nazi sentiments and considered too nationalist by the United States, Dr. Arias laid the foundation for his popularity in the 12 months before he was overthrown, creating a social security system, giving the vote to women and strengthening labor laws.

Jail and exile followed until his "second coming" in the late 1940's when 18 months passed before his victory in the 1948 elections was recognized. In May 1951, however, he was again deposed by an alliance of the National Guard and wealthy families.

He ran once more for office in 1964 and most independent observers deemed him to have won, but an apparent fraud gave the presidency to Marcos Robles. Four years later, however, his victory was so overwhelming that it had to be recognized. Just 11 days after taking office Oct. 1, 1968, he was ousted again by the National Guard and went into exile in Miami.

Dr. Aria's first wife died two decades ago and in 1976 he married Mireya Moscoso, who was then 28 years old. He has a son by his first marriage, Gerardo, who is an agronomist.

What will Dr. Arias do now? "I've just come to add my grain of sand to the struggle for the return of democracy and not to become president again," he said today. "But I've got the tiger by the tail and I can't let go or else it will turn and eat us all up."

PANAMA, ACCEPTING TREATY CHANGES, PLANS A BIG WELCOME FOR CARTER

(By Alan Riding)

PANAMA, June 13.—The Panamanian Government has swallowed its objection to Senate amendments to the new canal treaties and has decided to give a huge welcome to President Carter when he comes here Friday to exchange the instruments of ratification with Panama's Chief of Government, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera.

Tens of thousands of government employees, schoolchildren and peasants are to be brought in from the provinces. Meanwhile, radio, television and newspaper advertisements are telling the people of Panama City that it is their patriotic duty to receive President Carter.

Among officials, the bitterness that accompanied the final weeks of Senate debate on the treaties, when conservative senators refused to support ratification until the United States assumed the right to keep open the canal by force after it comes under Panama's control in the year 2000, has also largely disappeared.

"We owe Carter a lot," said Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, Panama's chief treaty negotiator. "He gambled heavily on the treaties even though he had little to gain politically."

MANY STILL OPPOSED TO FACTS

Yet while the President now seems assured of a noisy and friendly official reception, many Panamanian leftists and nationalists remain strongly opposed to the new canal treaties and consider that Mr. Carter's visit is, in the words of one group, "the climax to an injustice."

Some leftist student organizations are planning demonstrations against the visit this week and have already sprayed walls in the capital with such slogans as "Carter go home!" "Don't come Carter!" and "Panama si, Carter no!" Every morning, government workers can be seen painting over the signs. Some dollar bills, which serve as Panama's paper currency, have also appeared stamped in red ink with the words, "Carter out of Panama!"

More significant, however, is the importance Mr. Carter's visit has assumed in terms of internal Panamanian Politics, with both officials and opposition leaders seeing it as a crucial American endorsement of the authoritarian Torrijos regime at a time when it is being buffeted by growing domestic criticism.

On Saturday, 100,000 people crowded downtown Panama City to welcome home from exile former President Arnulfo Arias Madrid, who was overthrown by the National Guard in October 1968. The reception turned into the largest anti-Government demonstration in a decade, with Dr. Arias cheered wildly for his speech attacking both General Torrijos and the new canal treaties. The Government apparently is hoping that a bigger turnout for the United States President will suggest that General Torrijos is more popular than his principal political challenger.

The Government-controlled press has played down the size of Dr. Arias's welcome, saying that "only 40,000" people turned out, and officials have redoubled their efforts to bring in as many people as possible Friday.

BANDS TO PLAY ALONG ROUTE

Some 200,000 T-shirts printed with Mr. Carter's photograph will reportedly be handed out, while bands will play along the route of the President's motorcade.

Noting the domestic political implications of the visit, some foreign diplomats have begun questioning Mr. Carter's wisdom in coming for the exchange of instruments of ratification, particularly since the treaties cannot enter into effect until Oct. 1, 1979, unless Congress approves implementing legislation before next March 31.

"How many times can you celebrate this political victory?" one foreign diplomat asked, recalling the signing ceremony last September in Washington attended by most Latin American presidents. "Wouldn't it have been better to have had a simple symbolic exchange of instruments instead of Carter coming down with a cast of thousands?"

Mr. Carter will reportedly be accompanied by some 300 personal guests, while Panama has invited the Presidents of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Costa Rica and the Prime Minister of Jamaica.

Opposition groups of both left and right all but the Liberal Party, which was in power between 1964 and 1968, have come out strongly against the trip—are therefore interpreting the visit as Washington's way of bolstering the Torrijos regime and insuring the survival of the new treaties. All these groups, including the moderate Liberals, have warned that the absence of a second Panamanian plebiscite following the Senate amendments to the treaties cast doubts on their legitimacy. In last October's referendum, two-thirds of voters approved the treaties.

CARTER URGED NOT TO COME

"By coming here, Carter is returning Torrijos's favor of accepting treaties that were so negative for Panama," said Dr. Miguel Antonio Bernal, a Trotskyist leader who was recently allowed to return here after two years in exile. "Carter is coming to bless the Torrijos dictatorship just one week after its repudiation in the reception for Dr. Arias."

A group of 43 priests and nuns has written to Mr. Carter urging him not to come, terming the treaties "injust, imposed and immoral," and noting that the absence of public protests against them was the result of "the public's sense of impotence and the lack of sufficient freedom."

Former President Arias, who has returned to the center stage of Panamanian politics for the first time in a decade, is not opposing the visit. "I think it's convenient," he said in an interview, "because if their is repression of protesters, it will hasten the day that the people will rise up against the regime."●

THE TRUTH ABOUT TEXAS AIR TRANSPORTATION

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently, several newspaper articles and editorials have been printed in Texas concerning H.R. 12611, the Air Services Improvement Act of 1978—popularly known as the deregulation bill. These articles were generated initially by a press release issued on March 24, 1978 by the chairman of the Texas Aeronautics Commission (TAC), and carried to all parts of the State by news wire services.

The press release contained grossly misleading statements and some false representations. A few newspapers picked up the statements and printed them without bothering to investigate whether or not the charges were valid.

Following the initial publication of the news articles, generated by the TAC press release, a congressional candidate in the Dallas-Fort Worth area attempted to use the misleading information as a campaign issue, further distorting the picture with a series of demagogic and untrue statements.

An editorial that was printed in the Dallas Times Herald on May 16, 1978, which contained even more false and grossly misleading information. In fact, the editorial was so lacking in correct factual information until one would be generous in terming it "irresponsible."

Finally, the president of an intrastate airline company circulated a letter to members of the Texas delegation that contained misleading information.

Many of the people involved in the communications listed above, have vested interests in provisions that may or may not be included in H.R. 12611. Others garner an advantage by the resultant publicity of their involvement.

Since I was one of the sponsors of H.R. 12611 and the author of a few of the provisions in that bill, I feel compelled to set the record straight as to what is truth. In order to avoid the wild charges and countercharges that have been

banted about, concerning this bill, I requested assistance from reputable authorities who have no ax to grind.

A series of questions were submitted to the General Counsel of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the General Counsel of the Public Works and Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives. These questions were designed to get to the heart of the controversy and misleading information that has arisen and to provide authoritative answers.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1978, on page 16721, all documents involved in this controversy were printed. These included the original press release that was issued by the chairman of TAC, the editorial printed by the Dallas Times Herald, the letter authored by the president of the Texas Intrastate Airline Company and the questions and answers posed to the General Counsel of CAB and to the Chief Counsel of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The Texas Aeronautics Commission's press release would have the reader believe that H.R. 12611 (the same bill as H.R. 11145, referenced in his press release), would totally wipe out low cost fares in Texas.

In the press release the TAC chairman charges or infers that H.R. 12611 would:

Destroy the existing intrastate air carrier networks;

Impose Federal controls over existing intrastate air carriers;

Force intrastate air carriers to raise their fares;

Take away State jurisdiction over intrastate air carriers; and

Create more, rather than less, regulations.

The implications and statements above simply are not true. The bill does not, in any way, contain provisions that would permit Federal controls of intrastate air carrier operations. As in the past, intrastate air carriers will be regulated by the State. Also as in the past, interstate operations will be regulated by CAB.

What did change, from past provisions, is the elimination of dual regulations that previously existed in the case of a carrier transporting both interstate and intrastate passengers. The new provision eliminated the ridiculous situation that arose in one State, wherein the State regulators required one fare rate for intrastate passengers and the CAB required another rate for interstate passengers—even though both passengers were riding side by side in the same airplane at the same time.

In the new bill, the law makes clear that an air carrier operating solely within the boundaries of the State would be regulated by State authorities. If the air carrier is operating across State lines, the CAB will control.

The new bill would, in no way, force higher fares. This is true whether the carrier is operating under State jurisdiction as an intrastate carrier or operating under Federal jurisdiction as an interstate carrier. Neither the CAB nor the TAC is authorized by State or Federal laws to establish fare rates. The new bill grants no authority to either agency to establish or fix fares.

Regardless of insinuations made by the chairman of the TAC, the president of the Texas Intrastate Airline Company and the uneducated statements in the Dallas Times Herald editorial; there are no differences in air carrier operations under CAB from air carrier operations under State agencies. Both types of air carriers obey the exact same operational and safety laws. CAB and State regulations deal only with route awards and economic matters. Neither issue regulations involving aircraft operations.

Fares are established by the management of each operating company, whether that company be an intrastate air carrier or an interstate air carrier. As a matter of law the CAB and the State agencies can only approve or disapprove management-suggested fare offering. Lower fare offerings are never disapproved by either State or CAB authorities unless it can be clearly shown that the lower fares constitute a deliberate predatory raid on a competing air carrier.

Under the provisions of the new bill, an interstate air carrier can unilaterally reduce fares up to 50 percent without CAB action. It can raise fares by only 5 percent without CAB approval.

One might logically ask, just why is the chairman of the Texas Aeronautics Commission making such a fuss about this bill? Why is the president of Southwest Airlines so obviously concerned?

There are good questions and there are good answers. H.R. 12611 is known as the "Deregulation Bill" because it is designed to simplify the regulations process and to foster fair competition.

I would suggest that the real concern, on the part of the TAC chairman is the fact that this bill virtually puts his bureaucracy out of business. Under the bill, the commuters are placed under the CAB then given a statutory exemption from Federal regulations until such time as they begin operating large jet transports (over 56 passenger capacity). Many of these small carriers were previously regulated by TAC.

The only significant intrastate air carrier, regulated by TAC, is Southwest Airlines. Southwest is attempting to expand its Texas operations to other parts of the Nation (these expansion plans should not be confused with Southwest Midwest operations, which are a separate subsidiary operation). Under the provisions of H.R. 12611, any expansion of Southwest Airlines across State lines would place their entire operation under CAB. Again the TAC would have no one to regulate. As pointed out earlier, such an expansion on the part of Southwest Airlines would not legally change their ability to establish fare rates. They would simply file their fare rates with CAB instead of going to the State agency.

Therefore, I would suggest that the main concern of the Texas Aeronautics Commission and its august chairman is not the protection of low-cost Texas fares, but the protection of a State bureaucracy that is about to be deregulated.

In the case of Southwest Airlines, I would suggest that its august president is trying to gain an unfair competitive edge over existing interstate air carrier companies. Southwest wants to use its intrastate Texas operation as a base for expansion into an interstate operation. Furthermore, Southwest wants to use Dallas' Love Field as its hub. They want to develop an interstate network by diverting existing traffic from Dallas-Fort Worth and by their existing State-controlled routes.

Neither I nor anyone else to my knowledge would attempt to prevent Southwest Airlines (or any other air carrier company) from freely competing with any other air carrier—interstate or intrastate. I do insist that the competition be fair.

Several years ago the cities of Dallas and Fort Worth concluded that Love Field was saturated. It could not longer be able to accommodate area growth. The two cities then invested nearly $800 million in a new airport and forced all air carrier operations to relocate to the new Dallas-Fort Worth airport. At the time of the move to the more expensive airport facility, the operating air carriers were assured that Dallas-Fort Worth would be the sole air carrier airport in Dallas and Fort Worth.

As most know, Southwest Airlines began an intrastate commuter operation from Love Field. This was a new type of aviation market, transporting primarily intrastate passengers. Most of these travelers had previously gone by bus or automobile.

New Southwest would like to use its intrastate Texas operation as a collector network to generate interstate passengers to be funneled through Love Field to other parts of the United States. They propose to do this at the same low-fare rates.

On the surface, this would seem to be a good deal for Texans, because Southwest could indeed fly passengers from Dallas to other parts of the Nation at slightly lower fares. The reason is simple, and has nothing to do with Federal controls of Southwest Airlines. The fares would be lower because citizens of Dallas and Fort Worth would be subsidizing Southwest fares.

By operating out of Love Field, landing fees, rental rates and other Southwest operating expense would be approximately half those encountered by competing carriers at Dallas-Fort Worth. Southwest would divert interstate passengers residing in central and east Dallas, even without lower fares. Such a diversion would be a loss to competing Dallas-Fort Worth interstate carriers operating from Dallas-Fort Worth.

If Southwest Airlines should be allowed to fly interstate routes from Love Field, Dallas and Fort Worth would also be forced to allow other competing air carriers to return to Love Field. Such a move would immediately create an air traffic jam and result in Dallas-Fort Worth becoming a losing operation. All citizens of Dallas and Fort Worth—not just those using the airports—would then be forced to pay off the Dallas-Fort Worth bonds with tax money, rather than airport income.

In the long run, everyone in Dallas and Fort Worth would lose.

Therefore, I think the situation is now in focus. The president of Southwest Airlines does not like the Milford amendment to H.R. 12611, because it would

force Southwest to compete on an equal basis with all other interstate air carrier companies if Southwest should decide that it wanted to get into the interstate market. Please note that nothing in the bill would prevent Southwest Airlines from competing fully with any interstate air carrier—on an equal basis.

There have also been some discussions about commuter air carriers. Texas Commuter Air Carrier company officials have joined with the TAC chairman in objecting to H.R. 12611 on the grounds that it "outlawed State regulation of the commuter airline industry within the State's borders."

As pointed out earlier, H.R. 12611 does preempt State control of commuter air carriers that are transporting interstate passengers. However, the bill also gives a statutory exemption from Federal regulation to all commuter air carriers operating aircraft with less than 56 seats (this would include all of the Texas commuter airline industry).

Actually, as far as Federal controls of the commuter airline industry is concerned, nothing has been changed. CAB has never regulated the commuter airline industry. They have always been exempt from Federal CAB regulations.

What did change was the fact that H.R. 12611 removed State controls also. In other words, this segment of the airline industry was totally deregulated.

The total deregulation of the commuter airline industry did not make the TAC happy, because no bureaucracy likes to lose regulatory control. The deregulation move did not make existing State commuter air carriers happy because they will now be required to face free competition. Prior to this act, the TAC would grant exclusive routes to commuters. These routes will now be open to free competition.

Finally, I am compelled to comment on the disgraceful distortion of facts by persons who should know better and for the omission of information that should have been brought forth.

The editorial published by the Dallas Times Herald on May 16, 1978, has been totally discredited by the replies to questions made by the counsels for the CAB and for the House Public Works and Transportation Committee. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 7, 1978, p. 16721.)

A Dallas Times Herald story with an Austin dateline erroneously reported that my amendment to H.R. 12611 would bring about CAB control of Southwest Airlines because of their Chicago-Midwest operations. The article also erroneously reported that the bill contained exemptions for California airline operations and not for those in Texas.

All of the Dallas and Fort Worth newspapers joined to parrot demagogic charges made by congressional candidate as he desperately sought to use H.R. 12611 as a vehicle to gain newspaper coverage in his campaign. The papers printed such untrue charges as:

Milford's position is rooted in the Congressman's past association with Braniff.

Milford is a lackey of Braniff and Texas International in their efforts to harm Southwest.

Milford does not care about the very people he represents.

Milford is anti-consumer and anti-Texan, because he supported legislation that would harm Southwest Airlines and other Texas intrastate carriers.

Perhaps it is time for members of the Texas delegation and the Dallas and Fort Worth newspapers to take stock of the true situation. I am sure that the congressional candidate will soon be reminded by his opponent of the tremendous role played by interstate air carriers generally in Texas and particularly in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. He will also learn that almost all persons employed directly or indirectly in interstate air carrier transportation reside in the congressional district he wants to represent.

The TAC chairman reported that 2,971,026 Texans traveled the intrastate air carrier network in 1977, that 1,632,882 passengers came in and out of Love Field and 361,858 in and out of Dallas-Fort Worth. This is indeed a laudable record. The intrastate air carrier industry should be commended.

However, the interstate carriers were no sluffs. While 2,971,026 Texans rode the intrastate and commuter airplanes, 15,532,594 rode the interstate carriers. 8,259,573 flew in and out of Dallas-Fort Worth alone. Braniff and Texas International, who also carry a few Texans, carried 6,493,089 passengers in and out of our State. Approximately 6,000 families in the Dallas-Fort Worth area are supported through employment at Dallas-Fort Worth, either by the interstate air carriers or in direct support of interstate air carriers. This compares to only 500 jobs at Love Field that are involved in intrastate air carrier operations. Even at Love Field, Braniff employs 1,563 employees at its maintenance base.

I think it is time to stop the demagoguery and recognize the fact that both interstate and intrastate carriers are important to Texas. It is also important that our laws be fair to both without giving either an advantage in law. If regulators and bureaucracies are needed, they must be kept to a minimum. This is the purpose of H.R. 12611, a very complex legal act.●

FLAG DAY HOLDS A SPECIAL MEANING IN PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the celebration today of Flag Day has a special meaning for Philadelphians, because it was in our city that Betsy Ross lived and created the first American flag 201 years ago.

Two ceremonies will take place in Philadelphia to mark the holiday, and to pay tribute to the colonists who fought for our independence and the Members of Congress who adopted our first U.S. flag.

The 201st anniversary of the adoption will be celebrated today at the 80th annual commemoration at the Betsy Ross House.

Thomas S. Gates, former Secretary of Defense, will be the principal speaker at the ceremony, which will be held at the Atwater Kent Park, adjacent to the house at 239 Arch Street. The ceremony will include selections by members of the Opera Company of Philadelphia and music by the police and firemen's band.

Other highlights of the festivities will be a demonstration in the house of the operation of a spinning wheel, wool spinning and quill pen writing by the Children's Museum of Philadelphia; a singer in costume vocalizing early American folk songs; distribution of free flags as well as red, white and blue cookies; and an opportunity for the audience to make its own Ben Franklin bifocals.

In the second ceremony, the Philadelphia Flag Day Association will stage a program at Independence Hall in a fitting climax to other events sponsored by the association during Flag Week—June 9–14, which was proclaimed by Mayor Frank L. Rizzo.

Hobart G. Cawood, superintendent of Independence National Historical Park, will be the principal speaker. He will be the recipient of the Flag Day Association's "Distinguished Service Award."

Irving N. Kief, Esq., who has served as recording secretary for the association since 1960, will receive the Judge Leopold C. Glass Founders Award. The late Judge Glass was founder and first president of the association 41 years ago.

The program will get off to a festive start with the Mummers "String Band Jubileers," who will perform in full costume a "Tribute to Old Glory." They will be followed by a medley of patriotic marches by some 90 members of the Overbrook High School Band.

An exhibition of baton twirling, rolling drums, ringing bells, and military drills will be presented by 80 students, dressed in red, white, and blue uniforms, of the Stanton Central Elementary School Drum and Flag Corps, Wilmington, Del. The award-winning corps has performed to large audiences up and down the eastern coast.

Leading the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag and national anthem will be Maryellen Petrilla, Miss Pennsylvania United Teenager, who will be dressed in colonial costume.

City representative and director of commerce Joseph A. LaSala will represent Mayor Rizzo at the ceremonies and extend greetings to the audience. Judge Joseph C. Bruno, president of the Philadelphia Flag Day Association, will present remarks of welcome and will make the presentations to the award winners.

Robert P. Abrams, executive vice president of the association, is program chairman of the event, and will be master of ceremonies.●

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF DEEP SEABED MINING RELEASED

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported that the National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) within the Department of Commerce completed an assessment of the environmental effects of prototype deep ocean mining. The Administrator of NOAA presented a briefing recently to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and other interested Members and staff on the results of their assessments so far.

While there were more studies planned and required to fully evaluate the long-term environmental effects of manganese mining on the ocean ecosystem, the preliminary conclusions from NOAA indicate that environmental impacts will be small. Studies under NOAA's deep ocean mining environmental study (DOMES) will continue and I hope to follow the results closely so as to assure that all precautions are taken to adequately protect the ocean environment.

Since the Murphy-Breaux deep sea mining bill (H.R. 3350) will be coming to the floor for consideration within the next few weeks, I believe that a recent article in Ocean Science News will be of interest to Members of the House of Representatives. One of the outstanding issues to be debated on the floor during consideration of H.R. 3350 will be dealing with the appropriate lead agency to administer the Federal ocean mining program. The following article presents some important facts which could be very informative for those unfamiliar with the efforts which NOAA has undertaken in recent years:

[From the Ocean Science News, June 12, 1978]

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF DEEP SEABED MINING

Experience so far with the limited taking of nodules in the Pacific indicates, says the Natl. Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, that any environmental impact will be small. Wilmot Hess, head of the Environmental Research Laboratories of NOAA, told the House Merchant Marine Committee last month that there might be "some mischief to the bottom life," but he didn't say it would be serious. Certainly, there is no need to delay mining because of potential environmental damage, NOAA chief Richard Frank indicated to the House committee.

Asked by Rep. John Breaux (D-LA), chairman of the Oceanography Subcommittee, how much more work NOAA had to do "if we pass deepsea mining legislation," Frank replied that standards would be set up, a licensing procedure established, and then the license applications acted upon. "We won't have to wait a substantial period of time," he said.

Asked if he were prepared to write ocean mining regulations now, Frank said that "by necessity we'll have to write them before we know all the answers . . . and then rewrite" as necessary. He admitted there was no way to know the long-term impact of deepsea mining. NOAA has been running its Deep Ocean Mining Environmental Studies (DOMES) project since 1972. It consisted of the collecting of baseline environmental data at several sites which the four mining consortia have shown an interest in, and the monitoring of the environmental effects of prototype ocean mining. NOAA is now preparing several documents in anticipation of having to write a programmatic environmental impact statement on deepsea mining. Hawaii's Dept. of Planning & Economic Development also has prepared a report for its state legislature and the final version is due next month.

The coming fight on the House floor over which federal department has jurisdiction over ocean mining should serve to exhibit NOAA's expertise in the deepsea adventure and the Dept. of Interior's relative innocence. Since Leigh Ratiner left Interior a couple of years ago, where he was the head of the Ocean Mining Administration, there is little evidence that Interior has had much interest in deepsea mining.

The Carter Administration has never bothered to appoint a replacement for Ratiner.

While National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration executives must accept whatever decision Congress makes on the jurisdictional issue, many observers of the federal process now believe deepsea mining belongs at NOAA rather than Interior. Indeed, at least one of the top executives of an ocean mining company has told OSN: "We now prefer NOAA to Interior." Once a stalwart defender of Interior's right to run ocean mining, this executive admitted that he has changed his mind because he now believes that under the Carter Administration the Dept. of the Interior is being turned into another variety of Environmental Protection Agency. The irony is, of course, that it has been NOAA which has had the responsibility for checking out the environmental consequences of ocean mining, and Interior which has been supposedly interested in fostering deepsea mining.

NOAA's basic argument for being assigned management and regulatory authority over deepsea mining is that it is the oceans agency of the federal government and is the only one capable of integrating that authority with all the other ocean uses—i.e., fishing, coastal management, marine environmental monitoring, ocean research, and so on. NOAA has the ships and the operating capability for deep ocean work, including the elite NOAA corps of scientists and engineers.

Ocean mining is not land mining. Furthermore, there is no simple transfer of activities seaward from hard mineral mining on the outer continental shelf where Interior has some jurisdiction. OCS mining of sand and gravel is an extension of land mining techniques. Specifically, worries NOAA, would Interior be capable of managing a deepsea mining operation in the very area which contains a major tuna fisheries operation—the Clarion-Clipperton rift area (between Hawaii and Mexico) where the first nodule mining is certain to take place. Another argument that can be used in favor of NOAA is its long history of familiarity with international matters, in contrast to Interior's historic concentration on domestic matters. Ocean mining will take place on the high seas, and NOAA already possesses a team of international negotiators through its fisheries service. Interior is, after all, the "Interior" Dept.

Equally, there are reasons for keeping mining at NOAA because it is part of the Commerce Dept., which also happens to be the home of the Maritime Administration, the Domestic and International Business Administration, and the Economic Development Administration. A Commerce Dept. source, noting that the U.S. Coast Guard's role in seeing to the safety of vessels at sea, nevertheless points out that the Maritime Administration has experience with the design, construction, equipment and manning requirements of ships, as does NOAA. "The new safety problems presented by deep ocean mining are uniquely related to the mining operations, not vessel operations," he notes, implying that the Coast Guard's relationship to those vessels may be different from other vessels.

Responding to one of Interior's main claims to jurisdiction—the U.S. Geological Survey's traditional responsibility for resource assessment—this Commerce source finds that "since the U.S. does not have property rights over the deep ocean minerals, it does not require the detailed assessment normally utilized for maximizing Treasury Dept. revenues. Thus, resource assessments do not play as important a role as they do regarding OCS petroleum which is under U.S. jurisdiction," he argues. In the case of ocean mining, it is the industry that has done the exploration and evaluation of the resource. And it is very likely to continue to do so. Thus NOAA has no plans for checking out the validity of the report by Scripps' H. William Menard (now head of the U.S. Geological Survey) that the quality of the nodules varies inversely to the quantity in any given mine site, according to Hess. If Interior did decide it wanted to get into the nodule resource assessment business, some might suggest that was analogous to its attempt to cement its right to do exploratory drilling for oil and gas on the OCS.

Finally, says the Commerce source, NOAA's initial studies of the environmental and socio-economic impact studies of potential coastal sites for manganese nodule processing centers, or other shore-based facilities for ships at sea, give indications of the needs of some communities for additional public facilities to support such development. The Commerce Dept.'s EDA would have some responsibility in those areas, while the nature of the Coastal Energy Impact Fund currently administered by NOAA's Office of Coastal Zone Management would seem to be capable of expansion to ocean mining impact considerations if need be.●

UNSILENCING THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a condensation of the speech delivered March 21, 1978, by my good friend Theodore A. Bruinsma before the Town Hall General Luncheon, Los Angeles Forum. Until recently "Ted" Bruinsma was president of Harvester Industries, and has first hand experience of the Federal octopus that threatens the social, economic, and political relationships of all our citizens. My friend's speech is an excellent summary of the stifing effect which practitioners of unlimited Government are able to achieve under the mask of public service.

The next few years will determine which side of the razor's edge we come down on in this tug of war between private enterprise and arbitrary Federal control of our lives. No citizen will be immune from the consequence of this decision. My hope, and that of millions of Americans like Ted, is that we will not reject the principles upon which this Nation was founded in the vain expectation that socialism can produce Heaven on Earth. Ted Bruinsma is like a modern day Paul Revere riding out to rally the forces of reason and commonsense economics. Hear him well Governor Brown. Hear him, Senator CRANSTON. If you have any smarts left, heed him. His speech follows:

You will agree that as Americans and Californians we are facing unprecedented challenges. Never before in history has so much been happening so rapidly in so many facets of our lives. We haven't grasped today's technology before it is outdated by tomorrow's. At the same time, the finite nature of

this planet coupled with a population explosion that continues unabated, particularly in the developing nations, pose complex, worrisome problems in the fields of energy, food, and mineral resources.

Then, too, ideas and values long held paramount are being assaulted by subtle shifts in economic and social pillars that have supported them for years. The stabilities of the past are being replaced by the uncertainties of the future.

THREAT

Today, I propose, there is a threat to human liberties because economic freedoms are being restricted. A dominant central government has placed impediments and nonproductive restraints upon individual activity, voluntary association, and economic enterprise. This central government and its bureaucracy remote from the great productive regions of industry and commerce, remote from the farms, factories, mines, and markets, remote from our communities and their governments, is enacting laws and laying down edicts that unnecessary stifle individual and corporate growth and productivity.

The end of bigger and bigger government is not in sight. I am afraid that we are being conditioned to changes that ultimately will constitute a total social and economic revolution. If we, today, had the individualism our forefathers had in 1776, we'd all be "throwing tea in the harbor." But instead we are drifting with the current that is quickening and threatens to consume us all.

LAWS

The United States Constitution provides that laws are to be created by our Legislative Branch of government. However, much of the social and economic policy that today affects our individualism results not from law but from policies implemented by the rules, orders, and regulations of the bureaucracy—actions that carry the full weight of law, but without a commensurate tempering by the legislative process.

The administrative and regulatory powers of governments at all levels have skyrocketed in their scope and reach in the past 10 years. Government agencies now directly regulate over 10% of everything bought and sold in the United States. They indirectly regulate almost every other part of the private economy. Thinking people now realize that this cumbersome regulatory system has too often stifled innovation and competition and has added billions of dollars each year to the price of consumer and business products.

The government does have a legitimate responsibility to protect the public interest. Abuses that have given rise to legislation and regulation have occurred. But the degree of government intervention has reached such a level of irritation that individuals and businesses all over are demanding relief from the incredible power of the army of more than 100,000 government regulators. Just to fill out the necessary forms, the American people must now spend over 130 million work hours a year. The many regulators and policies that overzealous advocates have brought to life to protect the consumer have instead, on balance, harmed the people they were designed to help. Costs have outstripped benefits.

Put another way, we have moved a long way from the simple certainty of the law of yesterday to a point where, in more and more areas, one must probe the vast government jungle to find out what the law and its maze of regulations are. The Internal Revenue Service, with its changing rules and regulations, can be a far more detrimentally significant factor in personal and corporate life than individual or corporate behavior under many other civil and criminal statutes.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

But there is something even more disturbing that has contributed to the present state of affairs. The traditional American ethic of each individual bearing personal responsibility for his own acts has shifted to a general blaming of society and individual or group deficiencies for all ills. Not only has there been a lessening of individual or group responsibility for their actions, but there has also been placed upon government the charge to take remedial actions both to correct the deficiencies and to deter antisocial actions. So a host of government programs have been launched not only for traditional humanitarian or charitable reasons to help individuals or groups with public funds to better their lot but also on the premise that such programs will protect society against antisocial behavior, delinquency, crime, and violence.

Yet, even with this governmental action in social areas, we are seeing a precipitous decline in personal and business morality. In business, we are experiencing a reduction of human value to material value. The syndrome is "success at any cost." There is a polarization in society as we lose confidence in our government and withdraw support for the system. The concern for the common good is lessened.

CHANGES

Some changes are subtle, less obvious. It has long since been accepted that unions were needed as a positive force in our economic society. Yet the unionization of our military forces is a growing threat that goes beyond all common sense. A "hot" political issue of 1978 is the right of our public employees—hospitals, fire departments, police departments, and city utilities—to unionize, to strike, to shut down our services as homes burn.

Pension enrichments have come to be an attractive alternative to granting salary hikes demanded in public employee bargaining. This alternative survives only because it delays the impact of retirement benefits to become someone else's nightmare in the distant future. Typically it is the next generation of politicians and taxpayers who must foot the bill for pension commitments made in the past. Today we are fast becoming the next generation.

Our tax laws are no longer simply enacted for revenue-producing purposes. They are also becoming tools for social change. Through both income taxes and estate taxes, there has been adopted a policy of redistribution of wealth, a policy already formally adopted abroad.

Let's look at the insurance industry. Product liability insurance for almost all companies increased at least 100 percent in 1977. No one legislated this. Some of the increases in premiums were occasioned by portfolio losses of the insurance companies. But the major thrust has come from a shift in the concept of liability from tort (or a requirement of negligence) to absolute liability. The full effect of this switch has not yet been felt, but its impact on industry is and will be severe.

CAUSES

What has caused the increase in insurance costs? First, pressures on elements of the judiciary from groups such as the consumer groups led by Common Cause and the Naderites. Second, a change in the fundamental constitutional concept that we are judged by a jury of our peers. I submit that a corporation, an insured defendant, and, in fact, most of us in this room today would be lucky to be judged by a jury solely of our peers. For the jury would be certain to include one or more persons who are anti-success, anti-individualism, or anti-business. Consider the recent "Ford" case.

Since 1960 the number of domestic spending programs have increased tenfold, from 100 to over 1,000 individual programs. We have spent over $1 trillion in social programs designed to "improve the quality of life." You can question the results of this cornucopia of good intention, but you can't question that the level of dissatisfaction among the beneficiaries has increased at an even faster pace. The group gets larger and larger and unhappier and unhappier.

Over the past 15 years, the government has tried many solutions. Yet the problems persist and our people grow more frustrated, disillusioned, and cynical. This doesn't mean there are no answers. It means only that we have been taking fundamentally the wrong approach. We suffer not from a lack of government action but from an excess of government action. The trouble with the Federal Government is that it is trying to do more than its resources permit, trying to do many things it should not do at all, and foolishly trying to do all these things at the same time.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The Federal Government today is the nation's biggest single employer, its biggest consumer, and its biggest borrower. The figures on our annual budget and our national debt are disasters. The annual interest on the national debt is now the third largest expense in the federal budget, $45 billion in 1977.

Stop and think. If a million dollars is no small number, $45 billion is incomprehensible. If your wife went on a shopping binge 7 days a week, spending $1 million at the rate of nearly $3,000 each day, she wouldn't get home for a year. If she took $1 billion, she would not be back for a thousand years!

If the postwar spending trends continue until the end of the century, total government outlays will account for almost 60 percent of the Gross National Product. That means that by the year 2000, just 22 years from now, government will tax and spend more than half of the total economic output of America. If government achieves that degree of dominance over our lives, many of the economic, political, and social freedoms we now take for granted will be gone. Every free country in which the government has usurped the major share of economic activity has prompted instability, minority government, and a diminution of the heritage of a free society.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

The issues are by no means narrow economic ones. They concern fundamental principles of equity and of social stability. The problem of growth in government spending is that however good the intentions behind the growth are those intentions are rarely if ever achieved. Instead, growth in government spending invariably makes low-income people suffer more, undermines social cohesion, an threatens the very foundation of a free and representative government.

The evidence proves conclusively that big government far from being our greatest source of prosperity and material security, as some people would have you believe, has now become a direct threat to every American's entitlement to live in a free society.

Those who consistently look to government have never asked themselves why a country like the Soviet Union, with some of the largest, richest tracts of grain land in the world, but with a government-owned and operated agricultural system, cannot even feed its people without turning to American farmers who own their own land, make their own decisions guided by the incentives of a free marketplace, and feed not only our

own people but millions of others around the world.

INVOLVEMENT

It seems to me almost criminal for so many of the people in industry and in our professional groups to stay aloof from any participation in political activity. While we are raising and teaching our kids, building our homes, and factories, and churches, and paying our taxes, the U.S. Congress has become the tool of well-organized and militant special interest groups, such as consumerists, environmentalists, golden agers, welfareists, and unions. All of those groups have one thing in common in that they are all trying to get some special right or freedom at the expense of others.

The "silent majority" of Americans is not organized into a coalescent political force. Divided as we are, Congress shows little concern for us. Few of us speak out, or work together to get out the vote, work in campaigns, or contribute to the campaigns of candidates who share our views. But, we must if we are to preserve the freedoms we know and love.

The product we must sell together is the restoration of faith in the American system as devised by our forefathers, because faith and hope hold our system together. We must impose discipline and high moral and ethical standards on our own business and our personal enterprises. Private enterprise faces a critical problem of credibility. Here there is an important assignment for effective use of public relations. Our private enterprise system is the source of the good life we enjoy in the form of jobs, quality products, and services. We must support and protect it. We must become involved in our political process. We must communicate our thoughts on key issues to our representatives with clarity and strength of conviction. We must hold them accountable for their actions.

We must impress on everyone the need for government to conduct its financial affairs responsibly—and with far fewer people and agencies. We must persuade others to avoid asking government to solve every economic and social problem by spending public funds. We should aid the less fortunate among us. But we should never permit lazy Americans to live off the efforts of creative and productive workers.

We must let our lawmakers and leaders in government know that they cannot continue to work at cross purposes with the very system that generates our wealth, our strength, and our freedom. We must support deregulation across the board, not just selectively, by helping to end government subsides, quotas, and handouts, bailouts, or other inducements that offer superficial promise of security in exchange for freedom.

Finally, we must initiate and, in some cases, intensify efforts to inform and educate the public about the benefits and realities of private enterprise. Jobs and real economic growth will only come from investment in the private sector. Yet here, in California, we now have an Administration that tends to regard profit primarily as an expression of narrow self-interest rather than as a source of capital that creates jobs, growth, and higher living standards.

There is a big job to be done. And, it is not a job that can be done with acquiescence or quiet approval. It demands the zeal and enthusiasm, the contagious conviction that is bound to be within each of you who have become successful in business. May I urge that you not underestimate the importance of your own personal effort. You are men and women of leadership and influence or you would not be in this room. You know a lot about human relations; you are experts on the free enterprise system; and by the very nature of your work, you are in a position to render extraordinary service.●

VERIFICATION, THE DERWINSKI AMENDMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as the ongoing Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in Geneva wear on, it is becoming increasingly clear that significant elements of the proposed SALT II agreement cannot be verified. This includes range limits on cruise missiles, limits on the upgrading of ICBM's, the strategic potential of the Backfire Bomber, the deployment of mobile ICBM's as well as the conversion of medium mobile missiles to mobile ICBM's.

Against such a backdrop, with the U.S.S.R.'s alarming advances in both its offensive and defensive capabilities causing growing U.S. public concern about Soviet intentions and trustworthiness, verification has emerged as a crucial factor in SALT. Consequently, Congress now realizes that—with so much at stake in these negotiations—it must stay abreast of what is transpiring in Geneva. With that in mind, my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) authored an amendment to last year's Arms Control and Disarmament Act requiring the executive branch to report to Congress on a timely basis as to the verifiability of any arms control proposals made to or accepted by the United States.

While the ramifications of the Derwinski amendment have been the subject of considerable discussion, both in Congress and the executive branch, little has been written about how it may figure in the debate between Congress and the administration over the contents of the new SALT agreement. In recognition of that fact, Dr. Carnes Lord, assistant professor of government and foreign affairs and a foreign affairs officer in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's Verification and Analysis Bureau from 1975 to 1977, definitively analyzed the implications of the Derwinski amendment in an article he wrote on verification and the future of arms control which appeared in the spring issue of Strategic Review. I commend it to our colleagues' attention, Mr. Speaker, and request that the pertinent excerpts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

VERIFICATION AND THE FUTURE OF ARMS CONTROL

(By Carnes Lord)

IN BRIEF

Verification has become an ever more prominent factor in SALT, reflecting in large part a growing mood of uneasiness and skepticism in the United States about Soviet intentions and trustworthiness. The technical process of verification is not nearly as controversial as the political judgment of how extensive verification should be—i.e., how much assurance regarding compliance is necessary. Given the complexity of the new limitations being discussed in SALT II, the incidence of compliance issues is likely to rise. Critical to the verification process is the willingness to respond vigorously to assessed violations. A coherent and effective U.S. verification policy must be based on the recognition that domestic support for SALT can no longer be sustained by official efforts to apologize for, or interpret away, threatening aspects of Soviet behavior.

Verification—the process of monitoring and assessing compliance with arms control agreements—has been an important factor in the arms control policy of the United States and in the history of arms control efforts since World War II. Only in the last several years, however, has verification become a truly controversial issue in American politics.

The protracted dispute over alleged Soviet violations of the strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreements of 1972, which became a central element of the debate over the meaning and value of détente with the Soviet Union, is the most important, if by no means only, example of the new prominence of the verification issue. What has not been generally recognized is that the sudden notoriety achieved by the verification problem has in some degree altered the terms of the problem itself. If SALT has become the touchstone of U.S.-Soviet détente, verification may be becoming the touchstone of SALT. Whether a SALT II agreement can bear up under the political weight of détente is a question that will depend in no small measure on the responsiveness of SALT verification to essentially political requirements.

This is not to suggest that verification is only now becoming a "political matter." Verification has always served a political function and involved political decisions. Yet the particular complexity and abstruseness of the verification process, together with the relatively modest demands that were for many years placed on it, tended to conceal this fact from public (and indeed official) view. Verification was generally left to the care of technical specialists.

Largely because it was for so long regarded as primarily a technical matter, verification tended to be neglected in policy thinking about arms control and national security. It is not surprising that those responsible for the management of the United States' national security apparatus were ill-prepared for the emergence of verification as a source of impassioned political controversy. What may have been tolerable inadequacies in policy or critical thinking on verification at a time when arms control was at best a marginal element of the national security policy of the United States were revealed as serious vulnerabilities after control of strategic armaments had become the centerpiece of that policy.

Nor should recognition of the frankly political side of verification be construed as an endorsement of the corruption of technical judgments on verification by the perceived requirements of policy—corruption of a sort that is sometimes alleged to have occurred within the U.S. government during the heyday of detente. On the contrary, delineating as clearly and publicly as possible the exact role that politics *should* play in the verification process may well be the best way to avoid such corruption. Decisions concerning verification that are based on fundamentally political considerations ought to be identified and defended as such. Failure to recognize the political element in such decisions—or deliberate attempts to disguise that element—tend to destroy the very possibility of independent technical analysis of verification questions.

The emergence of verification as a prominent issue on the American political scene may have been signaled by a little-noticed action of the United States Congress. In May 1977, the House, and subsequently the Senate, voted to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as extended to fiscal year 1978, so as to require the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) to file statements with Congress on a number of matters pertaining to verification, and, in particular,

to report on the verifiability of arms control provisions prior to the actual conclusion of an agreement. Speaking in favor of the amendment of which he was chief sponsor, Representative Edward Derwinski (R-Ill.) emphasized that "when we speak of verification we are speaking of a political problem," and went on to state:

The purpose behind the amendment is my recognition of what I consider to be the political facts of life; namely, that there is in the United States, there is now and has been for many years, a public feeling that "you can't trust the Russians." Now, whether this is right or wrong we might argue, but the fact is that feeling is there. If this is a true public feeling, obviously to meet this public concern, if we can demonstrate to the public that the verification procedures are thorough, they are exact, that Congress is fully informed, this will go a long way toward easing the instinctive opposition and doubt about any treaties or agreements that are worked out.

Elsewhere in his remarks, Derwinski noted that one of the purposes of the amendment was "the need to keep verification uppermost in everyone's mind at a time when we are on the verge of negotiating a new SALT agreement."

The Derwinski Amendment clearly reflected a certain uneasiness on the part of Congress at the Carter Administration's lack of experience as well as its predilections relative to SALT and arms control matters in general. Yet, the wide support it received also suggested a new Congressional sensitivity to the potentially explosive political repercussions of verification decisions, particularly in the context of SALT. As Derwinski put it, the "political facts of life" were that many Americans were unwilling to trust the Russians to any significant degree. What was certainly in Derwinski's mind, and in that of other Congressmen, was the thought that many Americans were, if anything, less willing to trust the Soviet Union than had been the case in the recent past, or that a change had occurred in the American mood.

Americans had been hearing for some time that the Soviets were circumventing, if not actually violating, the terms of the SALT I agreements. They were discovering that the Soviets appeared committed to increasing their military power relative to the United States without regard for what many understood to be the requirements of arms control and detente, were devoting to that task a much greater share of state expenditures than had previously been thought, and seemed prepared to take advantage of their newly acquired strength to challenge American interests in areas remote from their own country (such as Angola). In the past, the American public by-and-large had been encouraged to look at arms control as an integral part of detente—that is, of a new sort of relationship with the Soviet Union based on mutual accommodation and an enhanced degree of mutual trust. Indeed, it seemed to be detente that made arms control (or at least strategic arms control) both possible and desirable. Yet the detente relationship, once called into question by Soviet actions (and, indeed, by the pronouncements of both candidates in the American presidential election of 1976), could no longer sustain the momentum of the arms control process. It was rather the momentum of detente that needed sustaining. That the arms control process itself could be relied upon to perform this function was a hope or a gamble which seemed increasingly to beg the decisive question—the question whether it is possible after all to trust the Russians. This new mood of skepticism seemed to be the primary stimulus for the emergence of verification as a political issue.

THE ACDA REPORT ON SALT II VERIFIABILITY

In spite of the opportunity it afforded Congress for involving itself in the negotiation of SALT II, the Derwinski Amendment has only recently figured in preliminary skirmishes between Congress and the Administration over the shape of a new agreement. On February 1, 1978, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee requested ACDA to submit a report on the verifiability of the projected SALT II agreement in accordance with the provisions of the amendment. Such a report was duly submitted on February 23 over the signature of ACDA Director Paul Warnke. Unclassified portions of the report were released by the Committee on the following day.

While indicating that a final assessment of SALT verifiability was not yet possible, the ACDA report unequivocally stated that the proposed agreement as a whole as well as its individual provisions are "adequately verifiable." It admitted that "the possibility of some undetected cheating in certain areas exists," but argued that such cheating could not significantly affect the strategic balance, and that any uncertainties would be neutralized or compensated by "the flexibility inherent in our own programs." Remarkably, the report stressed the "experience" gained by the U.S. intelligence community in monitoring the SALT I agreements and the ability it had "demonstrated" to monitor them with high confidence. It did not even mention in this connection either the obvious and substantial differences in the verification requirements of SALT II and the original agreements or the public distress over alleged Soviet violations of those original agreements.

The released portions of the ACDA report contain only a general assessment of SALT II verifiability, and say little or nothing about particular limitations. The contents of the report as a whole are, however, clearly controversial, and seem unlikely to satisfy those critics in Congress and elsewhere who are most sensitive to the political importance of verification. One Senate aide was quoted as calling the report "wholly inadequate" and "not a serious piece of work." Hearings on verification are reportedly to be held at some point by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

THE POLITICS OF VERIFICATION

The verification requirements of the United States differ fundamentally from those of the Soviet Union, and a grasp of this difference is essential for understanding the politics of verification. The United States is an open society, and is constantly striving to become more open. Much military information is readily available; and because Americans do not have the habit of secrecy, much more can be inferred, or acquired with only modest efforts. The Soviet Union is by contrast a closed society, and if not constantly striving to become more closed, it is at any rate singularly resistant to pressures—foreign or domestic—for openness . . .

Given the nature of the Soviet regime, the United States cannot assume that deliberate violations of an agreement will not be attempted—or that, if attempted, they will be exposed by a vigilant Soviet citizenry. Thus the United States must not only monitor activities and geographical areas that are directly affected by the agreed limitations, but must also seek to assure itself that Soviet activities elsewhere or in other military spheres are consistent with these limitations. Further, the United States must assume that violations deliberately attempted by the Soviets would most probably be accompanied by more or less elaborate efforts at concealment and deception. For the United States, verification is in an important sense more demanding than conventional (peacetime) military intelligence, since it must seek to penetrate security that is designed to conceal not merely certain characteristics of military systems, but, in the extreme—yet vital—case, their very existence.

For reasons that are not altogether easy to understand, this aspect of verification policy has been a subject of controversy within the U.S. government. Indeed, an important purpose of the Derwinski Amendment was to ensure that ACDA and the intelligence community take full account of the possibility of concealment and deception in analyzing the verifiability of potential treaty provisions. As the Amendment expressly states: ". . . in assessing the degree to which specific elements of any arms control proposal can be verified . . ., it should be assumed that all measures of concealment not expressly prohibited could be employed and that 'standard practices' could be altered so as to impede verification." This requirement had been recognized in a policy statement on verification issued by ACDA in early 1976—which also provides the best commentary on the somewhat cryptic language used in the Amendment. But it was apparently felt that the policy in this area was not sufficiently known, or was not being (or might not in the future be) adequately implemented by those responsible for assessing verifiability or for the programming of U.S. verification assets. It is not clear to what extent the recent ACDA report complies with the Amendment on this point.

THE QUESTION OF POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE

What is perhaps most seriously wrong with military significance as a test of the adequacy of verification is that it fails to take account of the *political* function of verification, and of the fact that the military significance of a violation cannot be assumed to coincide with its political significance in all or even in most cases. A treaty provision that is adequately verifiable from the point of view of detecting violations of an agreement might be less than adequately verifiable from the point of view of building domestic or international confidence in its viability. This will be particularly the case where an agreement bears a political burden beyond that normally associated with arms control as such.

SALT is the obvious illustration of such a political burden. By making SALT I the centerpiece of detente, the United States (and the Soviet Union) ensured that the question of verification would assume unusual importance in domestic disputes over foreign policy. By looking to SALT II to sustain detente itself, the United States ensured that Soviet compliance with the agreements would be viewed as a crucial indicator of Soviet attitudes and intentions generally, and hence that any evidence of any breach of the agreements would threaten to call into question the basis of the U.S.-Soviet relationship and indeed of U.S. foreign policy as a whole.

This is not to argue that future SALT agreements will not be acceptable to the American public unless verifiable in some demonstrably foolproof way. It *is* to argue that assessments of the verifiability of SALT limitations must be considerably more sensitive to the requirements of domestic confidence-building than has been the case in the past. . . . To attempt to secure Soviet agreement to a range of confidence-building measures in peripheral areas—as the Carter Administration did to some extent in its initial SALT II proposals—without resolving the very real verification problems associated with the limitations that are central to the new agreement is an approach that is not likely to satisfy Congress or the American public. The sound or politically necessary approach may well involve a radical rethinking of the limits on those systems—primarily cruise missiles and their launch plat-

forms—that pose the greatest technical difficulties for verification and are most likely to become contentious compliance issues.

COMPLIANCE AND RESPONSE

It is necessary to consider briefly the question of compliance and response. The process of determining whether the other party is complying with its obligations under an arms control agreement is at least as complicated—and generally misunderstood—as the process of assessing verifiability. . . .

The problem of assessing compliance is inseparable from the problem of response. It is inevitable, and indeed proper, that response to possible violations of an arms control agreement be governed by political considerations. Response should not be conceived as an automatic process somehow prescribed by international law, and still less as an essentially retributive act designed to satisfy a public thirst for justice. There are times, then, when evidence of noncompliance might be officially ignored or its importance minimized for political or diplomatic reasons. Conversely—and this side of the coin is too often forgotten—there are times when evidence of noncompliance might be exaggerated for similar reasons. In particular, it is not necessary (and may not always be possible) to attempt to be "fair" to the Soviets or others by waiting until all the evidence is in and is unambiguously indicative of a violation. There is no reason for the United States to hesitate to call something a violation where the evidence is less than conclusive if it should be advantageous to do so; certainly the Soviets have not hesitated to make such accusations against the United States.

The primary hazard in the U.S. approach to response is not so much that evidence of violations may be publicly soft-pedaled. (Indeed, this may be advisable for reasons unrelated to politics—for example, because of a need to protect some unusually sensitive intelligence source.) It is rather that the requirements of response may affect and corrupt the process of determining whether noncompliance has actually occurred. . . . The openness of the U.S. government makes it almost impossible to maintain an official view that is seriously at variance with official statements, at least in matters as controversial as SALT compliance.

The importance of response for verification lies in the fact that the deterrent function (and hence in some measure also the confidence-building function) of verification depends on the willingness of the verifying party to respond to violations—that is, to endow violations or possible violations with a political or military cost sufficient to cancel any advantage the other party might hope to gain from them. It is sometimes assumed that exposure of violations by itself would bring a sufficiently high political cost to deter violations, or at least significant or intentional violations. This view rests on a seriously deluded appreciation of the justice and intelligence of world opinion and the sensitivity of the Soviets to such opinion, and it fails to take account of the frequently paralyzing effect of ambiguities in treaty language or in the factual evidence.

For all of these reasons, response is central to any verification strategy; and if any presumption should exist as to the requirements of response, it is that response should be active and vigorous. This may—and probably should—lead to compliance challenges that are based on imperfect evidence or that overstate the case. Such challenges always involve the risk of appearing provocative and of disrupting otherwise laudable diplomatic projects. Yet the possibility of shifting priorities in this respect is one that will merit serious consideration.

In general, it is becoming increasingly apparent that domestic support for SALT and for other arms control agreements can no longer be maintained by efforts on the part of U.S. officialdom to apologize for, or interpret away, whatever may seem irresponsible or threatening in Soviet behavior. To recognize why this is so would be an important step toward developing the coherent and effective verification policy that is at present so conspicuously lacking.●

SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday I had the opportunity to visit the United Nations and observe first hand the special session on disarmament. It is difficult at this point to determine if the SSOD will be successful in achieving any meaningful movement toward world disarmament. However, I would like to share some general impressions I gathered while visiting the U.N.

Perhaps the most interesting development so far is a loose coalition between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the SALT negotiations. Apparently, both countries believe that SALT negotiations are a bilateral matter and do not wish to permit any substantial input from Third World nations who have expressed some disappointment that the talks are not more comprehensive and are not moving at a much quicker pace. Since SALT negotiations are highly technical and extremely difficult to handle on a bilateral basis, I agree with the position that to extend the negotiations to Third World nations would make any meaningful SALT agreement impossible to obtain.

I am well aware of the concerns that nonnuclear nations have over the dangers of a nuclear war; however, I hope that the Secretary of State's statement of June 12 will ease the concerns of Third World nations. For those who are not aware of the Secretary's statement, he announced that:

The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any nonnuclear weapons state party to the Nonproliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear weapons state, or associated with a nuclear weapons state in carrying out or sustaining the attack.

I do not expect any major steps toward world disarmament from the SSOD. Nevertheless, the SSOD is serving a very special function by beginning the long process of world awareness that the United States and the Soviet Union, among other nations of the world, are currently attempting to negotiate arms control or arms limitation treaties. Whether these efforts will be successful is anyone's guess at this point, but at least the efforts are being made. These efforts include the SALT talks, the comprehensive treaty banning nuclear explosions, limiting chemical weapons, eliminating radiological weapons and weapons of mass destruction, the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and associated measures in central Europe, and the Indian Ocean arms control talks, the United States-Soviet talks on conventional arms transfers, and the United States-U.S.S.R. antisatellite discussions. These talks are accompanied by a wide variety of nonproliferation activities plus the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

Like many of my colleagues, I am concerned with the present state of United States-U.S.S.R. relations. I believe the short term, and perhaps even the long term-future of Soviet American cooperation depends on the current events of the coming months. Whatever the differences we have with the Soviets they should not interfere with our mutual efforts to control the arms race. At the same time, however, Soviet involvement in Africa must act as a backdrop to any arms control negotiations. The Soviets must do more than negotiate in good faith, they must illustrate a spirit of peaceful coexistence with the West. Any future aggressions by the Soviets or their proxies can do little but undermine the entire spirit of détente.

While I am concerned that the national security of the United States has not always been adequately represented during our negotiation efforts, I remain hopeful that the United States and the U.S.S.R. can set an example of peaceful coexistence and mutual restraint in war-making capabilities. History and human nature give little encouragement that total world disarmament can ever be achieved. However, if we are able to limit the arms race and reduce the threat of nuclear war to any degree, we will have to achieve any goal we can realistically set.●

FLAG DAY CEREMONIES DEDICATED TO ASTRONAUTS AND NASA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in our Flag Day ceremonies that are dedicated this year to our Nation's astronauts and are in observance of the 20th year of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I believe it is only fitting that this body recognize and honor our astronauts as they are a group of outstanding Americans who have greatly contributed to the prestige of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the space age has played an important role in the history of the United States. It was ushered in on October 4, 1957 by the Russians with their launching of the world's first artificial satellite, Sputnik I.

Our Nation was caught by surprise by this remarkable achievement and it was important for us to immediately respond to the challenge it represented. I am happy to have had the opportunity of working closely with the Nation's space program that saw us forge ahead as a country to become the first nation to

land men on the Moon and return them safely to Earth.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's lunar landing commitment was announced by President John F. Kennedy in his state of the Union address to Congress on May 25, 1961. He urged that we accomplish that goal within that decade.

I am pleased that we have several astronauts here with us today who played a major role in our Nation's successful achievement of that goal.

Less than 10 years after the Kennedy announcement, and on July 20, 1969, our first astronauts stepped onto the Moon and planted our American flag.

The activities of Astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin E. "Buzz" Aldrin, Jr. on that day were watched by 600 million viewers on Earth—one-fifth of the world population—on live television transmission from the Moon. That successful mission was the result of the teamwork of thousands of American people.

Mr. Speaker, of the many people who contributed so greatly to the success of the Apollo 11 mission, none made a more diverse and interesting contribution than those astronauts who pioneered in the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs. Today, we have with us two of the original group of seven astronauts who were selected for the Mercury program.

United States Senator JOHN GLENN of Ohio is here with us today and is remembered as the second American in space and our first astronaut to fly a suborbital mission. We will remember the feeling of national pride brought about by his Friendship 7 flight.

Another Mercury astronaut who is well known to all Americans is here with us today. Donald "Deke" Slayton joined the original astronaut team and was chosen to fly the Mercury Atlas flight. A few days before the mission flew, Deke was grounded from flying of a heart difficulty. Although grounded, he never wavered from his commitment to the space program and provided his excellent leadership to the manned space program throughout the years. We were all pleased that Deke regained his flying status and became a member of the crew of the Apollo-Soyuz mission. He is now actively involved in the shuttle program.

Lt. Gen. Thomas Stafford, now Deputy Chief of Staff in Research and Development, U.S. Air Force, is also with us today. As we all remember, Tom was chosen as a member of the second group of astronauts and contributed greatly to the space program. He was a member of the Gemini 6 flight which performed the first rendezvous in space with the already orbiting Gemini 7 group. He made his second flight as command pilot of the Gemini 9 mission and he flew the Apollo 10 mission, the first comprehensive lunar-orbital test of an Apollo lunar module. He was the commander of the Apollo-Soyuz. He is a man of great ability and now serves our country in a most important office with the same dedication that was his throughout his years with the astronaut program.

Another astronaut of special distinction is here today. He is Michael Collins who was the command module pilot for Apollo 11, our first lunar landing mission. Mike was chosen in the third group of astronauts in 1963 and has an outstanding record and is one of our most famous astronauts. It is also my pleasure to mention that Mike was just recently appointed as Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Speaker, two other astronauts who are also known to all Americans are with us today. They have the special distinction of being members of two Apollo missions that landed on the Moon.

Astronaut Alan Bean, a member of the Apollo 12 mission, who landed on the Moon on November 19, 1969, began his astronaut program as a member of the third group. He is now head of the operations and training group within the astronaut office, working on the development of the Space Shuttle and hopes to be assigned to test and fly it in the future.

And, all of us here know U.S. Senator HARRISON SCHMITT from the State of New Mexico. Senator SCHMITT was the scientist member of the Apollo 17 mission that landed on the Moon on December 11, 1972. As a member of the last of the Apollo missions, Senator SCHMITT contributed greatly to the wealth of our scientific knowledge of the Moon surface.

Dr. Joseph Allen served as mission scientist while a member of the astronaut support group for Apollo 15. He is doing an outstanding job for the space agency and the Congress in his work as NASA Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, and we are all pleased to have him with us today.

Mr. Speaker, Astronaut Joe Engle, one of the 19 astronauts selected by NASA in 1966, is here with us today. He was a backup lunar module pilot for the Apollo 14 mission and was commander of one of the two crews who flew the Space Shuttle approach and landing test flights from June through October 1977. We are proud of him and his important contribution.

Mr. Speaker, it is also good to recognize that astronaut Richard Harrison Truly is among those present. As we know, he transferred into the astronaut corps from the Manned Orbiting Laboratory in 1969. His record is also outstanding and includes service as a member of the support crew of the Apollo-Soyuz. Also, he was a member of the crew who flew the Space Shuttle approach and landing test flights from June through October 1977.

Our astronaut program work continues today while the Space Shuttle is being readied for flight. And, I was pleased that a new group of astronauts were recently chosen by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We have three astronauts from that group with us today and it is a pleasure to recognize them. They are Capt. James Buchli, Mr. Stanley Griggs, and Dr. Judy Resnik.

Mr. Speaker, it is also an honor to have with us today several outstanding former and present NASA officials.

Former NASA administrator, James Webb, who did so much during the time he served in directing and managing the programs that culminated in our successful efforts of landing men on the Moon deserves recognition for his outstanding contribution. It is our honor that he is with us today for our Flag Day ceremonies.

And, I am also pleased that we have the honor of having with us both the present NASA administrator, Dr. Robert Frosh, the Deputy NASA Administrator Dr. Alan M. Lovelace, and Dr. Christopher Craft, manager of the Johnson Space Center in Houston.

It is our pleasure to honor our Nation's astronauts and to recognize all of those with us today. We are proud of the tradition of our astronauts and their contribution which so enhances the prestige of our Nation. And we know that those present NASA officials and current astronauts will continue to uphold that tradition of which we are all so proud.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this group of dedicated Americans and join with the other Members of this body in wishing them and our space program continued success as we work toward meeting the challenges of the future.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is also my pleasure to have this opportunity to extend my personal appreciation to all of the NASA team for a job well done over the past 20 years.●

THE PRESS PROTECTION ACT OF 1978

HON. DAVID L. CORNWELL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. CORNWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 12952, "The Press Protection Act of 1978," which would strike down the Supreme Court's ignominious decision in Zurcher against Stanford Daily News. Under this decision, police officials, armed with a search warrant based on probable cause, would be allowed to search any third party property whether occupied or not by the third party. The "Press Protection Act of 1978" shall deem "unlawful any person acting under color of law, without a prior adversary court proceeding, to search any place or seize any things" pertaining to the print of broadcast media, unless accompanied by a warrant issued upon probable cause that said person has committed or is committing a crime.

It is in the High Court's 5 to 3 decision that one can see the flagrant disregard for the sacred rights promulgated by our forefathers in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Throughout its history, the Supreme Court has strived toward broad interpretations of the Constitution and subsequent amendments in the penumbra of the 1st and 14th amendments, specifically concerning privacy and due process of law. The High Court's recent narrow construction of the fourth amendment rebuttals decades of liberal interpretations.

Writing for the Court, Mr. Justice White stated:

As the fourth amendment has been construed and applied by this court, when the States reason to believe incriminating evidence will be found becomes sufficiently great, the invasion of privacy becomes justified and a warrant to search and seize will issue.

The implications of this statement and subsequent rulings are ever so treacherous. I believe ABC commentator Howard K. Smith summed the recent court decision best by proclaiming it the "worst, most dangerous ruling the Court has made in memory." Prevailing sources of information which are available to the press will virtually evaporate from the fear of police review. Reporters will be deterred from recording and preserving their recollections for future use if such information is subject to seizure by local, State, or Federal law enforcement agencies. But the most outrageous effect of surprise police searches armed with search warrants would be the "chilling effect" upon the processing of news in this country. Policemen occupying a newsroom and searching it thoroughly for what may be an extended period of time will inevitably interrupt the subpena duces tecum would afford the newspaper itself an opportunity to locate whatever material might be requested and produce it. Also, the subpena would assure to members of the news profession, third party members not involved or suspected of involvement in a crime, that their basic rights under the 1st, 4th, and 14th amendments would be insured.

It is with this in mind that I urge swift passage of H.R. 12952. Actions such as this directed Nazi Germany during the reign of the Third Reich, and Russia during more recent times. Our civil rights and civil liberties have distinguished and protected our country from the "gestapo" like tactics of countries less fortunate in the past, and should continue to afford us this right in the future.●

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE MAILING COSTS

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which would allow candidates in a general election for Federal office to mail campaign materials as third-class mail, at rates applicable to matter mailed in bulk by qualified nonprofit organizations.

This provision would drastically reduce the cost of mailing campaign literature during election time. A major party candidate, from the time of nomination until the time of election, would be able to mail items as third-class mail at a rate of 2.4 cents per piece. Under current law, the cheapest rate for mail is as third-class mail at 8.4 cents per piece.

This bill would authorize such reduced rates on a trial basis only; its provisions would expire at the end of fiscal year 1979. Adopting such a measure on an experimental basis is warranted, I believe, by the relatively profound effect it will have on the congressional election process. The modest costs of this measure—which I estimate would total approximately $12 million—would be more than offset by its benefits.

This amendment will have three major effects. First, voters will receive more information about the personal characteristics, professional background, and issue positions of candidates. Second, more exposure to an upcoming election will promote a larger turnout. Third, and perhaps most important, a substantial reduction in mailing costs for all candidates would help neutralize the advantage of incumbency.

How this bill can benefit a candidate is underscored by the following statistics. The average voting district has some 230,000 voters. If a candidate wishes to canvas the district with two mailings, postage alone costs 8.4 cents per piece for a total of $38,600 for two mailings. Under the amendment I am offering, mail costs would be just $11,000, a savings to the candidate of over $27,000. For a candidate, in particular a challenger, with limited financial support, this provision will make a real difference in his or her ability to reach the voter.

There is no question that the incumbent goes into an election with a number of advantages. During his or her term of office, the incumbent has easy access to constituents through franked mail, newsletters, press, and travel. Historically, incumbents can raise campaign money more easily; in 1976 House races, for instance, incumbents raised twice as much money as challengers were able to raise.

In a nutshell, the incumbent has already got the voter's ear. While this bill will reduce the incumbent's mailing costs for campaign literature, it will not significantly improve the incumbent's ability to contact the voter—the incumbent already has that ability. What this provision will do is give the challenger that same ability to contact the voter.

My proposal offers us a chance to neutralize the advantage of incumbency. By reducing mailing costs, we will encourage a large turnout of well-informed voters. More importantly, the voters will have the benefit of familiarity with challengers, as well as with incumbents. This measure is in the public's best interest and I urge my colleagues, in the interest of equity, to support it. A copy of this bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide that candidates in general elections for Federal office may mail campaign materials at reduced third class mailing rates.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-225; 86 Stat. 3) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE V—GENERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN MAILINGS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 501. For purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'campaign mail' means any piece of mail which is mailed by any candidate for the purpose of influencing the election of such candidate in a general election or special election for Federal office;

"(2) the term 'candidate' means any individual who—

"(A) has been nominated for election to any Federal office; or

"(B) has qualified to have his name on the election ballot for any Federal office;

"(3) the term 'Commission' has the meaning given it in section 301(g); and

"(4) the term 'Federal office' has the meaning given it in section 301(c).

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 502. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c), any candidate in a general election or special election for Federal office shall be eligible to make mailings of campaign mail in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) Any campaign mail of a candidate may be entered and mailed as third class mail, at rates applicable to matter mailed in bulk by qualified nonprofit organizations, in accordance with the applicable provisions of former section 4451 through former section 4453 of title 39, United States Code.

"(c)(1) Any mailing of campaign mail may be made by a candidates only during the period beginning on the date such candidate is nominated or otherwise qualifies as a candidate and ending on the date of the general election or special election involved.

"(2) Any such mailing may be made only to addresses located in the geographical area with respect to which the general election or special election for Federal office is held.

"(3) No such mailing may be made under this section unless the candidate making such mailing is specifically identified in the campaign mail. No such mailing may be made on behalf of more than one candidate.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 503. The provisions of this title shall be administered by the Commission.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 504. There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States Postal Service an amount determined by the Postal Service to be equal to the difference between the revenues the Postal Service would have received if mailings under this title were not permitted to be made at reduced rates under section 502(b) and the estimated revenues to be received on mail carried under this title.".

(b) Title V of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a), is repealed effective at the end of fiscal year 1979.●

CHAMBERLAIN HONORS KEMP

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the results of last Tuesday's California referendum on proposition 13 reflect the increasing popularity of tax reforms which curtail taxation. People are concerned with the excessive tax burden which all levels of government place upon them. Proposition 13 is the product of one such group of citizens who were concerned enough to take action.

Here in the Congress, we have another individual who is concerned enough to act. I refer, of course, to my good friend and colleague from New York, the Honorable JACK KEMP.

Congressman KEMP has worked diligently for congressional tax reductions. In particular, he is sponsoring the Kemp-Roth Tax Reduction Act, a bill sponsored on the Senate side by Senator WILLIAM ROTH. This act, which I am proud to cosponsor, would reduce taxes by an average of 33 percent across the board.

I have been pleased to note that Congressman KEMP's efforts are being recognized by many political columnists, especially in the aftermath of proposition 13. One exemplary illustration of these columns was recently penned by John Chamberlain of Cheshire, Conn. Mr. Chamberlain is a noted political writer, and a constituent of mine. I am honored to represent such a distinguished and astute gentleman. I would like to take this opportunity to insert his column into the RECORD for my colleagues' information.

The column follows:

KEMP SCORES POLITICAL TOUCHDOWNS

(By John Chamberlain)

The other day I heard Rep. Jack Kemp, the Republican congressman from Buffalo, N.Y., who wins by margins that reflect a strong blue-collar labor support, ruefully refer to his college career as a physical education major. All I could say is thank heaven that Jack Kemp, a pro football quarterback of distinction, learned his logic and his ideas of strategy on the gridiron and not in Economics I, as taught by any number of our past generation of Keynesians.

On the football field, cause is followed by effect; in most economics classrooms there is no ascertainable connection between what is proposed by our policy makers and what actually happens as a result of the legislation they inflict upon us. One can call a pass play with infinitely more chance of success than one can hope to get from a new urban rehabilitation project.

With his direct mind, Jack Kemp, as a congressman dedicated to reviving our industrial system for the benefit of his blue-collar constituents, became the first politician of the past-Keynesian age to grasp the significance of Wall Street Journal editorial writer Jude Wanniski's path-making book, "The Way the World Works." Wanniski himself takes off from a phenomenon he calls the Laffer Curve, which is merely common sense observation that when you tax something you get less of it and when you subsidize something you get an excess of it. If the tax rate is set at 100 percent you will obviously get no production whatsoever.

At some point along the parabola that represents the realtionship between rates of taxation and individual incentives there is a point that will result in the best compromise possible between tax volume and production. It is the business of the statesman to find that point—and Jack Kemp, with the bill he has co-authored with Sen. William Roth of Delaware, thinks a tax reduction of some 30 percent across the board would promote a prosperity that would actually bring a bigger volume of taxes into the federal treasury than we now get at high rates.

Jack Kemp's perceptiveness in economics is matched by his strategic awareness in the field of foreign policy. Any football quarterback who uses his mind off the field as well as on must realize that the object of any contest in geographical space must be to turn the opponent's flank if one cannot crash through his center. The Soviets, with Cubans running interference, are currently attempting to turn the southern flank of the West European NATO nations in Africa. They are getting away with it.

Meanwhile, at the SALT II negotiations currently being held in Geneva, the Soviets are concentrating on devising special over-the-center passes designed to flummox the United States defenses at home and special power plays to crack NATO at some point along the line from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic.

As a congressional delegate to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, Jack Kemp figuratively listened in on the latest Soviet huddles about SALT II. With the United States prohibited by the proposed terms of the SALT II treaty from deploying "heavy" intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Soviets are holding out for permission to deploy 326 so-called SS18s each with the ability to deliver five times the payload of our most modern ICBM, the Minuteman III. And the Soviets want concessions for their Backfire bomber, which, despite Moscow's disclaimers, is a "strategic delivery" vehicle capable of crossing the Atlantic with inflight refueling and possible landing at Cuban bases. By falsely labeling the Backfire as a "tactical" weapon, the Soviets would avoid counting it against American strategic bombers in the proposed SALT II ceilings.

Since, in his estimation, the SALT II deliberations favor a deck stacked for the benefit of the Russians, Kemp thinks President Carter should recess the talks and bring our negotiators home. The Geneva draft text should be thoroughly reviewed by the Executive and Congress with a view to "reformulating the American negotiating posture."

The United States has a good quarterback's passing arm in the long-range cruise missile. If we give that up it would be equivalent to keeping Joe Namath on the bench. Jack Kemp, as an old Buffalo Bills' quarterback, doesn't have to be told the importance of the cruise missile. Thank heaven he majored in physical education and football, not in what passes these days for political science.●

AID HUMAN RACE, STOP ARMS RACE

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, last month I addressed a public meeting in the First Congressional District about the severe financial impact of the arms race on the human race. I was proud to welcome Senator JOHN C. CULVER, who gave the keynote address on "New Perils in the Nuclear Arms Race."

The Committee for a Nuclear Overkill Moratorium (NOMOR) sponsored the meeting at the Hyde Park Union Church.

Worldwide military expenditures in 1977 totaled $400 billion, reports the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. Annual worldwide military spending is twice as high as the yearly gross national product of the whole continent of Africa, and it is 20 times more than the total annual development assistance given by industrialized nations to the developing countries.

The national resources and human talent which are now used to increase military spending and to accelerate the arms race should be directed to the economic and social development of our people.

The manufacture, research, and development of all nuclear weapons, including all nuclear testing, must be stopped, and the international arms race must be reversed.

At the meeting, 235 people signed a petition calling for a nuclear moratorium. I include at the end of my remarks a copy of the petition text and the address by Senator CULVER.

Only when we make substantial progress toward reversing the arms race, will we address adequately the needs of the human race.

The material follows:

A PETITION TO PRESIDENT CARTER, THE CONGRESS, AND THE DELEGATION TO THE U.N. SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT

(Signed by 235 Residents of the First Congressional District of Illinois)

The nuclear arms race threatens our survival and must be halted. The prolonged U.S.-Soviet negotiations offer us little hope that the race will soon end if we continue on the present course.

Therefore, we appeal to our government to take an immediate first step by declaring to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament that the United States will halt all testing and production of nuclear weapons and will call on other nuclear nations to demonstrate a similar commitment.

NEW PERILS IN THE ARMS RACE: LOOKING BEYOND SALT II

It has been said that people can be divided into three groups: those who make things happen, those who watch things happen, and those who wonder what happened. You people who are here today unquestionably belong to the first group—concerned citizens who do everything within your power to help shape the course of events toward peace, reason and the well-being of humankind. I am proud to have this opportunity to participate in this forum dedicated to your concerns that should be recognized as the top priorities of the nation.

For more than 30 years, we have lived in a state of mutual distrust and paranoia with the other ranking nuclear power—glaring at one another across the unthinkable abyss of possible nuclear war. In the meantime, other nations have edged or muscled their way into the nuclear club. The demarcation between nuclear power for peaceful purposes and weaponry has become increasingly blurred. How long can this situation continue before willful act or accident may torch the holocaust? Does it have to continue?

I may differ with some of you on the specifics of what our course should be. But basically, I think we are on the mainline together. It doesn't have to continue this way.

The stirring words from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar are familiar to all:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

I think it is time to give this old theme new application: There is a tide in the affairs of mankind, which, taken at the flood, leads on to stability and peace among nations . . . Unheeded, we face the certainty of an ever-escalating arms race and the prospect of massive destruction of the human species.

We are, in my judgment, at such a stage in the present hour. SALT II, the Strategic Arms negotiations with the Soviet Union, are the most important national security discussions of our era.

The success of these negotiations will stand as a symbol to the other nations of the world, encouraging them along the path of arms restraint and peace. If they should fail, the mindless race for strategic superiority between the two superpowers will inevitably accelerate, increasing the pace of military build-up and nuclear proliferation throughout the world.

We have had strategic opportunities in the past for breakthroughs in nuclear arms restraint—as in the early stages of our MIRV production. If we had sought and obtained agreements for controlling the MIRVing of missiles at a time when we were far ahead in this technology, it is conceivable that we

could have avoided the situation we have today wherein both powers have mighty arsenals of nuclear missiles equipped with multiple and independently targeted warheads.

There have been other opportunities for possible breakthroughs in the U.S.-Soviet strategic impasse that have slipped away largely because it was not widely perceived in this country that strategic arms limitation is not simply an idealist's dream, but is in our practical, self-serving national interest; and secondly because many people in this country do not understand that such negotiations on our part would be made from a position of commanding strength vis-a-vis the Soviets.

In his bristling speech at Winston-Salem, North Carolina, last March, President Carter warned the Soviet Union that, with or without a new strategic arms limitation agreement, the United States will match the Soviet defense expenditures and military force levels.

"We are prepared," the President said, "to cooperate with the Soviet Union toward common social, scientific and economic goals—but if they fail to demonstrate restraint in missile programs and other force levels and in the projection of Soviet proxy forces into other lands and continents, then popular support in the United States for such cooperation will erode.

"We will not allow any other nation to gain military superiority over us," the President declared.

Does this blunt talk on military strength signify, as the Soviets angrily shot back, a shift in U.S. foreign policy away from détente and negotiations for arms limitation to a new era of threats and cold war?

No, Mr. Carter responded. "It's not a threat. It's just a simple statement of fact."

It seems likely that, in addition to warning the Soviets that the U.S. is prepared to expend any effort and whatever resources are needed to maintain a defense capability second to none, the President was notifying the Americans who rigidly oppose SALT and other arms control efforts that the U.S. enters these negotiations from a position of strength, not weakness.

There is a sizable and highly vocal contingent in our country who believe that the Soviets have overtaken us in military power and that any concession we might make in an arms agreement is a sell-out of our national security. To them, there is only one way to go—to constantly build up our military establishment, across the spectrum, matching the Soviets weapon system for weapon system and force level for force level.

Most advocates of arms control believe in a strong national defense, second to none. They are determined to keep it that way. But within that context, they see mutually beneficial arms restraint agreements as being in our national interest, the Soviet national interest and in the interest of the entire human race. Otherwise, where does it all end?

As the President indicated in his Winston-Salem speech, the United States has the resources to spend at "an increased level (for military forces) if needed to prevent any adversary from destabilizing the peace of the world." But there is another, saner way that deserves fair trial, considering the dreadful, dead-end consequences of an uninhibited arms race in this nuclear age.

In simplest terms, our country has three ways to go to safeguard our security. We can move unilaterally; we can act under mutual defense treaties with our allies; or we can negotiate agreements with our likely adversaries.

In the nuclear era, we relied first on ourselves; and the arms race, as a result, was an all-out, unrestrained competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. Starting with the test ban treaty in 1963, however, we embarked on a period of mutually agreed-upon controls over the ever-escalaing arms race.

No one can claim that these accords have brought the competitive arms build-up to a screaming halt. However, I believe we have laid a foundation for restraint with such measures as the nuclear test ban, the nonproliferation treaty, the agreements prohibiting the placement of nuclear weapons in space or on the ocean floor, and, of course, the ABM treaty in SALT I. While we don't feel all that secure today, it is frightening to imagine where we would be if those cooperative steps had not been taken. Against the fierce competition for military superiority, a momentum toward peace was established.

Now we are involved in the second Strategic Arms Limitations Talks with the Soviet Union. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and a member of the Congressional Committee appointed to observe the SALT negotiations in Geneva, I have been closely involved in this phase of national security policy.

Obviously, no agreement is better than an accord that barters away any of our vital security interests without a counterbalancing quid pro quo. I am confident that we have a strong, tough and extremely well-informed U.S. negotiating team for SALT. It goes without saying that we in the Senate will examine the fine print with a microscope when the treaty comes before the Senate for ratification.

But the obsession of the SALT opponents in this country, some in high places, that a successful treaty should be all in our favor and nothing for the Soviets, is a tragic, simplistic delusion.

Governor Averill Harriman, who served as U.S. Ambassador in many sensitive international negotiations, once said: "The one indispensable element in any successful negotiation is the determination to arrive at an agreement."

The corollary of this is that no treaty is durable that gives one side overwhelming unilateral advantage. There are effective means of verifying what the other side is doing, which I am sure will be written into the treaty. But the ultimate assurance of compliance rests in each side's self-interest in abiding by the agreement.

One wonders if the adamant opponents of any plausible version of SALT II have thought through the alternative of no treaty. With no safeguards of mutual restraint, we would be faced with the prospect of spending tens of billions of dollars just to stay even—and with no more security than we have now.

According to Defense Secretary Harold Brown, in the absence of a SALT agreement, the Soviet Union is likely to have over 3,000 strategic nuclear delivery vehicles by 1985. That would be 25 percent more than they have now and almost 50 percent more than they would probably have under a new SALT agreement. In addition, those weapons, mostly missiles, would be able to contain the latest improvements in yield, accuracy, and numbers of warheads—all of which would heighten the fears of surprise attack.

The United States could also raise the ante in this lethal poker game and position itself nearer the hair trigger for nuclear war. But would either nation be better off to plunge down the mutual extinction path?

A firm, clear, self-enforcing SALT treaty, on the other hand, would slow down or reverse this alarming trend and would channel the competition in strategic weapons into carefully defined areas. This means that the margin of uncertainty with respect to the threats we face would be narrower. Instead of having to worry simultaneously about Soviet improvements in all areas—missiles, submarines, cruise missiles—we would know that the Russians would have to limit themselves. They would have to restrict ICBM deployments, for example, if they wanted to put more missiles at sea.

Thus SALT can reduce the potential threat and thereby the range of anticipatory programs we might otherwise consider necessary. This will free us to perfect a defense system tailored to our own needs, resources, and expertise instead of being slavishly reactive to what the Soviets are doing next.

The savage attack on the SALT talks in this country is plainly based on an appeal to public fear—fear of the unknown, fear of the inscrutable Russians, above all, fear that this country is slipping behind the Soviets in strategic strength. We should have both respect and informed concern about what the Soviets are doing to improve their military capability, but fear and public hysteria do not constitute a rational foundation on which to base our all-important national security policy.

There is no question about the USSR building their military forces relentlessly and that this must be of continuing concern to us. But the contention that the Soviets have tipped the strategic balance in their favor simply does not square with the facts.

The Soviets know that we have deterrent power that could retaliate with devastating effect even after a first strike. In our triad of strategic weapons—submarines, bombers and land-based missiles—we have a more balanced and versatile attack force. We have retained strong ties with our regional allies that would greatly add to our strength in conventional warfare.

Moreover, strategic strength is more than military force; there are economic, industrial, agricultural, technological, diplomatic and other factors that contribute to our overall capability to wage a major war. The health, morale and economic security of the people are in the first line of a nation's ability to defend itself. This is well to remember when we hear the familiar argument that any expenditure for military purposes is justified, but funding for domestic social programs should be kept at a minimum. At the present time, the U.S. is first in military power, but only fourth in per capita expenditures on education; tenth in per capita expenditures on health; 17th in the rate of infant mortality and 20th in overall life expectancy.

But to return to our military efforts, we are also constantly modernizing, diversifying, refurbishing and moving out front in research and development to preserve our military edge.

Recently, two factors have been cited as endangering the U.S. edge in any possible nuclear war: one is that increased accuracy in Soviet ICBMs could make our land-based Minuteman vulnerable, and the other that Soviet civil defense has improved to such an extent that the Russians might feel they could win a nuclear war. While both factors deserve consideration, they have been exaggerated beyond the facts.

Defense debates in recent years have been distorted by over-emphasis on how much we spend vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, rather than on what we buy and what it will do to enhance our own defense capability. We need to develop our own military forces in terms of our own needs and objectives rather than simply trying to match the Soviets, dollar for dollar or ruble for ruble. For example, it is sometimes stated that we are falling behind because Soviet missiles have greater "throw-weight" than ours. This is true, but it is a result of a deliberate decision made by our defense planners, years ago, to opt for accuracy and mobility rather than sheer missile weight.

It is true that Soviet accuracy improvements will likely render the bulk of our Minuteman ICBMs hypothetically vulnerable to attack by the middle of the 1980s. Such a

development would not leave us defenseless by any measure, of course, since we could retaliate—and therefore deter attack—with our remaining ICBMs, and with our Poseidon and Trident missiles, and with our bombers and cruise missiles. We built a triad of strategic forces, after all, as a hedge against any such vulnerability.

According to an unclassified study by the Congressional Budget Office, even a totally surprise attack by the USSR in the mid- to late-1980s, using missiles with greater-than-expected capability, would still leave the United States with 4,500 to 8,000 nuclear warheads for retaliation—at least half of our total current number.

And this "worst case" scenario of the Soviets being able to destroy our Minuteman in the years ahead would have to be based on a perfectly functioning Russian war machine impervious to shortfalls caused by weather, faulty intelligence, inadequate command and control, and numerous other factors.

As Defense Secretary Harold Brown concluded: "Neither Minuteman vulnerability nor Soviet civil defense on the scale we can now see can seriously degrade our basic retaliatory response."

Obviously, arms control is not simply a bilateral issue between the United States and the Soviet Union, nor can it be so considered if we are to make real progress in reducing the danger of war.

It is a tragic fact that the world spends about $400 billion each year on armaments. Developing nations, struggling with unimaginable problems of poverty, economic depression, inadequate health and education systems and soaring birth rates, nonetheless spend more on their military establishments than on health and education combined.

Take the sad case of Somalia—one of the half dozen poorest nations in the world. Rebuffed by the west in its search for arms and allies, it turned, several years ago, to the Soviet Union, which was only too willing to pour in equipment and advisors. Well-armed despite its poverty, and strong by comparison with the chaotic condition in its historical antagonist, Ethiopia, Somalia attacked across its borders. The Soviet Union abruptly cut off its aid to Somalia and joined with Cuba to prevent an Ethiopian collapse. The United States refused to aid Somalia as long as it was in the position of invader. Now the Somalis have retreated within their own borders, and after many months of debilitating war and countless casualties, they are now back at square one.

In recent years Congress has recognized the folly and danger of the pathological competition between arms-producing nations to sell the most modern instruments of death to any country willing to pay the price. Last year, President Carter proclaimed the Administration's determination to cut down on these indiscriminate and constantly growing foreign military sales. Over the years, we have ourselves seen the pathetic results of arming to the teeth nations in regions of traditional enmities and potential conflict. We had the dubious honor of having furnished arms to both sides in the conflicts between India and Pakistan and Turkey and Greece. For years now, we and other arms-producing nations have been pouring sophisticated armaments into the volatile Mideast.

The pathological competition between industrial arms-producing nations to sell instruments of death to any nation that has the money goes on despite President Carter's commendable announcement that this country will lead the way in reducing foreign arms sales. These, of course, are conventional weapons but included are weapons of the most sophisticated kind, with an enormous kill ratio. Conventional warfare of the future will show frontiers of devastation in its own right as well as providing the likely stepping-stone to nuclear war. So in our efforts to restrain nuclear arms, we cannot be permitted to forget that a parallel effort to control conventional weaponry is also necessary.

In conclusion, I would point out that the Strategic Arms Control Talks with the Soviet Union are the centerpiece and symbol of the arms control movement in the world today.

The successful resolution of these negotiations will spur other initiatives for arms restraint throughout the world.

Who can doubt that this is in our national interest as well as in the interest of all humanity?

No matter what we could do to tip the strategic balance vis a vis the Soviets in our favor, either with or without SALT II, the Russians would still be in a position to inflict unacceptable damage on our country—only to receive a more completely devastating holocaust upon their own country from our awesome triad of nuclear weapons.

At this point, there is no absolute security for any country in a changing, increasingly interdependent and dangerous world. The security we have is in deterrent power, strategic balance and the determination to move toward initiatives for peace.

The words are still as true as when John Fitzgerald Kennedy said them: "Mankind must put an end to the arms race or the arms race will put an end to man."

Do I leave you with a message of optimism or pessimism? Neither. But I would hope to leave you with a message of hope. There is no way to assure that our efforts to control nuclear proliferation and prevent nuclear war will succeed. If the house is burning and we try to put out the fire, we cannot be guaranteed of success. But we see what must be done; we do have a chance, whatever the odds may be. And finally, we really have no choice but to do everything within our power to prevent the people on this planet from destroying themselves and their fellow human beings in mindless nuclear conflict. Thank you for your concern and your effort in this great cause.●

NO, POOR DO NOT PAY BULK OF U.S. TAXES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, one of the persistent myths abroad in this Nation is the one that the poor pay all the taxes and that all the rich folks avoid taxes. Statistical studies in recent years have not borne out this contention. Prof. James Green, a professor of economics, at the University of Georgia, made the case against this myth in excellent fashion in his column that appeared in the Sunday, May 7, 1978, Atlanta Journal and Constitution. If any conclusion is to be drawn from his column, it is that the rich do pay taxes and that the middle class is carrying the major share of the burden, and they are getting tired of it. This was very evident in the recent vote in California on proposition 13. The column follows:

NO, POOR DO NOT PAY BULK OF U.S. TAXES

(By James Green)

We have April 15 behind us. Our taxes are paid. Most of us feel naked but breathe easier now with a sigh of relief. It's over. Then comes that questioning doubt. Who paid the taxes? Did everyone pay his share?

Economist Paul Craig Roberts who works with Sen. Orrin Hatch tells us the answers to these questions (National Review, April 17). Dr. Roberts attacks the myths which condition our attitude with facts.

One myth has it that the bulk of taxes is paid by lower income recipients while high income earners largely avoid taxes. This is in no way supported by the facts.

In 1975, the top 5 percent of income recipients—those with adjusted gross income of $29,272 or more—paid over one-third of all personal income taxes. The top 10 percent with adjusted incomes of $23,420 or more paid almost 50 percent of total income taxes. Those with adjusted incomes of $15,898 or more—the top 25 percent—paid a full 72 percent of all personal income taxes.

HALF PAY 7.1 PERCENT OF TOTAL

Those income earners in the bottom 25 percent paid less than one-half of 1 percent of the total. The lowest 50 percent—those with adjusted incomes of $8,930 or less—paid only 7.1 percent of taxes paid. Compare this with the fact that the top 1 percent paid nearly 20 percent of total income taxes collected by the IRS.

Where does the tax burden lie?

Dr. Roberts directs our attention to the fact that in 1970 the lowest 50 percent of income earners paid 10.3 percent of the total; in 1975, this group paid 7.1 percent. In contrast, the top 50 percent paid 89.7 percent of the total in 1970 and a higher 94 percent in 1976. Further, several million taxpayers disappeared from the tax rolls after 1970 as tax changes favoring low income earners were legislated.

LOOPHOLES DON'T AID WEALTHY ONLY

How about all those tax loopholes?

In 1977 the Treasury listed 69 tax loopholes. Of the deductions allowed, for every dollar saved by high income earners, the lower and middle income groups saved three dollars. Two of the largest loopholes are the contributions employers make to pension plans and medical insurance for employees. According to Treasury figures in 1976, upper income taxpayers took about $16 billion in deductions; lower and middle income taxpayers were allowed some $50 billion in deductions and exclusions. This prompted Sen. Curtis to observe: "When I see that the great majority of benefits got to people who are not rich, I wonder what the tax reformers are up to."

What about capital gains?

Capital gains is becoming a central issue in tax reform. The Carter reform proposal is to tax capital gains as ordinary income. This would amount to a confiscation of capital assets and a very real shrinkage of capital stock, already a potent cause underlying joblessness and declining productivity. In contrast to the Carter proposal, the elimination of all taxes on capital gains would increase federal revenues an estimated $38 billion over the next four years. Attention Mr. Carter: This is one tax reform proposal which should be reversed immediately.

In 1977 Americans paid $16.7 billion more in taxes than they spent on food, clothing and housing. The average American worked from January through May 11 to pay his taxes. This is more government that we want, need or can afford.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional adviser, I attended the United Nations special session on disarmament on June 8 and 9. Because I had to miss some rollcall votes, I would like to list in

the RECORD how I would have voted if I had been present:

Rollcall vote No. 429, "yea."
Rollcall vote No. 430, "yea."
Rollcall vote No. 431, "nay."
Rollcall vote No. 432, "yea."
Rollcall vote No. 433, "aye."
Rollcall vote No. 434, "yea."
Rollcall vote No. 435, "yea." ●

LET'S NOT FORGET THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is a special day for this country but one which, unfortunately, receives too little attention. Today we honor our Nation's flag—Old Glory. There was a time—and not so long ago—when our beautiful flag would have been prominently displayed on this date waving in the breeze in front yards and on porches throughout the country. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be the case anymore. Has patriotism gone the way of the front porch? Are both considered obsolete?

Old Glory is an important part of our history; she represents a nation dedicated to independence, freedom, and justice. Born as the banner of an infant republic, she is a symbol of over 200 years of growth and liberty for our country. Her stripes remind us of the 13 original colonies and of our forefathers whose wisdom, perseverance and foresight forged the way toward a United States of America made up of 50 diverse States, each represented on our flag, and over 200 million people. Old Glory is a symbol of a pledge made for all of us by our forefathers:

. . . we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

She is a mighty symbol to people everywhere of a sovereign nation, a great democratic Republic.

On Flag Day in 1917, only a few months after the United States entered World War I, President Wilson spoke eloquently on the meaning of our flag and what our banner stands for:

This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

We celebrate the day of its birth; and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, of a great plan of life worked out by a great people . . .

Woe be to the man or group of men that seeks to stand in our way in this day of high resolution when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were both, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people.

Just across the bridge, in Arlington, Va., we have erected a memorial to six brave servicemen who risked their lives on Iwo Jima in 1945 to keep our banner flying. Three of those men also died on Iwo Jima. Nearby, in Arlington National Cemetery, are the graves of thousands more patriotic Americans who sacrificed their lives for everything Old Glory stands for.

The brilliant Henry Ward Beecher once said:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of Liberty and men rejoicing in it.

The stars upon it were like the bright morning stars of God, and the stripes upon it were beams of morning light. As at early dawn the stars shine forth even while it grows light, and then as the sun advances that light breaks into banks and streaming lines of color, the glowing red and intense white striving together, and ribbing the horizon with bars effulgent, so, on the American flag, stars and beams of many-colored light shine out together . . .

Our flag deserves our love, our reverence and our respect. She is a glorious banner representing, in the words of Francis Scott Key, "the home of the brave and the land of the free." There are many people in this world today who wish they were fortunate enough to salute the same flag we salute, and to live in the land which she represents.●

THE ROLE OF GRAIN TRADERS AND EXPORTERS

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times carried an article regarding the role of grain traders and exporters in the Geneva negotiations for a new international wheat agreement. Farmers, the article states, have been kept away from the negotiations while wheat industry officials maintain a cozy relationship with the U.S. negotiating team.

Under such circumstances, the U.S. negotiating team inevitably acquires a rather parochial orientation, believing that what is good for the wheat industry must be good for wheat farmers. Little wonder that the farmers' interest in a fair price continues to be undermined by the cheap food mentality which prevails among U.S. negotiators.

The article follows:

INDUSTRY ROLE SCORED IN TRADE TALKS

(By Michael C. Jensen)

The scene was Geneva. A high-level American team led by Dale E. Hathaway, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, was negotiating a new international wheat agreement.

Team members included officials from the State Department, the Treasury, the White House and Capitol Hill. And in their midst—giving advice, providing information, arguing strategy—were Michael L. Hall, president of Great Plains Wheat Inc., an influential organization of wheat interests; Joseph Halow, head of the North American Export Grain Association, which includes the nation's most powerful grain traders and exporters; Don A. Woodward of the National Association of Wheat Growers, and Eugene B. Vickers of the Western Wheat Association.

The presence of industry members at such international negotiations—involving wheat, coffee, cocoa, sugar and other commodities—although a longstanding practice, has touched off fresh debate.

Both farmers and some Congressmen question the wisdom, as well as the propriety, of allowing trade interests to fill nearly all of the non-Government seats at the bargaining table. The twin specters of undue influence and inside information have been raised.

Industry and the Government defend the business role. At Geneva, Dr. Hathaway says, industry members were "helpful" on two counts: "They have technical knowledge of how wheat is sold and traded. If you inadvertently mess up the way they do business, you could impede trade flows. And, they gave us some parameters of what the growers consider acceptable."

Dr. Hathaway also says nothing that took place in Geneva last winter was "market-sensitive" and that industry members "do not have access to everything I have access to." Price thresholds that would trigger certain activities under the agreement are among the most potentially sensitive information, but they will be proposed, Dr. Hathaway says, following a "decision by the Executive Branch, not by the producers."

Still, the subject is complex. Last November, it was disclosed that for more than 15 years the American coffee industry maintained a largely unpublicized position close to the Government officials who negotiate international coffee agreements. So influential were the industry officials, according to one Treasury Department memorandum, that they helped dissuade the Government from seeking an international stockpile to stabilize supply and thus avert price increases.

Representative Frederick W. Richmond, a Brooklyn Democrat who heads the House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, says business not only exerts inordinate influence in setting Government policy on commodity agreements but also regularly obtains inside information from which it could profit.

ACCESS TO DATA CITED

The General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, at the request of the House subcommittee, recently reported some of the problems arising from industry's role as advisers to commodity-negotiating teams.

The G.A.O. said some of the information generated at the wheat negotiations, for example, was "not normally available to the general public" but was provided to industry representatives, including classified information for which they did not have proper security clearance. They also had access to the following:

Policy proposals by the Agriculture Department, including possible elements of new wheat agreements are proposed measures to be taken by the United States Government under "specified market conditions."

Policy proposals of other grain-importing and grain-exporting countries.

Furthermore, the report said, wheat-industry advisers were limited to individuals representing Great Plains Wheat, Western Wheat, the National Association of Wheat Growers and the North American Export Grain Association.

"Though other organizations have expressed their desire to be considered for advisory positions," the report said, "their input has been limited to attendance at public sessions in Washington." Among the organizations that said they wanted to participate as accredited members of the American delegation, but were not accepted, are Bread for the World, a citizens' lobby on hunger and poverty, and the National Farmers Union.

EFFORT TO KEEP FARMERS OUT SEEN

Despite the presence of some farm groups as advisers, Robert G. Lewis, national secretary and chief economist for the National Farmers Union, says there has been a "studied effort to keep farmers from being on the inside."

"We probably represent more wheat farmers than any other organization in the country," he added. A former Government official, Mr. Lewis in 1962 headed the American delegation to Geneva. Now he cannot get a seat. The non-Government advisers to the current negotiating team, he says, "primarily represent the trading companies."

The G.A.O. report also said "nonaccredited persons" whom it did not identify from the wheat industry had participated in the negotiations, attending the formal sessions as well as the informal discussions that preceded and followed them. No official records were kept of those informal meetings, it said.

Providing an assessment of the role of trade advisers was Dr. Robert O. Herrmann, professor of agricultural economics at Pennsylvania State University (and a former student of Dr. Hathaway, who was a professor at Michigan State before he became Assistant Secretary of Agriculture). He sat in on the Geneva negotiations as a "consumer" representative.

"What gave the trade members such great power and influence," Dr. Herrmann says, "was the web of information they had that the Government didn't. Mike Hall would sometimes come back to the hotel and have eight or 10 Telexes waiting for him. One night he was talking on the telephone to people in the United States until about 5 A.M."

Furthermore, Dr. Hermann says, when price levels enter the discussion, "I can imagine that it would be extremely tricky. It would be very advantageous for the trade to know" about such matters. Still, he said, trade representatives in general "had a lot more to offer to the Government than they had to gain" in Geneva.

ADVANTAGE ACKNOWLEDGED

Fred H. Sanderson of the Brookings Institution in Washington, a member of the American grain-negotiating team in 1967, said he did not favor allowing trade members to attend negotiating sessions. They currently attend all sessions, participating fully in the staff meetings and observing but not speaking at the negotiating sessions.

But Mr. Sanderson acknowledges there is one advantage to allowing trade members to participate: Congress must ratify any agreement and is generally sensitive to the desires of the domestic trade so it is important for Government negotiators to know the trade's position early.

Trade members concede that they do not spend weeks of time, and thousands of dollars in expenses, out of an altruistic desire to help the Government. Clearly, they try to shape the Government's approach to commodity agreements, and, in an industry where up-to-the-minute information is crucial, they pass the word throughout the industry of fresh developments.

Last February, after the first week of the wheat negotiations in Geneva, Mr. Halow of the North American Export Grain Association sent a confidential three-page memorandum (labeled "Not for Publication or Further Distribution") to his association's members, including Cargill Inc., the Continental Grain Company, the Bunge Corporation, the Garnac Grain Company and the Louis Dreyfus Corporation, five industry giants.

After characterizing the negotiating positions of the Canadian, Australian, Soviet and European delegations, he observed that there appeared to be "very little—if any—chance the conference will produce any substantive agreement on sharing of the responsibility for world stocks."

From time to time, Mr. Halow leaves the negotiations, and members of his organization take his seat. Robert W. Kohlmeyer of Cargill, for example, sat in Mr. Halow's chair in Geneva for a time, as did Richard Carter, a vice president of Continental. Mr. Carter is currently in London with the Government's "interim committee" on wheat, which is led by Thomas R. Saylor of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Kohlmeyer says he participates because the Government needs technical expertise and because it is "valuable to my employer, Cargill, to have results of negotiations which are beneficial to United States agriculture." ●

REINTRODUCTION OF THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY COIN LEGISLATION

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing my bill, with additional cosponsors, to amend the Coin Act of 1965, to, among other things, place the portrait of Susan B. Anthony on the proposed $1 coin. I am pleased that more than 35 of my colleagues have joined with me in sponsoring this legislation, as it is a unique opportunity to recognize and honor all women of our great country.

Susan B. Anthony 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. She spent her entire life working toward that end.

Senator PROXMIRE has introduced similar legislation in the Senate, and he fully supports this proposal to put Ms. Anthony's portrait on the new dollar coin.

It is important that we utilize this unique opportunity to honor all American women by authorizing the U.S. Treasury to place Susan Anthony's portrait on the new dollar coin. We know from a report by the U.S. Treasury Department that she is the overwhelming choice of Americans.

The bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Coinage Act of 1965 to change the size, weight, and design of the one-dollar coin, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Susan B. Anthony Dollar Coin Act of 1978".

SEC. 2. Section 101(c)(1) of the Coinage Act of 1965, as amended (31 U.S.C. 391(c)(1)), is amended by striking out "1.500" and inserting in lieu thereof "1.043" and by striking out "22.68" and inserting in lieu thereof "8.5".

SEC. 3. (a) The one-dollar coin authorized by section 101(c) of the Coinage Act of 1965, as amended by section 2, shall bear on the obverse side the likeness of Susan B. Anthony.

(b) Subject to subsection (a) and the limitations contained in section 3517 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 324), the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such design for the one-dollar coin authorized by section 101(c) of the Coinage Act of 1965, as amended by section 2, as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. Section 203 of the Act of December 31, 1970 (31 U.S.C. 324b), is amended by striking out "initially" and by inserting "(d)" after "section 101".

SEC. 5. Until January 1, 1979, the Secretary of the Treasury may continue to mint and issue one-dollar coins authorized under section 101(c)(1) of the Coinage Act of 1965, as such section was in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act. ●

ENERGY IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ARIZONA

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, last year the Forest Service conducted a nationwide inventory of all roadless and undeveloped land throughout the National Forest system.

The announced objective of this inventory—known as RARE II—was to consider all such land within our national forests for possible wilderness designation at some point in the future.

Millions of Americans object to the inclusion of vast additional acreage of public lands in the narrow wilderness category.

Such designation by the Federal Government removes this land from multiple use, where it is available under Government management for recreation, wildlife habitats, timber production, grazing, mineral exploration, and commercial development for the benefit of all the people.

The RARE II inventory includes more than 65 million acres of Forest Service land nationwide. This includes more than 1.8 million acres of land in the six national forests in Arizona. The Forest Service has informed me that it will this week issue the first draft of its environmental statement on the RARE II wilderness project, in order to present their view of the social and economic impacts of wilderness designation of various land areas.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly hope that the Forest Service will promptly return all Arizona acreage to multiple use, and I have requested the Secretary of Agriculture to order this on the basis of the land's high importance to our energy needs alone.

There are a multitude of reasons not to designate any further Forest Service land in Arizona as wilderness, but the energy importance of this land must be a top consideration.

The Department of Energy has con-

firmed this fact in a recent evaluation of all public lands included in the Forest Service's RARE II inventory, provided at my request.

The Department evaluated every tract and every acre of land that the Forest Service is considering for possible future wilderness designation. The land was evaluated according to its importance for oil and gas, coal, uranium, and hydro, which are vital to provide our future energy needs and to help make us self-sufficient in the energy area.

It was the judgment of Department of Energy officials that every tract of land among the 94 tracts of so-called "roadless and undeveloped" Forest Service land in Arizona is in some way important to our future energy needs.

More than 28.3 percent of all the acreage was designated either highly important or important to the Nation's oil, gas, and uranium needs.

Another 72 tracts totalling 1,487,990 acres were cited for their "commercial potential" for oil and gas.

The Department of Energy cited more than 236,050 acres of Forest Service land in Arizona as "highly important" or "important" to the Nation's uranium needs, with possible rich deposits of uranium for nuclear energy.

This is almost 14 percent of all land designated as a "highly important" or "important" source of uranium throughout the Nation.

Another 113,080 acres of the Forest Service land in Arizona was cited for its "commercial potential" for uranium in the Department of Energy report.

Mr. Speaker, I have carefully studied this Federal energy evaluation of every tract of Forest Service land included in the RARE II inventory throughout Arizona.

I have summarized that information in a simple chart that shows the importance of each tract of land for oil and gas, coal, uranium, and hydro.

I would like to include the chart at this point in the RECORD. I hope that this valuable information has been considered by those responsible for the RARE II wilderness project. It should serve as a compelling reason for the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately terminate consideration of this Arizona land for wilderness, and to return it all to multiple use for the benefit of all the people.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ANAYLSIS OF FOREST SERVICE RARE-II WILDERNESS PROJECT IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Area code and nama	Gross acres	Oil and gas				Coal				Uranium				Hydro			
		Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential
APACHE-SITGREAVES NATIONAL FOREST																	
3128 Escudilla Mountain	4,100			X					X				X				X
3129 Black River Canyon	11,630			X					X				X				X
3130 Centerfire	13,100			X					X				X				X
3131 Bear Wallow	9,590			X					X				X				X
3132 Nolan	6,640			X					X				X				X
3133 Campbell Blue	7,020			X					X				X				X
3134 Mother Hubbard	2,100			X					X				X				X
3135 Painted Bluffs	42,910			X					X				X				X
3136 Mitchell Peak	35,670			X					X				X				X
3137 Pipestem	34,370			X					X				X				X
3138 Hell Hole	15,470			X					X				X				X
3139 Lower San Francisco	59,330			X					X				X				X
3140 Salt House	22,270			X					X				X				X
3141 Hot Air	31,700			X					X				X				X
3142 Sunset	29,040			X					X				X				X
Total	324,940																
COCONIHO NATIONAL FOREST																	
3040 Jacks Canyon	5,010		X						X				X				X
3041 East Clear Creek	1,730		X						X				X				X
3042 Barbershop Canyon	1,250		X						X			X					X
3043 Lower Jacks Canyon	870		X						X				X				X
3044 Hackberry	24,910			X					X				X				X
3045 Wet Beaver	9,810		X						X				X				X
3046 Fossil Springs	14,050		X						X			X					X
3047 West Clear Creek	33,660		X						X				X				X
3048 Strawberry Crater South	8,050			X					X				X				X
3049 San Francisco Peaks	17,980			X					X				X				X
3050 Kendrick Mountain	2,200			X					X				X				X
3051 Padre Canyon	9,910		X						X				X				X
3052 Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Contig	2,650		X						X				X				X
3053 Red Rock Secret Mountain	47,480		X						X				X				X
3054 Rattlesnake	32,870		X						X				X				X
3055 Walker Mountain	8,840		X						X				X				X
3056 House Mountain	20,770		X						X				X				X
3057 Cimarron Hills	5,280			X					X				X				X
3058 Boulder Canyon	4,550			X					X				X				X
3059 Strawberry Crater North	1,790			X					X				X				X
Total	253,740																
CORONADO NATIONAL FOREST																	
3109 Chiricahua Wilderness Contig	60,150			X					X				X				X
3110 Whitmire Canyon	5,080			X					X				X				X
3112 North End	23,550			X					X			X					X
3113 Mount Wrightson	25,170			X					X			X					X
3114 Tumacacori	51,490			X					X			X					X
3115 Pajarita No. 1	10,320			X					X			X					X
3116 Pajarita No. 2	5,500			X					X				X				X
3117 Miller Peak	22,510			X					X				X				X
3118 Brushy Peak	8,480			X					X				X				X
3119 Canelo Hills	8,650		X						X				X				X
3120 Whetstone	36,610			X					X				X				X
3121 Santa Teresa	27,160			X					X				X				X
3122 Winchester	14,100			X					X				X				X
3123 Mount Graham	55,090			X					X				X				X
3124 Galiuro Wilderness Contig	22,130			X					X				X				X
3125 Little Rincon	11,560			X					X				X				X
3126 Rincon Mountains	62,930			X					X			X					X
3127 Kane Springs	6,970			X					X				X				X
3200 Bunk Robinson Peak	740			X					X				X				X
Total	458,190																

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ANALYSIS OF FOREST SERVICE RARE-II WILDERNESS PROJECT IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA—Continued

Area code and name	Gross acres	Oil and gas				Coal				Uranium				Hydro			
		Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential	Very important	Important	Commercial potential	No commercial potential
NATIONAL FOREST																	
3050 Kendrick Mountain	4,310			X					X				X				X
3060 Kanab Creek	73,330	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)				X				X				X
3061 Coconino Rim	8,510		X						X	X							X
3062 Saddle Mountain	39,190		X						X	X							X
3063 Red Point	7,960		X						X	X							X
3064 Big Ridge	8,850		X						X	X							X
3065 Burro Canyon	20,510		X						X	X							X
3066 Willis Canyon	8,730		X						X	X							X
Total	171,390																
PRESCOTT NATIONAL FOREST																	
3080 Juniper Mesa	9,770			X					X				X				X
3081 Apache Creek	5,610			X					X				X				X
3082 Connell Mountains	9,040			X					X				X				X
3083 Sheridan Mountain	37,380			X					X				X				X
3084 Granite Mountain	8,580			X					X			X					X
3085 Castle Creek	28,600			X					X				X				X
3086 Fritsche	14,660			X					X			X					X
3087 Muldoon	5,160			X					X			X					X
3088 Woodchute	5,540			X					X				X				X
3089 Black Canyon	10,420			X					X				X				X
3090 Ash Creek	8,430			X					X				X				X
3091 Grief Hill-I 17	12,280			X					X				X				X
3092 Arnold Mesa	28,000			X					X				X				X
3093 Pine Mountain Wilderness Contig	2,910			X					X				X				X
3094 Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Contig	8,280	(1)	(1)		(1)	(1)			X				X				X
3095 Blind Indian Creek	27,040			X					X			X					X
Total	221,700																
TONTO NATIONAL FOREST																	
3016 Mazatzal Wilderness Contig	83,750			X					X				X				X
3017 Pine Mountain Wilderness Contig	7,050			X					X								X
3018 Superstition Wilderness Contig	32,160			X					X			X					X
3019 Sierra Ancha Wilderness Contig	11,520			X					X		X						X
3020 Lime Creek	43,050			X					X				X				X
3021 Hells Gate	30,400			X					X				X				X
3022 Salome	30,470			X					X	X							X
3023 Cherry Creek	12,130			X					X	X							X
3024 Boulder	45,000			X					X			X					X
3025 Four Peaks	55,010			X					X				X				X
3026 Goldfield	16,930			X					X				X				X
3027 Black Cross	6,290			X					X				X				X
3028 Horse Mesa	10,450			X					X				X				X
3029 Salt	41,290			X					X		X						X
3030 Picacho	7,200			X					X		X					X	
3092 Arnold Mesa	320			X					X				X				X
Total	433,020																
Total, State	1,862,980																

(1) Not evaluated.

Source: Energy Resource Assessments Of Lands To Be Reviewed By U.S. Forest Service In 1977-1978 Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE-II), U.S. Department of Energy, Jan. 16, 1978. 52-43N

ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC STATES' GENOCIDE DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago, on June 14, 1941, the Soviet Union began to execute its policy of genocide in the Baltic nations. This date marks the anniversary of one of the most tragic episodes in history—the mass deportation from their lands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians by Soviet Russian military authorities.

These small republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had enjoyed a short-lived freedom, having secured their independence after the end of World War I. However, the territory of the Baltic lands became a battleground being first invaded by Soviet troops and followed by the occupation of Nazi armed forces.

Toward the end of World War II, when Soviet troops reoccupied the Baltic States, the U.S.S.R. illegally incorporated these three small countries into its huge empire. The end of World War II found the Communists in undisputed and complete control. Tens of thousands of the Baltic peoples were killed and over a million were deported to slave labor camps in Siberia and other areas of the Soviet Union.

Hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were transported from their homelands, to be replaced by peoples from other parts of the Soviet empire. This exchange of population has substantially altered the ethnic composition of the Baltic nations.

In addition, the Baltic people have suffered from the collectivization of their farms and the nationalization of their industries. They have suffered religious persecution and their children have been subject, through Soviet educational institutions, to Communist brainwashing.

However, throughout the free world, the peoples of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian origins have maintained their traditional civic, cultural, and church organizations and bravely continue their efforts on behalf of their enslaved compatriots held captive within the U.S.S.R.

As a nation, we stand for freedom and for the right of self-determination. I believe that this is an universal principle and not one that should be applied selectively. As this is not the case for those held captive of communism, it is absolutely necessary for the policy of the

United States to continue to be that of nonrecognition of the Soviet incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. These Baltic States were physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into the cluster of its "Socialist Republics." So far as the Soviets are concerned, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia have ceased to exist as separate entities and they are denied their own national identity and independence.

As we draw attention to this tragic anniversary, we recognize that it is the duty of the United States to support the cause of freedom so it can be restored to these lands. The legitimate aspirations and the perseverance of the Baltic peoples to independence will ultimately triumph over communism.●

"THE WEST'S DECLINE IN COURAGE"

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with the speech given to the 1978 graduating class of Harvard University by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. I hope that Mr. Solzhenitsyn's message was heard and will be pondered by those in policymaking positions.

I was most intrigued by his observations of the national media in the United States:

Hastiness and superficiality are the psychic disease of the 20th century and more than anywhere else this disease is reflected in the press. Indepth analysis of a problem is anathema to the press. It stops at sensational formulas.

Such as it is, however, the press has become the greatest power within the Western countries, more powerful than the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. One would like to ask: By what law has it been elected and to whom is it responsible?

I would especially like to highlight his statement that—

Enormous freedom exists for the press, but not for the readership, because newspapers mostly give enough stress and emphasis to those opinions which do not too openly contradict their own and the general trend. . . . Without any censorship, in the West fashionable trends of thought and ideas are carefully separated from those which are not fashionable; nothing is forbidden, but what is not fashionable will hardly ever find its way into periodicals or books or be heard in colleges.

Mr. Speaker, I think that his point about reporting only what is "fashionable" gets at the heart of the question of the Soviet military buildup and our own national defense.

I would like to commend the text of the Solzhenitsyn speech, as it appeared in last Sunday's Washington Post, to my colleagues in Congress:

SOLZHENITSYN'S INDICTMENT: "THE WEST HAS LOST ITS COURAGE"

(By Alexander Solzhenitsyn)

An unchecked materialism, timid leadership, legalism without moral values, an irresponsible press, a spiritual vacuum—all these add up to a society that has lost the will to defend itself.

A loss of courage may be the most striking feature which an outside observer notices in the West in our days. The western world has lost its civil courage, both as a whole and separately, in each country, each government, each political party and of course in the United Nations.

Such a decline in courage is particularly noticeable among the ruling groups and the intellectual elite, causing an impression of loss of courage by the entire society. Of course there are many courageous individuals but they have no determining influence on public life. Political and intellectual bureaucrats show depression, passivity and perplexity in their actions and in their statements and even more so in theoretical reflections to explain how realistic, reasonable as well as intellectually and even morally warranted it is to base state policies on weakness and cowardice.

And decline in courage is ironically emphasized by occasional explosions of anger and inflexibility on the part of the same bureaucrats when dealing with weak governments and weak countries, not supported by anyone, or with currents which cannot offer any resistance. But they get tongue-tied and paralyzed when they deal with powerful governments and threatening forces, with aggressors and international terrorists.

Should one point out that from ancient times decline in courage has been considered the beginning of the end?

When the modern western states were created, the following principle was proclaimed: governments are meant to serve man, and man lives to be free and to pursue happiness. (See, for example, the American Declaration of Independence).

Now at last during past decades technical and social progress has permitted the realization of such aspirations: the welfare state. Every citizen has been granted the desired freedom and material goods in such quantity and of such quality as to guarantee in theory the achievement of happiness, in the morally inferior sense which has come into being during those same decades.

In the process, however, one psychological detail has been overlooked: The constant desire to have still more things and a still better life and the struggle to obtain them imprints many western faces with worry and even depression, though it is customary to conceal such feelings. Active and tense competition permeates all human thoughts without opening a way to free spiritual development.

The individual's independence from many types of state pressure has been guaranteed; the majority of people have been granted well-being to an extent their fathers and grandfathers could not even dream about; it has become possible to raise young people according to these ideals, leading them to physical splendor, happiness, possession of material goods, money and leisure, to an almost unlimited freedom of enjoyment. So who should now renounce all this, why and for what should one risk one's precious life in defense of common values, and particularly in such nebulous cases when the security of one's nation must be defended in a distant country?

Even biology knows that habitual extreme safety and well-being are not advantageous for a living organism. Today, well-being in the life of western society has begun to reveal its pernicious mask.

Western society has given itself the organization best suited to its purposes, based, I would say, on the letter of the law. The limits of human rights and righteousness are determined by a system of laws; such limits are very broad.

People in the West have acquired considerable skill in using, interpreting and manipulating law, even though laws tend to be too complicated for an average person to understand without the help of an expert. Any conflict is solved according to the letter of the law and this is considered to be the supreme solution. If one is right from a legal point of view, nothing more is required, nobody may mention that one could still not be entirely right, and urge self-restraint, a willingness to renounce such legal rights, sacrifice and selfless risk: it would sound simply absurd.

One almost never sees voluntary self-restraint. Everybody operates at the extreme limit of those legal frames. An oil company is legally blameless when it purchases an invention of a new type of energy in order to prevent its use. A food product manufacturer is legally blameless when he poisons his produce to make it last longer: after all, people are free not to buy it.

I have spent all my life under a communist regime and I will tell you that a society without any objective legal scale is a terrible one indeed. But a society with no other scale but the legal one is not quite worthy of man either. A society which is based on the letter of the law and never reaches any higher is taking very scarce advantage of the high level of human possibilities. The letter of the law is too cold and formal to have a beneficial influence on society. Whenever the tissue of life is woven of legalistic relations, there is an atmosphere of moral mediocrity, paralyzing man's noblest impulses.

And it will be simply impossible to stand through the trials of this threatening century with only the support of a legalistic structure.

In today's western society, the inequality has been revealed of freedom for good deeds and freedom for evil deeds. A statesman who wants to achieve something important and highly constructive for his country has to move cautiously and even timidly; there are thousands of hasty and irresponsible critics around him, parliament and the press keep rebuffing him. As he moves ahead, he has to prove that each single step of his is well-founded and absolutely flawless. Actually an outstanding and particularly gifted person who has unusual and unexpected initiatives in mind hardly gets a chance to assert himself; from the very beginning, dozens of traps will be set out for him. Thus mediocrity triumphs with the excuse of restrictions imposed by democracy.

It is feasible and easy everywhere to undermine administrative power and, in fact, it has been drastically weakened in all western countries. The defense of individual rights has reached such extremes as to make society as a whole defenseless against certain individuals. It is time, in the West, to defend not so much human rights as human obligations.

Destructive and irresponsible freedom has been granted boundless space. Society appears to have little defense against the abyss of human decadence, such as, for example, misuse of liberty for moral violence against young people, motion pictures full of pornography, crime and horror. It is considered to be part of freedom and theoretically counterbalanced by the young people's right not to look or not to accept. Life organized legalistically has thus shown its inability to defend itself against the corrosion of evil.

And what shall we say about the dark realm of criminality as such? Legal frames (especially in the United States) are broad

enough to encourage not only individual freedom but also certain individual crimes. The culprit can go unpunished or obtain undeserved leniency with the support of thousands of public defenders. When a government starts an earnest fight against terrorism, public opinion immediately accuses it of violating the terrorists' civil rights. There are many such cases.

Such a tilt of freedom in the direction of evil has come about gradually but it was evidently born primarily out of a humanistic and benevolent concept according to which there is no evil inherent to human nature; the world belongs to mankind and all the defects of life are caused by wrong social systems which must be corrected. Strangely enough, though the best social conditions have been achieved in the West, there still is criminality and there even is considerably more of it than in the pauper and lawless Soviet society. (There is a huge number of prisoners in our camps who are termed criminals, but most of them never committed any crime; they merely tried to defend themselves against a lawless state restorting to means outside of a legal framework.)

The press too, of course, enjoys the widest freedom. (I shall be using the word press to include all media.) But what sort of use does it make of this freedom?

Here again, the main concern is not to infringe the letter of the law. There is no moral responsibility for deformation or disproportion.

What sort of responsibility does a journalist have to his readers, or to history?

If they have misled public opinion or the government by inaccurate information or wrong conclusions, do we know of any cases of public recognition and rectification of such mistakes by the same journalist or the same newspaper?

No, it does not happen, because it would damage sales. A nation may be the victim of such a mistake, but the journalist always gets away with it. One may safely assume that he will start writing the opposite with renewed self-assurance.

Because instant and credible information has to be given, it becomes necessary to resort to guesswork, rumors and suppositions to fill in the voids, and none of them will ever be rectified, they will stay on in the readers' memory.

How many hasty, immature, superficial and misleading judgments are expressed every day, confusing readers, without any verification? The press can both simulate public opinion and miseducate it.

Thus we may see terrorists heroized, or secret matters, pertaining to one's nation's defense, publicly revealed, or we may witness shameless intrusion on the privacy of well-known people under the slogan: "Everyone is entitled to know everything."

But this is a false slogan, characteristic of a false era: people also have the right not to know, and it is a much more valuable one. The right not to have their divine souls stuffed with gossip, nonsense vain talk. A person who works and leads a meaningful life does not need the excessive, burdening flow of information.

Hastiness and superficiality are the psychic disease of the 20th century and more than anywhere else this disease is reflected in the press. In-depth analysis of a problem is anathema to the press. It stops at sensational formulas.

Such as it is, however, the press has become the greatest power within the western countries, more powerful than the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. One would then like to ask: By what law has it been elected and to whom is it responsible?

In the communist East, a journalist is frankly appointed as a state official. But who has granted western journalists their power, for how long a time and with what prerogatives?

There is yet another surprise for someone coming from the East where the press is rigorously unified: one gradually discovers a common trend of preferences within the western press as a whole. It is a fashion; there are generally accepted patterns of judgment and there may be common corporate interests, the sum effect being no competition but unification.

Enormous freedom exists for the press, but not for the readership, because newspapers mostly give enough stress and emphasis to those opinions which do not too openly contradict their own and the general trend.

Without any censorship, in the West fashionable trends of thought and ideas are carefully separated from those which are not fashionable; nothing is forbidden, but what is not fashionable will hardly ever find its way into periodicals or books or be heard in colleges.

Legally your researchers are free, but they are conditioned by the fashion of the day. There is no open violence such as in the East; however, a selection dictated by fashion and the need to match mass standards frequently prevent independent-minded people from giving their contribution to public life. There is a dangerous tendency to form a herd, shutting off successful development.

This gives birth to strong mass prejudices, to blindness, which is most dangerous in our dynamic era. There is, for instance, a self-deluding interpretation of the contemporary world situation. It works as a sort of a petrified armor around people's minds.

Human voices from 17 countries of Eastern Europe and Eastern Asia cannot pierce it. It will only be broken by the pitiless crowbar of events.

It is almost universally recognized that the West shows all the world a way to successful economic development, even though in the past years it has been strongly disturbed by chaotic inflation.

However, many people living in the West are dissatisfied with their own society. They despise it or accuse it of not being up to the level of maturity attained by mankind. A number of such critics turn to socialism which is a false and dangerous current.

I hope that no one present will suspect me of offering my personal criticism of the western system to present socialism as an alternative. Having experienced applied socialism in a country where the alternative has been realized, I certainly will not speak for it.

But should someone ask me whether I would indicate the West as such as it is today as a model to my country, frankly I would have to answer negatively. No, I could not recommend your society in its present state as an ideal for the transformation of ours.

Through intense suffering our country has now achieved a spiritual development of such intensity that the western system in its present state of spiritual exhaustion does not look attractive. Even those characteristics of your life which I have just mentioned are extremely saddening.

A fact which cannot be disputed is the weakening of human beings in the West while in the East they are becoming firmer and stronger. Six decades for our people and three decades for the people of Eastern Europe; during that time we have been through a spiritual training far in advance of western experience. Life's complexity and mortal weight have produced stronger, deeper and more interesting characters than those generated by standardized western well-being.

Therefore, if our society were to be transformed into yours, it would mean an improvement in certain aspects, but also a change for the worse on some particularly significant scores.

It is true, no doubt, that a society cannot remain in an abyss of lawlessness, as is the case in our country. But it is also demeaning for it to elect such mechanical legalistic smoothness as you have.

After the suffering of decades of violence and oppression, the human soul longs for things higher, warmer and purer than those offered by today's mass living habits, introduced by the revolting invasion of publicity, by TV stupor and by intolerable music.

All this is visible to observers from all the worlds of our planet. The western way of life is less and less likely to become the leading model.

There are meaningful warnings which history gives a threatened or perishing society. Such are, for instance, the decadence of art, or a lack of great statesmen.

There are open and evident warnings, too. The center of your democracy and of your culture is left without electric power for a few hours only, and all of a sudden crowds of American citizens start looting and creating havoc.

The smooth surface film must be very thin, then, the social system quite unstable and unhealthy.

But the fight for our planet, physical and spiritual, a fight of cosmic proportions, is not a vague matter of the future; it has already started.

The forces of evil have begun their decisive offensive, you can feel their pressure, and yet your screens and publications are full of prescribed smiles and raised glasses. What is the joy about?

Very well-known representatives of your society, such as George Kennan, say: We cannot apply moral criteria to politics. Thus we mix good and evil, right and wrong and make space for the absolute triumph of absolute evil in the world.

On the contrary, only moral criteria can help the West against communism's well-planned world strategy. There are no other criteria. Practical or occasional considerations of any kind will inevitably be swept away by strategy. After a certain level of the problem has been reached, legalistic thinking induces paralysis, it prevents one from seeing the size and meaning of events.

In spite of the abundance of information, or maybe because of it, the West has difficulties in understanding reality such as it is. There have been naive predictions by some American experts who believed that Angola would become the Soviet Union's Vietnam or that Cuban expeditions in Africa would best be stopped by special U.S. courtesy to Cuba.

Kennan's advice to his own country—to begin unilateral disarmament—belongs to the same category. If you only knew how the youngest of the Moscow Old Square officials laugh at your political wizards!

As to Fidel Castro, he frankly scorns the United States, sending his troops to distant adventures from his country right next to yours.

However, the most cruel mistake occurred with the failure to understand the Vietnam War. Some people sincerely wanted all wars to stop just as soon as possible; others believed that there should be room for national, or communist, self-determination in Vietnam, or in Cambodia, as we see today with particular clarity.

But members of the U.S. antiwar movement wound up being involved in the betrayal of Far Eastern nations, in a genocide and in the suffering today imposed on 30 million people there. Do those convinced pacifists hear the moans coming from there? Do they understand their responsibility today? Or do they prefer not to hear?

The American intelligentsia lost its nerve, and as a consequence thereof danger has come much closer to the United States. But there is no awareness of this.

Your shortsighted politicians who signed

the hasty Vietnam capitulation seemingly gave America a carefree breathing pause; however, a hundredfold Vietnam now looms over you.

That small Vietnam has been a warning and an occasion to mobilize the nation's courage. But if a full-fledged America suffered a real defeat from a small communist half-country, how can the West hope to stand firm in the future?

I have had occasion already to say that in the 20th century western democracy has not won any major war without help and protection from a powerful continental ally whose philosophy and ideology it did not question.

In World War II against Hitler, instead of winning that war with its own forces, which would certainly have been sufficient, Western democracy grew and cultivated another enemy who would prove worse and more powerful yet, as Hitler never had so many resources and so many people, nor did he offer any attractive ideas, or have such a large number of supporters in the West—a potential fifth column—as the Soviet Union.

At present, some western voices already have spoken of obtaining protection from a third power against aggression in the next world conflict, if there is one; in this case the shield would be China. But I would not wish such an outcome to any country in the world.

First of all, it is again a doomed alliance with evil; also, it would grant the United States a respite, but when at a later date China with its billion people would turn around armed with American weapons, America itself would fall prey to a genocide similar to the one perpetrated in Cambodia in our days.

And yet—no weapons, no matter how powerful, can help the West until it overcomes its loss of willpower. In a state of psychological weakness, weapons become a burden for the capitulating side. To defend oneself, one must also be ready to die; there is little such readiness in a society raised in the cult of material well-being.

Nothing is left, then, but concessions, attempts to gain time and betrayal. Thus at the shameful Belgrade Conference free western diplomats in their weakness surrendered the line where enslaved members of Helsinki watchgroups are sacrificing their lives.

Western thinking has become conservative; the world situation should stay as it is at any cost, there should be no changes. This debilitating dream of a status quo is the symptom of a society which has come to the end of its development.

But one must be blind in order not to see that oceans no longer belong to the West, while land under its domination keeps shrinking. The two so-called world wars—they were by far not on a world scale, not yet—have meant internal self-destruction of the small progressive West which has thus prepared its own end. The next war—which does not have to be an atomic one and I do not believe it will—may well bury eastern civilization forever.

Facing such a danger, with such historical values in your past, at such a high level of realization of freedom and apparently of devotion to freedom, how is it possible to lose to such an extent the will to defend oneself?

How has this unfavorable relation of forces come about? How did the West decline from its triumphal march to its present sickness? Have there been fatal turns and losses of direction in its development?

It does not seem so. The West kept advancing socially in accordance with its proclaimed intentions, with the help of brilliant technological progress. And all of a sudden it found itself in its present state of weakness. This means that the mistake must be at the root, at the very basis of human thinking in the past centuries.

I refer to the prevailing western view of the world which was first born during the Renaissance and found its political expression from the period of the Enlightenment. It became the basis for government and social science and could be defined as rationalistic humanism or humanistic autonomy: the proclaimed and enforced autonomy of man from any higher force above him. It could also be called anthropocentricity, with man seen as the center of everything that exists.

The turn introduced by the Renaissance evidently was inevitable historically. The Middle Ages had come to a natural end by exhaustion, becoming an intolerable despotic repression of man's physical nature in favor of the spiritual one.

Then, however, we turned our backs upon the Spirit and embraced all that is material with excessive and unwarranted zeal. This new way of thinking, which had imposed on us its guidance, did not admit the existence of intrinsic evil in man nor did it see any higher task than the attainment of happiness on earth.

It based modern western civilization on the dangerous trend to worship man and his material needs. Everything beyond physical well-being and accumulation of material goods, all other human requirements and characteristics of a subtler and higher nature, were left outside the area of attention of state and social systems, as if human life did not have any superior sense.

That provided access for evil, of which in our days there is a free and constant flow. Merely freedom does not in the least solve all the problems of human life and it even adds a number of new ones.

However, in early democracies, as in American democracy at the time of its birth, all individual human rights were granted because man is God's creature. That is, freedom was given to the individual conditionally, in the assumption of his constant religious responsibility.

Such was the heritage of the preceding thousand years. Two hundred or even 50 years ago, it would have seemed quite impossible, in America, that an individual could be granted boundless freedom simply for the satisfaction of his instincts or whims.

Subsequently, however, all such limitations were discarded everywhere in the West; a total liberation occurred from the moral heritage of Christian centuries with their great reserves of mercy and sacrifice.

As humanism in its development became more and more materialistic, it made itself increasingly accessible to speculation and manipulation at first by socialism and then by communism. So that Karl Marx was able to say in 1844 that "communism is naturalized humanism."

This statement turned out to be not entirely senseless. One does see the same stones in the foundations of a despirtualized humanim and of any type of socialism: endless materialism; freedom from religion and religious responsibility, which under communist regimes reach the stage of antireligious dictatorship; concentration on social structures with a seemingly scientific approach.

This is typical of the Enlightenment in the 18th century and of Marxism. Not by coincidence all of communisms meaningless pledges and oaths are about Man, with a capital M, and his earthly happiness.

At first glance it seems an ugly parallel: common traits in the thinking and way of life of today's West and today's East? But such is the logic of materialistic development.

We are now experiencing the consequences of mistakes which had not been noticed at the beginning of the journey. We have placed too much hope in political and social reforms, only to find out that we were being deprived of our most precious possession: our spiritual life.

In the East, it is destroyed by the dealings and machinations of the ruling party. In the West, commercial interests tend to suffocate it. This is the real crisis. The split in the world is less terrible than the similarity of the disease plaguing its main sections.●

IN PRAISE OF CETA

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is currently considering the reenactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. The CETA system has proven its effectiveness both in aiding the long-term unemployed and in providing immediate, high-impact stimulus to the national economy. I believe that the major strength of the CETA system rests on its ability to respond quickly and flexibly to national goals. I am concerned that those strengths are being undermined. Debate thus far has focused on scattered incidents of abuse in the program. Many of the new provisions in the CETA bill are addressed at curbing those abuses legislatively rather than through effective management and monitoring by the Department of Labor. The new provisions may severely limit the flexibility of the CETA system to respond quickly and effectively to both national priorities and local needs.

Prior to full House action on the bill (H.R. 12452), I would like to cite some of the successes achieved in Baltimore under the CETA program. The Baltimore Metropolitan Manpower Consortium has built a national reputation for excellence on strong local planning and innovative programing to meet local needs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that several articles about the CETA program in Baltimore be printed in the RECORD.

The following is excerpted from a major article appearing in the December 1977 issue of the County Manpower Report. It describes a program conducted by the CETA prime sponsor in Baltimore. The program attempted, with great success, to test the concepts embodied in present welfare reform proposals, and looked closely at the feasibility of using public jobs to channel welfare recipients into the economic mainstream.

CRISIS AND RESPONSE IN WELFARE: THE BALTIMORE EXPERIENCE

Congress and the Carter administration are currently debating full employment legislation and welfare reform proposals. However, a number of issues on which there are conflicting opinions remain to be resolved. In this context the Baltimore Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources has reviewed some of its own experience in this area and is presenting it here as a possible resource.

From our experience with a welfare-related manpower program, we have drawn some conclusions about the role of public employment programs that serve the disadvantaged unemployed.

First, we found that welfare recipients were generally anxious to work—even part-time work at the minimum wage—if they were given the opportunity and assistance.

The people in the Baltimore program had good attendance records, and their performance evaluations were good.

Second, our experience showed that under CETA a public employment program to help a specific segment of the population can be started quickly. However, it's very important that the governing regulations on such a program be flexible in the implementation so that diverse local needs can be met. Furthermore, our experience showed that an integrated system, locally managed, is not only possible but also effective from both a cost and service viewpoint.

Another conclusion that we were able to draw is that if the participants—who are traditionally considered disadvantaged—are expected to eventually obtain unsubsidized jobs in the private sector, then giving them immediate work is not the only solution. They should be taught skills, either in on-the-job training situations or in the classroom. Other job-related skills, such as securing transportation or how to get a business loan, should be taught in addition to job search skills and basic education.

Finally, barriers to employment for these people must be overcome. These barriers may be subjective or objective in nature. Subjective barriers include the participants' attitudes toward society, work, employers, and themselves. Objective barriers are factors like limited education, lack of skills or work experiences, and even a criminal record. These barriers were addressed by the job skill and education components of the program. Other barriers to permanent, full-time employment are often raised by the program itself. For example, a participant who works full time under the program is unable to look for another job and still maintain good attendance. In fact, the participant is often penalized, with either loss of wages or a bad record, and discouraged from seeking work during business hours. And if the wages in a subsidized job are high, a participant may not be motivated to look for another job. To overcome these barriers, the Baltimore program reduced the hours of work during the week, providing the opportunity and incentive for the participants to find an unsubsidized job. At the same time, the program provided participants with assistance on how to find a job and hold it.

Without a measurable recovery in the private sector, no amount of innovative program design and client commitment can achieve the program's goals.

THE WELFARE CRISIS IN BALTIMORE CITY

For more than eleven years Baltimore City, in conjunction with the State of Maryland, maintained a program to meet the temporary needs of able-bodied unemployed, or underemployed persons who were without income or resources and were not eligible for aid under any federal assistance program. But in 1975, Baltimore's General Public Assistance to Employables (GPA–E) program ran into trouble. Between October 1974 and February 1976, during a period of recession and increasing unemployment, the number of GPA–E cases in Baltimore City increased by 600 percent from 207 cases to 1,466 cases. Expenditures rose by a similar margin, from a monthly average of $20,804 in October 1974 to $151,379 in February, 1976. In its fiscal year 1976 budget (July 1975 to June 1976), Baltimore City allocated $175,000 as its share of a $350,000 program. By the end of October 1975, however, the entire amount had been spent. In an emergency move, the city allocated an additional $150,000 to be combined with a similar amount from the state for the remainder of the fiscal year.

At the same time an effort was made by the City Department of Social Services to alter the regulations and guidelines for GPA–E in order to bring program size and expenditures under control and to concentrate assistance on the most needy cases. The state, however, refused to modify regulations, and by January 1976, the program funds were exhausted and a deficit began accruing. Faced with increasing expenditures and deficits with no prospect of control, the GPA–E program was suspended at the end of February, 1976. But the needs of hundreds of people remained.

THE CETA RESPONSE

With the suspension of GPA–E assistance the city turned to the CETA program administered by the Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources to help meet the needs of former recipients with job and training opportunities. An emergency Adult Work Experience (AWE) program was created to provide temporary public sector employment on a part-time basis for the former GPA–E recipients. The program was designed to operate for only 16 weeks or until the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1976 and its major purpose was to help participants get unsubsidized jobs.

To ensure that as many job positions as possible would be available and as an incentive to get participants looking for unsubsidized jobs, positions were funded for a maximum of twenty-eight hours a week at the minimum wage of $2.30 an hour. The CETA public sector worksite development unit responded by creating 235 job slots at five different worksites where city agencies had significant public service needs.

The former recipients of the GPA–E program were notified by letter of the new program and were referred to one of five CETA Manpower Service Center (MSC) for registration. Of the 3,272 people notified, 837 former recipients came to the various centers to receive services, including counseling, job search skills workshops, and referral to training, remedial education, work experience, or jobs. Of this number, 462 qualified for one of the AWE positions. Eventually, 327 of these applicants (including "no shows") were selected, on a random basis, for the 235 jobs which existed. Only five of the applicants selected refused to participate at the point of selection.

The entire hiring process was conducted on a single day. Of those selected to apply for jobs, 268, again including refills for no shows, were actually hired. Fifty-seven of the selected applicants did not show for the hiring process, while two of those hired refused employment. Of those hired, 235 began work and the other thirty-three did not report for work. A schematic diagram of the identification and hiring process through actually being employed is shown in Figure 1.

One major factor in the GPA–E effort was the timing of the CETA response. Less than one month elapsed from the time of CETA's initial notification of the problem through actual employment of some of the former recipients in AWE positions. The time involved in the implementation of the GPA–E AWE program was in line with the observations of a number of studies of job creation in public employment programs. These studies show the time it takes to implement such programs is short when an established system of public employment is in place, flexibility exists in the regulations governing the eligibility of participants and program design, and there is a high and increasing rate of unemployment in the target population.

Subsequent experience of the prime sponsor during the recent Title VI buildup and other temporary job creation programs, such as the President's energy crisis jobs program last February, confirm the ability of the prime sponsor to react quickly and responsively.

CONCLUSION

The program proved that a locally developed manpower delivery system can meet the needs of a targeted welfare client population. Also the voluntary work program received a positive response from the participants.

This and other experiences in Baltimore reinforce the important role of local officials in designing and delivering manpower services to meet the critical needs of jobseekers. However, without local autonomy, flexibility, and control over the resources and design of a manpower delivery system, such responsiveness would not be possible.

The following is excerpted from an article that appeared in the April issue of Worklife magazine published by the U.S. Department of Labor. The article discussed some outstanding programs developed under the skill training improvement program (STIP) a special grant offered by the Department of Labor to CETA prime sponsors. The excerpt relates to Baltimore's innovative use of these Federal funds to train economically disadvantaged workers in a number of new occupations.

The first STIP grants were awarded on a competitive basis last November, when prime sponsors got nearly $123 million to run local projects. Additional grants were awarded early this year, and remaining program funds will be allocated under another round of grants to be made within the next few months.

During the first funding round, prime sponsors could apply for STIP grants totaling up to 25 percent of their title I allocations. Among the prime sponsors that received the maximum amount was the Baltimore Metropolitan Manpower Consortium, which received nearly $3.5 million for 13 STIP projects that will train between 300 and 400 persons. Baltimore's STIP effort offers one example of how the program works and shows some of the many kinds of training it may include.

Baltimore developed its STIP proposals after consulting with employers already working with the prime sponsor and conducting a mail survey of employers on lists maintained by the Chamber of Commerce and the Baltimore Economic Development Corp., a quasi-government agency promoting local economic growth. In addition, the Consortium ran an ad in local newspapers and business journals explaining that CETA officials were assessing training and personnel needs of Baltimore area employers, especially those interested in training additional workers for their own establishments.

"We got a good response to the ad, and we're still getting feedback," Jay Harrison of the Baltimore Consortium reported early this year. Harrison noted, however, that not all the employers' suggestions led to STIP projects. "Some employers came up with ideas that didn't lend themselves to STIP but were compatible with regular OJT. So we asked them if they'd be interested in doing that, and it's accounted for a considerable number of new OJT contracts."

Research done by Baltimore CETA staff indicates that the occupations eventually chosen for STIP training pay starting wages of between $4.50 and $6 an hour. For every occupation chosen, the Consortium has on file letters from local employers expressing either a commitment to hire STIP graduates or a serious interest in considering them.

One of Baltimore's most innovative STIP projects trains opticians, optical mechanics, and contact lens mechanics. This project, which will last 9 months and train 30 participants, was designed jointly by the Consortium and the Maryland Association of Ophthalmic Dispensers.

The project will include classroom instruction, laboratory training, and OJT. The classroom component, being offered by Essex Community College, will cover such subjects as optics, theory of light propagation, reflection and refraction of plane surfaces, and anatomy and physiology of the eye. Partici-

pants will also get training in a laboratory set up by the Maryland Association of Ophthalmic Dispensers, followed by OJT in the offices of Association members. During the classroom and laboratory phases, trainees will receive $3 an hour. OJT wages will be negotiated with individual employers.

In another Baltimore STIP project, WES Corp., a minority electronics firm, is preparing 50 persons to become rapid transit electronic technicians, workers who operate the controls for transportation systems like San Francisco's BART and Washington, D.C.'s new Metrorail subway. Several Baltimore firms build component parts for such systems, and these companies have expressed interest in hiring project graduates.

The year-long program will include such areas as rail and transit control, signal technology, cab signals, basic track circuitry, and the electronics of transit control. Training will consist solely of classroom instruction.

Another Baltimore STIP project is training 75 persons for three occupations related to weatherization: weatherization mechanics who install insulation and weatherstripping; estimators who can assess the needs of residential or commercial buildings for insulation and compute the costs of necessary materials and labor; and supervisors who can direct and manage weatherization crews. Training will combine classroom instruction and OJT.

This project, which aims to tap the growing market for workers skilled in energy conservation techniques, was developed with the assistance of Baltimore's Frank A. Knott Remodeling Co. Knott Co. employees designed the training format, compiled lists of the tools and equipment needed for training, and provided instruction. The company will also coordinate the project's OJT component, providing some OJT itself and soliciting cooperation from other local firms.

Like most of Baltimore's 13 STIP projects, those cited above provide training for persons who have been unemployed. Three projects, however, focus on upgrade training:

20 aides employed by nursing homes are being trained as licensed practical nurses skilled in geroltological nursing and chronic care;

16 machine operators are learning to set up lathes, drills, and milling machines for precision metalworking; and

4 unskilled employees of a metal-working firm are being upgraded, two as welders and two as machine tool operators.

Jay Harrison says the Baltimore Consortium is pleased that STIP allows prime sponsors to provide upgrade training. "We can't provide upgrading with regular OJT funds," he says, "and we think that misses a chance to upgrade one employee while creating a job opportunity at the entry level. It essentially gives you two for the price of one." ●

KATE IRELAND

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for years I have known Miss Kate Ireland who, through the Frontier Nursing Service, has been an "angel." Her life has been dedicated to construction of health facilities and to financing and supervising delivery of health care. Miss Kate Ireland has put service above self. I include an interview from the Thousandsticks News:

KATE IRELAND, FRONTIER NURSING SERVICE

(By Martha Wiglesworth)

Miss Kate Ireland, native of Cleveland, Ohio, adopted Kentucky when she came in 1966 to live in Hyden because of her interest in the Frontier Nursing Service and the problems of the whole Appalachian region. Her volunteer activities in Cleveland included various positions in the Junior League, the Mental Health Association, the Visiting Nurse Association, and the Republican Party. She served on the Cleveland Symphony Women's Committee and was regional auditions chairman for the Metropolitan Opera Association. She is presently chairman of the Kentucky River Area Development District, director of Hyden Citizens' Bank, treasurer of the Regional Mental Health and Retardation Care Center, national chairman of the Frontier Nursing Service, and principal stockholder of the Appalachia Motel.

Q. Miss Ireland, in your younger days in Cleveland, your volunteer activities ranged from Junior League to health and welfare agencies; from legislative committees to support for the arts. You seem to have built your whole life around various community commitments. How did you get started in this direction?

A. I suppose much of the impetus came from the League; service is a strong emphasis in its program. Then, too, it was part of my family heritage.

Q. Your interest in the Frontier Nursing Service must have been kindled by stories from the other women in your family who were connected there.

A. Yes, by great, great aunt was on the founding committee with Mary Breckinridge back in 1925. My older sister was a courier in 1938; my grandmother and mother were also active in FNS. I came down as a courier in 1951 after a year of college at Vassar for two months in the spring, but ended up staying that first year for eight months. Later, I was in charge of the courier, or volunteer program, for fifteen years, came on the Board in 1963, and then was chairman of the development committee to raise funds for the Mary Breckinridge Hospital at Hyden. I was vice chairman of the board, and now am national chairman. I suppose I put in more hours than most paid people do when I'm at home in Leslie County.

Q. You could well be labeled a "professional volunteer." How do you react to the criticisms leveled against voluntarism?

A. I have quite a few strong feelings on this subject. I feel that anyone, male or female, whatever color, religion or social class who has any belief in God or a spiritual being, must volunteer his or her services. If one can't do anything for someone else without getting money for it, one isn't a whole person. This is the first premise that's incorrect in this business of voluntarism vs. professionalism.

Second, the argument that as a volunteer you're taking away the work of someone who would get paid for it isn't true at all. Most of the work I'vd done you couldn't have paid anyone to do. No one's going to be working all those week-ends, or the bad shifts on hospital schedules.

In no way has it impaired the woman's image to be a volunteer. I think the male volunteer and the woman volunteer can work hand in hand, just as the male and female professionals can work in complementary ways.

Q. The story of FNS itself, as I understand it, begins as a story of voluntarism with Mary Breckinridge, who chose to give her whole life to the maternal and child health needs of Eastern Kentucky.

A. Yes, volunteers have been essential to the Frontier Nursing Service. Mrs. Breckinridge had a brainstorm when she set up the system. She invited these young ladies from their finishing schools to come down, and they loved horses, and had the appeal to see another apsect of life and take care of the animals for these "nurses on horseback." She had in her mind when she organized the courier system that after they came home and got married, they would be the donors and the future of the FNS. It had an immediate but also a long-range benefit.

Q. How many have gone through the ranks as couriers?

A. We are preparing for our 50th anniversary of the courier service this May and over 600 letters are going out to these alumnae. During our capital fund drive for the hospital, every city chairman was a courier alumna or the husband of one.

Q. Hasn't FNS been largely a women's project?

A. Well, over the years we have had only a few male couriers, but men have been volunteers in various aspects of our work. And we've hired 15 to 20 guys in the past on our staff. Our present director, Dr. Rogers Beasley, is the first man in that administrative position. Now that nursing is not limited to women, or medicine to men, we find married women come for the midwifery or family nurse training, and their husbands come along. Some of the men get hired on our staff or in the community, and they settle there.

Q. Are you still drawing from a privileged class for your couriers?

A. Not as much as we were back before the Second World War. We draw more now from the regular colleges, but the couriers still have to pay for their training. They come for six weeks in the summer, two months the rest of the year. We have many more applicants for the four of five places we have in the summer, and also more than enough to fill the need in the winter.

Q. And what does their work involve?

A. In the old days, when we had the horses for the nurses and always cows around the centers, they took care of the animals. They have always been involved in transportation, so when horses began to be phased out and the jeeps were phased in with the improvements of our roads, they began to do the driving to the various nursing centers. You see we cover 1,000 square miles in Leslie and adjoining counties. We have the hospital nucleus in Hyden; we have Mrs. Breckinridge's home, Wendover, which is our donor office and organized guest area where the couriers live and seven outpost centers. Drugs have to be taken out to these nursing centers; patients' records have to be transported, fees brought back to headquarters, supplies delivered. They can do visiting with the older people and the homebound, or they work a great deal in the hospital with special clinics, helping out in the pharmacy or X-ray rooms.

Q. How are your services different today from the days when Mary Breckinridge and her trainees were battling weather, impassable roads and creeks to get into the remote sections for care of mothers and their babies?

A. All but two or three of our 300 deliveries a year are done in the hospital. One reason for this is that the insurance programs pay only for hospital deliveries, but also it is a more expedient use of the nurse-midwives' time.

Q. What does becoming a nurse-midwife involve?

A. One has to be an RN with some experience before one can take this extended training. When the Second World War came, we could no longer bring in the English nurses or send our girls for training in England, and so we opened up our own midwifery school. There are many graduate courses tied up with universities now, but in 1939 we were one of the first. At that time we took six at a time, for six months' training, graduating twelve a year. Since 1970, we have instituted another training—that of the family nurse practitioner. These are nurses trained to recognize the more "normal" sicknesses. They can check the heart, lungs, chest, eyes, ears, nose, throat, do a throat swab to send off to the lab—many things to

save the doctor's time. We also now have an affiliation with the University of Kentucky, so that a nurse can combine this training with work on her BA or MA. I think our model for a rural school with rural clinical training can be utilized elsewhere.

Q. You have already been a model for maternal health care and midwifery training in underdeveloped countries, I believe.

A. Yes, over the years we have had many visitors from other countries, through agencies such as the World Health Organization, AID, UNICEF. Until the mid-60's, we were better known abroad than in the U.S.; better known on the East Coast than in Kentucky.

Q. What could wider knowledge of your service do for you?

A. For one thing, we always need additional financial support. Some of our patients are able to pay; some have insurance plans, but these do not cover all the costs by any means. Our people are proud, they're hard workers, but they are barely above the poverty income line and so do not qualify for public aid. These are the ones who have a hard time meeting their health care problems, and we are always trying to raise money to assist these private paying families.

Also, we feel our product that we are turning out of our school—our family nurse midwife—is a product that can be used throughout the U.S. Because we are in close cooperation with all the other health providers in surrounding counties, these nurses have had experience which makes them valuable in needy or rural communities. The MD can use three or four of these nurses to relieve him, and if we are talking about cost containment in this country, it's the use of para-medical personnel that's going to save us some money. Another thing is the prevention side of medicine. The nurse has always had more time to discuss things like nutrition and exercise. Since they do go into the homes, they have the chance to diagnose illnesses before they become so serious.

Q. What about birth control?

A. We've been into birth control, or family planning as we call it, since 1959. Dr. John Rock was a friend of Mary Breckinridge. When he was still doing the research on the pill, he came down to our area and Mrs. Breckinridge allowed her nurses to distribute the pill if the family would consent to participate. Often now, the families are not so agricultural, so they don't have the need for the numbers of children. Our birth rate in Leslie County dropped in ten years from 40 per 1,000 to 18 or 19 per 1,000.

Q. You have many other connections with the Appalachian community—mental health, Board of Trustees for Berea College, and you're in Lexington today in your capacity as chairman of the Kentucky River Area Development District Board. How did you, an outsider, come to this responsibility?

A. I will always be an outsider, even though I've been in Leslie County since 1951 and have made my permanent home there since 1966. In a way, this makes me more useful. I first got interested in health needs, then was chairman of the Human Resources Committee for the same area for four years, worked in mental health committees at the state as well as the regional level. Whenever I saw a need, I went to work on it. With the help of a local businessman, Eddie J. Moore, we built a 24-unit motel-restaurant, the only one in the county. Right now, we need a small airport—that may be the next push. I suppose I am seen as a business asset in the community, as someone with experience in committees, as representing, or maybe I just had lots of friends. Anyway, I had a landslide victory of one vote to be elected chairman of the Kentucky River Area Development District.

Q. You are also serving on the Board of Trustees of Berea College. You are functioning in top level roles in business and community organization, with politicians and educators. Has the fact that you are a woman made any difference?

A. I have no problems working with either men or women. I respect them as persons who are either heads of their departments or doing a professional job. As far as questions about the status of women, I go on record as being against women's liberation. I don't see that it has helped the women's cause at all. Of course a woman's mind is just as keen as a man's. A woman can do what a man can do, but maybe in different ways. I'm on the team for women's lib if you mean the part that women frequently get paid less for the same job.

I think the woman is first of all a mother, and those first formative years of the child's life are very important. If she chooses to have children, then she is going to be out of her career for a few years. The father needs to share in the care of the children, and that is their first priority.

Q. Your main objection to the women's movement, then, is that you feel it does not support the view of the woman's primary responsibility being with the child?

A. Yes. There are many couples now, however, not planning to have children. In this case, the woman can do anything the man can do. And it's a different story with the older woman who raises her children well and then gets involved. I'm not saying women can't do a career and raise their children simultaneously, but then they have to have a lot more cooperation from their husbands.

Q. With all this responsibility, do you find time to play?

A. Oh yes, but my favorite sport is not very womanly. I love the out-of-doors; shooting is a big thing with me. I'm a conservationist, but also a hunter. They're not incompatible.

Q. How could the Junior League life of Cleveland lead to Wendover at Hyden?

A. I guess I just enjoy people, and so I haven't really noticed any difference. I do miss the culture—the symphony. I can get some of this on the radio, the Met on Saturday afternoons. I usually go to New York once or twice a year for the Met. I'm enjoying "talking books," the classics now produced on tapes, and I carry these along in my car or hotel rooms.

Q. You don't feel deprived or hemmed in, living in the mountains?

A. I travel so much. My family, fortunately, can get together frequently in South Georgia to hunt, or in Maine in the summer for sailing. I have time with my family—my 83-year-old father, brothers and sisters, nieces and nephews. I prefer to live in the country where I can have good air to breathe, have my dogs around me, raise ducks and pheasants. I swim every day in the river from April to November. I share my home with Ann Cundle, an English woman who came over to work at FNS in 1966. We raise a garden, and I cook when I'm in the mood for being domestic. For me, life is a good combination of being with people and being alone, of freedom and commitment. I like it that way!"●

DAVID DAVIS TO BE HONORED AS OUTSTANDING HANDICAPPED POSTAL EMPLOYEE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the notable achievements of David Davis, who resides in California's 26th Congressional District which I serve. David Davis is being honored Friday, June 16, as the 1978 Outstanding Handicapped Postal Employee for the Western Region.

Dave worked at the Arcadia Post Office, located in the same building as my district office, where his coworkers cannot praise him enough. Now Dave works for the Pasadena Post Office where, incidentally, I worked part-time delivering special delivery mail in high school. Kathryn Wilson, MSC Manager/Postmaster of Pasadena, wrote the following letter to John Kennedy, District Director of Employees and Labor Relations for the Post Office, explaining why David deserved this honor . . .

Mr. Davis has been severely handicapped with Cerebral Palsy. This is a condition he has lived with his entire life. David is 29 years old, single and lives in Arcadia with his parents. He has been a postal employee since June of 1974, serving as a Custodian, Level 2. David has consistently been utilized in higher level custodial capacities because of his tremendous attitude and work output.

Being afflicted with Cerebral Palsy has not dampened this man's spirits at all. He walks with a high degree of difficulty and yet manages to turn out almost as much work as two average custodians. Dave undergoes therapy at least once a week at a clinic in Duarte. His affliction is naturally painful at times and yet he has used but a few days of sick leave in his three and one-half years with the Postal Service.

David Davis graduated from Pasadena High School in June of 1969. He has generally been confined to special education classes throughout his formal education. He has lived in the East and West and resided with his family for a time, in Utah. David enjoys bowling, bicycling, and swimming as hobbies, and, he states, "they're used for therapy, also."

In talking to Dave there is no question but that he intends to make the Postal Service a career. This is good news for his supervisor since David is rated as one of our most outstanding custodial employees, regardless of any handicap. Dave will never be found without a dustcloth or broom in his hand, working. Our brass and bronze doorknobs are eternally shining because of Dave's efforts. In point of fact, his supervisor sometimes worries that he is tackling jobs beyond his capabilities. In spite of his handicap Dave gets up on ladders to clean and dust our overhead light fixtures. He often refuses assistance and he considers no job too big or too small. It is really a pleasure to have a man such as David Davis working for us.

In view of Dave's outstanding achievements, it seemed appropriate to take this time on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to him. David Davis is truly an admirable young man. The residents in the 26th Congressional District of California and my colleagues in Congress join me in extending our congratulations to David Davis and wish him continued success.●

NAVY PROGRAMS GAIN ON CAPITOL HILL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

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

[From the Sea Power, June 1978]

NAVY PROGRAMS GAIN ON CAPITOL HILL; NUCLEAR CARRIER APPROVED

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The United States Navy and its supporters on Capitol Hill have won the first round of "The Great Naval Debate of 1978."

Late last month, the House of Representatives, rejecting the recommendation of the Carter administration, voted overwhelmingly to authorize funds for a fifth large-deck nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

When the balloting had finished, the House had authorized a total of $37.9 billion for military procurement, research, and civil defense in fiscal 1979. Included therein was in excess of $2.1 billion for a new 95,000-ton Nimitz-class flattop.

President Carter had not requested any kind of aircraft carrier when he sent his budget to Congress last January. He and Secretary of Defense Harold Brown had told the pertinent committees they opposed a nuclear carrier, but would request a conventional oil-fired one—designated CVV, because it would carry vertical/short takeoff and landing planes—in fiscal 1980.

Then, after both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees voted to authorize a nuclear carrier in fiscal 1979, Mr. Carter sent out word that he would be willing to start the CVV a year earlier than he had planned. The compromise bid failed in the House.

NIMITZ OUTLOOK BULLISH

The action now shifts to the Senate, where a companion military authorization bill, different in a number of major respects from the House measure, soon will be taken up on the floor. The chances that the upper chamber will also approve a fourth Nimitz ship are considered to be excellent.

Carter and Brown are expected to continue the fight against the nuclear carrier, probably right through the appropriations process which follows authorization.

(Authorization bills do not, of course, provide budget authority as such. They authorize appropriations and the actual budget authority must be approved through an appropriations act.)

The House bill provides an increase in authorizations of more than $2.4 billion over the $35.5 billion requested by the President. In the procurement sector, the increase is in excess of $3 billion, but the research and development category was reduced by $636 million.

Most of the House-approved increase was in ship construction ($2.3 billion). In addition to the $2.1 billion for the carrier, $1.1 billion was authorized for a Virginia-class cruiser armed with the Aegis fleet missile defense system. The Carter administration also opposed this ship for FY 1979.

To help hold down the ship construction total—which wound up at a little over $7 billion—the House deleted authorization of $912 million for an eighth Trident ballistic missile submarine because of delays in the program.

"A VERY SIGNIFICANT YEAR"

In its report on the authorization—which, incidentally, was approved by the house almost intact by a 319 to 67 vote—the Armed Services Committee observed that "this is a very significant year" for the future of the Navy and naval shipbuilding.

It then gave the following account of how the Carter administration had failed to get its act together in this important defense area:

"President Carter, on May 19, 1977, announced a new five-year shipbuilding program that included 30 ships and $8.5 billion in fiscal year 1979. Overall, it included 180 ships (with 20 conversions) for almost $50 billion. Only four days later, on May 23, 1977, the Navy was only permitted to ask for 17 new ships at $6.3 billion for the fiscal 1979 program, with a total five-year program of $45 billion for 99 ships. This was a drastic cut in four days. Of these ships, 26 would be conversion, not new ships.

"The Navy, in 1977, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, instituted a study as to the proper size of the Navy in the year 2000. The study was not completed at the time the hearings commenced on this authorization bill. The bill as submitted contained a proposed shipbuilding budget of only 15 ships (at a cost of $4.7 billion) for fiscal 1979. The required five-year program projection was not submitted. At the same time the President's budget message to Congress mentioned a $42 billion five-year shipbuilding program.

"In his initial testimony this year, the Secretary of Defense stressed the fact that the Naval Force Planning Study (SEAPLAN 2000) had not been completed, and since this was to be the basis for the five-year shipbuilding program, that program could be submitted only when the study was completed.

"The Naval Force Planning Study was forwarded to the Congress on March 21, 1978, and on March 24, 1978, the Secretary of Defense presented a five-year shipbuilding plan for only 83 ships for those five years (of which 70 were to be new) at a cost of $32 billion.

"Thus, in less than only one year the President's Navy program has dropped $18 billion and nearly 100 ships."

THE BIGGEST ONE-SHIP DIFFERENCE

Ironically, although the House added $2.3 billion to the ship construction authorization, if Congress appropriates the funds they will buy only 16 ships instead of the 15 that Mr. Carter would buy for $4.7 billion.

But the point that must be remembered is this: All sides agree that the Navy needs one more aircraft carrier to be able to maintain a force of 12 flattops through the end of this century. If Congress provides the funds this year then the years-long running controversy over a fifth nuclear carrier can end and the problem of numbers of other needed types can be addressed in fiscal 1980 and beyond without nearly one third of the total construction budget being devoted to a single ship.

The House committee report, noting that the facts surrounding naval shipbuilding have often been misconstrued, addressed two generalizations "most often heard as somehow justifying a smaller shipbuilding program."

Generalization: The Navy has a backlog of claims running to approximately $2.7 billion which is causing a delay in ship construction, and it is necessary to slow down the shipbuilding program until the mess is cleared up.

Fact: The overwhelming majority of claims come from three shipbuilders and are the product of contracts made several years ago. The present Navy leadership has made "substanial progress" on the claims but, regardless, past claims have little to do with the current ability of shipyards to build ships. "Shipbuilders can build for the future while lawyers argue over the past."

Generalization: Big, expensive, nuclear supercarriers are too costly. The Navy should build less expensive, because conventionally-powered, smaller carriers.

Fact: The official studies of recent years show conclusively that the Nimitz-class carrier (CVN) is the most effective in battle, is the least vulnerable, and is the most cost-effective ship.

"The closest competitor to the CVN is the conventionally-powered medium size carrier, called the CVV," the report said. "It has frequently been postulated that two CVVs can be purchased for the price of one CVN. This is simply not the case. The best estimated life cycle cost-ratio of the CVV to the CVN is 5:4 for the deck only, or 4:3 if the aircraft suite is included.

"When the total life-cycle costs for militarily equivalent task forces are considered, the costs are about even, if not slightly in favor of the nuclear task force."

CVN/CVV COMPARISON

The committee report also noted that it is sometimes argued that having two CVVs would provide the flexibility of being in two different places at once.

"The proposition is appealing until it is recognized that each of the CVVs will require additional escort and logistic forces, thereby adding to naval support costs, which have not been included in the cost studies."

The report said the issue of which of the two carriers is preferable is moot in any case, because only one more large-deck carrier is planned to be added to the force.

It gave the following comparison of the military characteristics of the two types of ships:

The CVN aviation payload is more than double that of the CVV and it can carry twice as much aircraft ammunition, nearly three times as much aviation fuel, and 89–94 aircraft as against 50–64 for the CVV.

In addition, the CVN has four catapults, four aircraft elevators, and four shafts to two of each for the CVV. The CVN has a significantly greater speed, and propulsion endurance of 13 years, compared with a few days for the CVV.

In its rationale favoring the CVN, the Senate Armed Services Committee made another valid point. It said the Nimitz class is a known quantity (two are already in the fleet and a third is under construction) while the CVV has not yet been designed or built.

"The CVV is as yet a 'paper' carrier," the Senate panel said in its report. "The currently estimated cost of $1,575 million (or nearly $1.6 billion) is at best a 'ballpark' estimate. The cost of operating and maintaining a CVV medium carrier is not known. However, separate and more costly supply and maintenance operations may be required because the CVV would be the only ship of its kind in the fleet."

The Senators credit the CVN with comparatively greater carrying capacities than the House panel does—more than four times the aviation fuel, nearly three times the aircraft ammunition, and a 50% larger air wing.

For all of the above reasons, it seems likely that if Congress funds one more big carrier it will be a CVN despite its higher front-end cost.

DIRTY POOL ON AEGIS

As for its recommendations to authorize more than a billion dollars for the first nuclear cruiser to be armed with Aegis, the House committee accused the Carter administration of playing dirty pool in not including such a ship in its requests this year.

"On May 19, 1977, President Carter submitted a budget amendment to the Congress for the fiscal year 1978 shipbuilding program which specifically added the long-lead time components for this cruiser, and provided for the full funding of the ship in fiscal 1979. This action was subsequently rescinded when the latest fiscal year 1979 Presidential budget request was submitted to Congress.

"The Armed Services Committee considers the failure to provide the Aegis cruiser in the Presidential budget for fiscal 1979 a breach of intent since it was on the basis of a Senate and House conference committee compromise, as written in the fiscal 1978 conference report, that the House Armed Services Committee agreed to full funding last year of the conventionally-powered DDG–47 Aegis destroyer."

The Senate committee did not authorize any funds for construction of the cruiser in its $5.6 billion shipbuilding account.

Along with the Nimitz carrier and nuclear cruiser, the House authorized one SSN–688

attack submarine, eight FFG guided missile frigates, one AD destroyer tender, three T-AGOS ocean surveillance ships for anti-submarine warfare, and one T-ARC cable repair ship.

For Navy/Marine Corps aircraft procurement, the House was generous, too, adding $476 million to the President's request, for a total of $4.6 billion.

Of the extra amount, there was $164.8 million for a dozen more F-14 Tomcats, to bring the FY 1979 total to 36, and $121.6 million for four more F-18 Hornet fighters, for a total of nine.

In addition, the House added $144.9 million for 24 more A-7E Corsair II attack jets and $90 million for 15 AV-8A Harrier V/STOL aircraft for the Marine Corps. It also deleted $113 million for 18 A-4M attack planes for the Marines.

In explaining its action on the Grumman Tomcats, the House committee report said:

"Navy testimony on the F-14 aircraft disclosed that the flyaway unit cost for 36 aircraft would be $19.2 million, compared to a flyaway unit cost for 24 aircraft of $22.1 million, a difference of $3 million in flyaway costs alone. When total program costs are computed, the analysis shows a savings of $861 million by authorizing 36 aircraft instead of 24.

"The total program buy planned is unchanged and the committee could find no rationale for the reduced buy proposed by the Defense Department beyond an arbitrary slowdown for immediate budget reductions. The committee finds this approach unacceptable."

Over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars have been wasted by arbitrary changes in aircraft production rates and ship construction schedules so that money could be "saved" in the upcoming budget year.

SES IN; LAMPS CUT

In the research and development category, the House made some changes that pleased the Navy and some that did not. Among the latter was its cancellation of the LAMPS III ASW helicopter program because of "extreme cost growth." The Navy had requested $124 million for FY 1979. Secretary of the Navy W. Graham Claytor, Jr., obviously hoping the Senate will approve the request, said later that the Navy "must have" LAMPS III.

Nor did the Navy like one bit the deletion by the House of its V/STOL technology program, for which $66.2 million had been requested. Rationale for the action: The development and procurement of "our existing high performance" aircraft is of higher priority than the development of advanced technology V/STOL planes.

On the plus side in R&D, the House voted to restore the surface effect ship (SES) program, which the Carter administration wants to kill. It left no doubt about its action, either, authorizing $93 million, or $400,000 more than the Navy originally had requested.

Asserting that the SES "represents a quantum jump" in the shipbuilding state of the art, the House committee report said the surface effect ship program "is this country's primary high-technology program that could provide a high-speed, eighty-knot and above, deep-water surface ship" for the post-1980 period.

The Senate Armed Services Committee also voted to restore the SES, but proposed only $30 million for FY 1979. If the full Senate should agree, the disparate House and Senate figures will have to be tackled by the joint conference committee and a compromise reached, as on other differences in the two bills.

The House also voted to transfer $40.1 million from the Air Force ground-launched cruise missile account to the Navy Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missile budget.

RESERVE RESTORATION

Naval reservists will be pleased to note that the House and the Senate committee have voted to authorize a force of 87,000 selected reservists. The Carter administration had asked for only 51,400.

The key vote in the House on the military authorization bill was not the final one (319 to 67). It came on an offer to substitute President Carter's original request (total $35.5 billion) for the committee bill.

The substitute was proposed by Representative Bob Carr (D-Mich.), a second-termer who serves on the Armed Services Committee. It was defeated 115 to 287.

In dissenting views on the committee's report, Carr, joined by two other minimal defense advocates, Representatives Thomas Downey of New York and Patricia Schroeder of Colorado, both Democrats, irritated the majority with a smart-aleck statement entitled "Givabucks grow on trees—just ask the committee," and which said:

"Your Armed Services Committee has run amuck. It has slipped its moorings, lost its bearings, stripped its gear, gone off its trolley, flipped its wig."

When all the voting was over, Representative Bob Wilson, ranking Republican on the panel, had this observation:

"As you can see, it was Carr who stripped his gears and ran out of gas."●

LIGHTS, CAMERA, ACTION: CRIME

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, when press accounts of an incipient scandal involving the highest levels of the motion picture industry came to light, there was talk of coverup and pressures on individuals to quiet the matter.

During this period, a single person stood out as unwavering in his belief that justice ought to be served, no matter the cost or the pressures.

Cliff Robertson, winner of an Academy Award and an Emmy Award, stood his ground and persisted. And he will apparently prevail, despite the powerful interests who wanted a coverup of the corruption within the industry.

I am proud to know Cliff Robertson as a friend. He is a man of singular courage and integrity. His stature among his colleagues in the film industry is perhaps unmatched in the wake of the Begleman affair.

Recently, Mr. Robertson delivered a speech to the Screen Actors Guild in New York. The New York Times reprinted a portion of it on June 10. I commend the attention of my colleagues to the contents of his address, for it is of great importance to us all.

The speech excerpt follows:

LIGHTS, CAMERA, ACTION: CRIME

(By Cliff Robertson)

I would like to say a few words about a cancer in our industry, a malignancy that split its first evil cell a long time ago but appeared relatively benign until recent years. Like all mortals, we have taken refuge in the hope that the diagnosis was incorrect or, at the least, exaggerated, that it is but a common ailment that will go away or, at worst we will simply have to live with.

The ugly disease has been given a rather innocuous name, a name that belies its evil intent and suggests it affects relatively few when, in truth, it affects everyone in this country.

The disease is corporate crime. And it threatens to degrade, debase and ultimately destroy the moral fabric of not only the motion-picture industry but industries throughout this country. Some say that prognosis is too dark, too dire, too dramatic. That what we are experiencing are a few local "brushfires." To those, I would say, pick up any newspaper or news magazine, read of embezzlement, bribes, payoffs, stock manipulation and corporate kickbacks.

Some months ago, when the "Hollywoodgate" scandal was finally uncovered, there were other dark, dire predictions equally dramatic. Certain superstars would boycott Columbia Pictures if an admitted forger-embezzler was not permitted to return to the scene of his crimes. They too were dark. They too were dire. But they were untrue. Other untruths and innuendos were shot from high windows. A small fiefdom that has exercised inordinate power in Hollywood desperately attempted to rally a cordon of support from those with vested interest, and they were not without some success.

Some men of integrity suddenly became silent. They didn't want to know. They played the game. They sealed their lips as well as their consciences. The odds were great. Why risk it? The firmament of fear prevailed.

Where were the brave ones? Those unafraid in previous days—unafraid to stand with small numbers if not alone?

Those others, those superstars of civic pride, those friends of the earth, those politically visioned, were they securely cocooned in million dollar contracts? Where were they? Why were they suddenly silent? Was it true? Was it really true? Is the bottom line really the buck? How tragic for them and for all of us. Was theirs a conspiracy of silence or mute evidence or moral decay? Had their dreams of an art form dissolved into a nightmare of money?

Slowly, slowly the mist is lifting. A few are coming forward to challenge, so speak out. A few.

Emotional blackmail is a frightening thing. It was frightening in the 1940's when criminal elements threatened our industry's lifeblood. Proud men were humbled into submission. Dirty, criminal hands clutched at our throats threatening us with extortion and violence. Today our industry is threatened by a foe equally formidable—perhaps more so. The hands are those of a few, astonishingly few. Hands that are nimble, manicured and slick. The wheelers, the dealers. Masters of the hip and the hype.

They make deals. The actors, directors, writers, the craftspeople, make movies. And when these movies are finished and successful, the dealers take the bow. Overnight Irving Thalbergs.

But, if the film is unsuccessful, the director has lost his touch, the actor doesn't draw, the writer is incompetent. And the dealers get in their limousines and look for new prey.

For those who don't know, or remember, there were brave men in the 1940's. Men and women who stood up to the gangsters and their bullies and kicked them out of town. Those brave men and women were members of our union, the Screen Actors Guild. And with the same courage this union can eradicate the corporate crime that is alien to the sense of decency in every member of this guild.

It has been said that Watergate proved above everything else that the system worked—the judicial system. I think it can

be said the "Hollywoodgate" has proven one thing to date. A free and responsibe press works. Indeed, it is the press that has been a purveyor of truth. And it is true, no matter how difficult, that truth will ultimately arrest corporate crime in our industry and set us free.

We'd better hurry. We haven't that much time.●

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for June 14, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION

Seventeen months after his Presidency began, people are still asking what Jimmy Carter is really like. Many view him as inexperienced and ineffective, a politician who flip-flops on the issues and has difficulty delivering on his campaign promises. Others admire his personal qualities—a lack of pretense, a willingness to work hard and an ability to admit mistakes—and believe that his basic instincts are sound. My guess is that most people do not yet have a clear picture of the Carter Administration. They do not see where the government is headed. These perceptions may explain the President's low standing in the opinion polls.

Mr. Carter assumed the Presidency at a time when that office had been weakened. Vietnam and Watergate had taken their toll in terms of esteem. The persuasive powers of the chief executive had declined and his word was no longer accepted as gospel. The role of the Congress had been fortified with the enactment of several special pieces of legislation. The War Powers Act and the Budget Act in particular had resulted in a loss of presidential influence.

American attitudes have also made the challenge of presidential leadership more formidable. The people do not seem to sense crisis in any domestic or international issue. The priorities on the national agenda are not ordered and few people are certain what they want their leaders to do. Lack of urgency and unclear priorities set limits on the President and make the Congress less responsive to his blandishments and more sensitive to political pressures and crosscurrents. The Great Society—with its singleness of purpose and its strong feeling of direction—is gone. The people recognize that there are unsolved problems, but there is nothing approaching a consensus on the proper solutions to them.

In the face of a weakened office and changing American attitudes, expectations have nonetheless remained high. The people want a forceful President and they tend to be baffled when he cannot make progress across the board. They encourage the President to break all political deadlocks and they petition his support for the many causes that interest them. They urge the President to defeat the proposals they do not like and they hold him accountable for failing to control 535 very individual members of Congress. Since the President is blamed for most of the things that go wrong, he has become responsible, in a way, for almost everything. But in our system of government it takes a long time to solve problems, and solutions are politically feasible or else they are not solutions at all.

Much of Mr. Carter's difficulty stems from the fundamental characteristics of his Presidency. To begin, he himself is a structural reformer with a keen eye for detail who does not like to deal in partial solutions or the superficialities of problems. However, his desire for comprehensive, detailed reforms may not be in tune with the mood of the country today. Though he may yet convince the people of the necessity of his legislative program, so far he has not communicated to them his sense of urgency about the problems he addresses. A second characteristic—the anti-Washington emphasis—was undoubtedly an important factor in Mr. Carter's election, but it has come back to haunt him. As an outsider uneasy with the ways of the Capital, he has needlessly crossed swords with influential legislators and has been slow to realize that good ideas and honorable intentions are not enough.

I have the feeling that the President has been hesitant to use presidential power, but that he is now settling comfortably into the Oval Office. It seems that he is beginning to master the intricate relationships in Washington and to maneuver among them, as a President must if he is to achieve his goals. He has had a long "shakedown cruise," but he has been blessed with good fortune at least in the sense that he has not had to confront a dangerous crisis. He is now intervening boldly in legislative battles, tackling long-ignored problems and having some success. After a full year of congressional haggling, the President has the energy bill moving again. He is getting tougher both in his fight against inflation and in his support of fiscal restraint. He is taking on every major foreign policy issue in the book, regardless of the political consequences. His Middle East arms sales package, his sharp attack on Soviet activities in Africa, his attempt to lift the Turkish arms embargo and his staunch advocacy of majorty rule in South Africa are outstanding examples.

Many people believe that Mr. Carter is indecisive. He seems to be responding to that criticism by making the effort to define his positions, even if the political flak is heavy. There is speculation about a one-term Presidency for him, but surely such talk is premature. Presidential historians advise us to watch the crucial third year of a President, and Mr. Carter is still several months away from it.

All of us are entitled to judge a President severely, provided that our judgment is tempered by an appreciation of the circumstances in which he governs and the limitations of his powers.●

THE NATION'S PRESS DEPLORES THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION ALLOWING THE POLICE TO SEARCH A NEWSPAPER'S OFFICES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press continues to express its horror and its indignation at the 5-to-3 Supreme Court ruling which allows police to search a newspaper office for criminal evidence without a subpena.

I am pleased that Senator BIRCH BAYH has scheduled hearings on press protection bills on June 22. Senator BAYH has filed S. 3164, entitled the Citizens' Privacy Protection Amendment of 1978.

I am pleased also to state that my bill, H.R. 12952, the Press Protection Act of 1978, now has 34 cosponsors in the House.

I reprint here, Mr. Speaker, the editorials from the Milwaukee Sentinel for June 2 and the Milwaukee Journal for June 1.

The editorials follow:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, June 2, 1978]

HIGH COURT PLACES PRESS IN JEOPARDY

A U.S. Supreme Court ruling that police may search a newspaper office for criminal evidence could open the doors for a search and destroy mission aimed at the freedom of the press.

Unless it is used with extreme discretion, a search warrant can be an intimidating weapon. In the case of newspapers, the intimidation will not directly affect conscientious reporters and editors but it is certain to have an impact on news sources.

It will be difficult, if not impossible, to keep a promise of confidentiality if there is a threat that the police may unexpectedly burst into the newsroom and start rifling through the paper's files.

Similar arguments had been made in the lower courts which earlier ruled in the case involving the search of a Stanford University student newspaper in 1971. The object was to turn up photos of suspected participants in a student demonstration and no new evidence was found.

The lower court findings were that the search was incompatible with the right of a free press guaranteed in First Amendment to the Constitution. It also was ruled that police searches of the premises of someone not suspected of a crime are almost never legally justified.

How the high court could find otherwise should be a matter of concern not only to the press but also to those who benefit from its unfettered operation. It has been only a few years since the confidentiality of news sources led to the exposure of crimes which resulted in jail sentences for several high placed national administration officials and the resignation of a president.

When the five member court majority voted to allow the surprise search of newspaper premises, it also eroded the protection the free press affords the public from such governmental abuses.

And it is not as though police had no other recourse than a search warrant in obtaining evidence from the press. It has always been easy enough to subpena particular items or broad categories of information.

The significant difference is that, when requests in subpenas are believed to be unreasonable, the point can be argued in court. A search warrant, under Wisconsin law, "shall be issued with all practicable secrecy," and the information on which it is based "shall not be . . . made public in any way" until it is executed.

Taken with the high court decision, this provision can be used to abolish the constitutional guarantee of a free press, not by the formal process of repeal, but in secret ceremony and without argument from those whose rights are being taken away.

State judges now vested with this authority should keep the potential consequences of their action on that freedom in mind. It is the kind of power that has the potential for bringing down not only a free press, but a free country as well.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, June 1, 1978]

RUMMAGING THROUGH THE NEWSROOM

The U.S. Supreme Court has accorded distressingly broad search powers to police in the case of the Stanford Daily in California.

We will grant, of course, that police must have reasonable access to all pertinent evidence in criminal cases if they are to perform their duties properly. Indeed, there are

times when a search warrant is the only effective means of obtaining important evidence. That is especially true if officers have reason to think the evidence will otherwise be destroyed or concealed. Yet a surprise search is by no means the only way to get evidence. Searches are a drastic device that should be reserved for cases in which less intrusive methods do not appear workable.

In the Stanford case, for example, it simply was not necessary for police to go barging into the newspaper office and rummaging around. No one on the Daily staff was suspected of committing crimes or concealing evidence. The only reason given for the search was that the police thought the newspaper had photographic negatives that might be useful in identifying persons who had taken part in a riot. As it turned out, the negatives contained no useful evidence.

Yet, even if such evidence had existed, it could have been obtained by subpena, without subjecting the newspaper office to unreasonable search and seizure.

The lower federal courts wisely condemned the search as unconstitutional, saying it was almost never proper to search the premises of someone not suspected of a crime. Those courts also noted that freedom of the press is chilled when police subject newspapers to unannounced searches. Unfortunately, the high court passed over those valid points and gave police more freedom to conduct searches than they really need.

The decision raises many disturbing possibilities. If police are permitted to conduct surprise raids on journalists, they also can be given warrants to subject innocent doctors, lawyers and other citizens to the same intrusion. What happens to private, confidential information that cops may see while pawing through files, notebooks and personal possessions?

The only slightly reassuring fact is that the Supreme Court majority opinion did make a reference to proper administration of warrants and to preconditions that should give newspapers "protection against the harms that are assertedly threatened." We don't know just what that means, but we hope, that it will at least cause judges to draw warrants narrowly so the intrusiveness of searches is held to a minimum.

THE ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST TURKEY

HON. SHIRLEY N. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mrs. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, within the next several weeks, the House will take up the International Security Assistance Act of 1978. During its deliberations on this measure, the House International Relations Committee voted to repeal the 4-year-old arms embargo against Turkey. I cannot overstress the importance of this issue for it will be one of the most critical foreign policy questions we will consider this year.

Today's edition of the Wall Street Journal contains two excellent articles supporting the action by the International Relations Committee. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

BLIND MORALIZING

In recent months there has been a gathering sense that in its outburst of post-Vietnam moralizing, Congress has gone too far in writing laws that foreclose foreign-policy options. Most of the discussion has centered around Africa, but in fact the clearest case of blind moralizing has been the embargo against arms shipments to Turkey.

The details of the dispute leading up to the embargo, and the enormous cost in terms of the Western strategic position, are clarified in an article on this page by Albert Wohlstetter, who over several decades has been an enormously influential strategic thinker and is for our money the nation's most careful analyst of military-political affairs. (Mr. Wohlstetter's studies warning of the danger of nuclear proliferation, for example, are rated by the chief spokesman for the nuclear industry as the most important single event leading to what the industry finds a vexing new concern.)

The embargo was imposed, of course, after the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. Congress has taken the position that this was an illegal use of American-supplied arms, and that no more should be shipped until there is a settlement of the ongoing Cyprus dispute. The Turks have closed down some American intelligence facilities, and are drifting closer to the Soviet camp. They have become, for example, the largest recipient of Soviet foreign aid. However, they remain within the NATO command structure, while the Greeks have withdrawn.

Just why the U.S. Congress should be picking sides in this age-old dispute has always been unclear to us, and becomes increasingly so as we review the dispute. Turkey did not start the Cyprus crisis. It started with an attempted coup backed by the colonels who then ruled Greece, with the purpose of union between Greece and Cyprus. Archbishop Makarios, the late Cypriot leader, told the UN Security Council that the coup forces were armed with tanks and armored cars—in other words, weapons the United States had supplied to Greece.

Turkey had a clear treaty right to intervene to stop Greek attachment of Cyprus. It landed in July, and landed more forces in August to expand its occupation zone. There have been spasmodic negotiations for a settlement between the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of Cyprus. At the moment, the Turkish proposals are the ones on the table.

In the light of this history, it's not hard to understand Turkish mystification at its treatment by the U.S. The Turks tend to attribute this to racism. They think the U.S. and other Western powers will automatically side with the Greeks, even when they have a military dictatorship, and against the Turks; even though they are the only democracy in the Islamic world. U.S. political analysts attributed it instead to the "Greek lobby," which while not large is decidedly vocal.

There may be some truth to both explanations. But after watching the fight over the sale of F15s to Saudi Arabia, we somehow doubt that the Greek lobby has a hammerlock on Congress. And we would like to reassure the Turks about racism by offering another explanation. Their sin was that their invasion actually succeeded, at a time when military success was unpopular in influential quarters of American opinion. So much moral capital had been invested in asserting that American success in Vietnam would be "immoral" that Turkish success in Cyprus must be "immoral" too.

This mood is passing. The Soviet arms build-up and its aggressiveness in Africa have brought home the real challenge to the American strategic position, and to the values of freedom and individual dignity that are the moral roots of American foreign policy. With this recognition has come the realization that the embargo has not helped and may in fact have hindered a settlement on Cyprus, so that Sen. Church, for example, has come to favor its repeal.

Those worried about restoring American flexibility in foreign policy should surely join him. That we have a law on the books so confused and so destructive as the Turkish embargo tells much about the mood of Congress when writing such restrictions was fashionable. We should get rid of this one first, and then move on to take a careful look at the others.

LIFT THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

(By Albert Wohlstetter)

The United States, Turkey and Greece have very strong mutual interests affecting their security—interests that have been harmed by the behavior of all three nations. The self-destructive pattern can be broken by support for President Carter's initiative to lift the arms embargo against Turkey.

All NATO countries—not only the United States, Turkey and Greece—have an interest in restoring health to the southeastern flank of NATO. That is also of great consequence for the credibility of any American guarantee in the Middle East and for countries such as Japan that depend on oil from the Persian Gulf.

What makes the problem urgent is the worsening of our position on the southern flank of NATO and especially in the eastern Mediterranean, the increase in Soviet ability to project power at a distance. Greece's continued absence from the NATO military command, the increased precariousness of our own and allied reliance on oil from the Gulf area, the deterioration of the Turkish armed forces that remain part of the NATO military structure, and the steady decline in our relations with Turkey.

There are of course endless claims and counterclaims about the rights and wrongs of Greek, Turkish or even American and British behavior on Cyprus. I do not think a fair and accurate picture can be drawn in simple black and white. Nor do I think the legal questions as to the use or misuse of U.S. arms aid present a simple issue, with an obvious answer justifying punitive action in the form of a continuing embargo.

THE GAO LETTER

The Greeks as well as Turks are armed predominantly by the United States and both, it is plain, have used these arms to protect what they regard as their legitimate rights and obligations. The usual authority cited on Turkish violations is the General Accounting Office letter to Sen. Eagleton. A careful reading shows that it does not unambiguously claim a Turkish violation. Moreover, I think the GAO would have qualified its judgment on Turkey even further if it had been asked about violations on the other side, which were much less ambiguous.

I am afraid many Americans made moralistic statements about the crisis that stain moral credibility. There is no doubt that the events started with a coup engineered by the military dictatorship then existing in Greece. And there is no doubt in my mind that the Treaty of Guarantee signed by Greece, Turkey and Great Britain was a justifiable basis for Turkish intervention in July. In the subsequent August landing the Turks expanded their very precarious foothold in the face of Greek delays and refusal to agree to a security zone around Turkish forces.

One always hears that 40% of the land is occupied by the Turks, who make up only 18% of the population. I would point out first of all that the 40% seems to be inaccurate; it is more like 30% or 37%, and the Turks question the 18% as well. More important, the Turkish "18%" or more of the population, being mainly farmers, always had more than the corresponding 18% or so of the land—about 40% at the time of the 1960 census, and perhaps 30% at the time of the coup. The recent Turkish proposals for voluntary population and land transfers consider the military and economic viability of the transfers, and seem to me as they do to Secretary General Waldheim a substantial advance in the negotiation.

On such complicated disputes between two

important allies, the United States had best avoid the pretense that the moral or legal issues are simple black and white ones on which we can sit in judgment. Such pretense does mischief to our reputation for any balanced concern about the rule of law. I would be as deeply opposed to an embargo on arms to Greece as I am to continuance of the embargo against Turkey. We should not be asked to choose; both are of key importance to our own security and to that of our allies.

The security considerations, meanwhile, are essential to the strategic significance of Turkey. While there have been recent claims that new weapons technologies make the Turkish armed forces, facilities and geographical position obsolete, it simply romanticizes technology to suggest that ICBMs or any other sophisticated technology can replace forces that operate from close-in range. Similarly, the Turkish intelligence facilities closed since the embargo were of great value, and substitutes have been only partial, creating deficiencies that become harder and harder to overcome. These facilities provided us with information about the development of Soviet long-range systems, and also, as in the fall of 1973, about movements and concentration of Soviet forces.

The value of Turkey for the United States and its NATO allies extends far beyond the few installations on which operations have been suspended since the embargo. That value proceeds in the first place from control of the exit from the Black Sea through the Straits of the Bosporus and of the entry to the Aegean through the Dardanelles. Second, from the large number of strategically placed base facilities for combat, communications, navigation and other support functions, including facilities besides those withdrawn from current operation. Third, from the control of the air space above Turkey. And fourth, from the Turkish ground forces themselves, which are the largest in NATO aside from those of the United States, and have a well-deserved reputation for fighting ability.

It is usual to talk of the value of Turkey for our allied security in rather general terms. That makes it easy to dismiss its value with some vague reference to technology or the like. I would like to illustrate Turkey's importance in some concrete detail.

First, on the importance of Turkey to Greece, which proponents of the embargo tend to think of, if at all, only in passing. Turkey's participation in NATO sharply increases Soviet force requirements for Bulgarian or combined Bulgarian-Soviet attacks on Greece. Turkish control of the Dardanelles blocks the Soviets' sea lines.

NATO planes based in Turkey could interdict Soviet sea and air movements to Bulgaria. The only invasion-supply route into Greece which is not within easy artillery range of Turkish forces is a single-track railroad with a parallel road. With Turkey and Greece cooperating in NATO this attack would be a much riskier adventure and therefore one much less likely to be attempted or persuasively threatened. And most important, Soviet force would be less likely to cast a political shadow.

On the importance of Turkey for the whole of NATO's southern flank, and consequently for the NATO center, Secretary of Defense Brown has been quite clear. If the flanks are neutralized by political or military action, an adversary can concentrate more massively against the center. The defense of the center cannot be separated from the defense of either flank.

In the defense of the Persian Gulf area, however, the potential role of Turkey deserves concrete illustration. If the Soviets can overfly Turkey at will, they can cut in half the time needed to deploy forces by air over Yugoslavia to an objective near the Gulf. (Roughly the same is true for deployments to Lebanon and Israel.) The availability of Turkish airspace drastically affects what the Soviets can do compared with what the United States can do in the Gulf area. Without substantial overflight over Turkey, the Soviets, for example, might be able to bring into the area a force roughly equivalent in firepower to a U.S. mechanized division and do it in about the same time as it would take the U.S., that is, in about two weeks. With overflights unconstrained the Soviets could get there a week earlier.

For conflict in the Persian Gulf area the Turkish Straits also are plainly important. If the Soviets cannot use the Straits to resupply by sea as well as by air their forces fighting in the Gulf, they might have to rely exclusively on a massive initial airlift until they could, for example, resupply by sea from Vladivostok—a much more distant supply route. Other conceivable routes might be even longer, more complicated or more vulnerable.

In short, when one looks at the grubby details of how the contestants might fare in a struggle in such key parts of the world as the Persian Gulf or Greece, it is apparent that with the technologies available to each side the role of Turkey is likely to be of major importance. No airy references to sophisticated weapon systems should erase that importance from our minds.

TURKEY'S SIGNIFICANCE

Finally, a few words on the significance of Turkey for the Middle East. It would be possible to illustrate in some detail the effects of the availability to one side or the other of Turkish air space, the Straits, bases and materiel in Turkey, or the Turkish forces. The potential effect on conflict between the confrontation states and Israel is large. The stability of settlements now being proposed for the Middle East depends not only on the ability of the parties to defend themselves with only logistic support from outside, but also on external guarantees of possible intervention.

But no guarantee is likely to be accepted if it cannot be backed up, that is, of the risks of backing it up are so large that fulfillment of the guarantee is not believable. And even if a very risky guarantee were accepted, the settlement guaranteed would very likely be unstable. There has been a long history of the importance of Turkey for military operations in the area. Turkey was a key to our successful intervention in Lebanon in 1958. Our intervention at that time exploited the strategic position of Turkey and was greatly aided by it.

To restore the role of Turkey in the alliance we should end the embargo. The embargo in any case blocks compromise on Cyprus. The Turks will not bend to a public humiliation by a major ally. And those Greeks who see Turkey only as a rival and a danger and want it weakened will delay compromise to perpetuate the embargo. For the sake of Cyprus, and for the mutual security of our allies, including Greece and Turkey, we should at long last bring the embargo to an end.●

ECONOMIC ADVANCEMENT COALITION RELEASED STUDY OF PROPOSED MILITARY BASE REALINEMENTS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, today the Northeast Midwest Economic Advancement Coalition released a study, "Proposed Military Base Realinements: The Regional Impact." The results of this study confirm beliefs that I have had for years. I have argued repeatedly that the Midwest has not been treated fairly by military realinements and I am concerned that shifts to the South and West are not in the best interests of national security. In large part, my conclusions were based on my personal observations. Having military installations in my district, the 19th of Illinois, which have been the objects of Defense Department and Army scrutiny, I am well aware of the efforts to relocate various functions for anticipated cost savings. As the Army will admit, it has only recently begun to perform post transfer studies to see whether, in fact, the anticipated cost savings accrue. I suspect that in many instances they do not. Thus the one advantage sought—savings in the defense budget—may never be realized. I am aware of the disadvantages that such transfers engender. Families are forced to move or else give up jobs. The community suffers from a depleted demand for services. These are disadvantages beyond the diminished national security that the Northeast Midwest Institute study suggests and which I have suspected.

Illinois is the second hardest hit of all of the States in the northeast-midwest region by the realinements selected for study by the Department of Defense. In the northeast-midwest region of this country, 10,228 jobs are being considered for termination, while 13,043 in the South and 9,710 in the West are under consideration. While the raw data might suggest that the region is not that bad off, take into consideration the fact that this region has less defense jobs to begin with. The States in the Northeast and Midwest stand to lose 2.4 percent of their share of jobs while the South and West are to lose only 1.2 percent of their share. Almost 15 percent of the bases in the Northeast and Midwest would be affected greatly—being closed completely or losing over half their personnel—while only 6 percent of those in the South and 9 percent of those in the West risk such a large impact.

This study by the Pentagon could result in a loss of over $109 million in direct payroll expenditures in the Northeast and Midwest. Secondary losses could climb to $94 million and 8,000 jobs.

I think it is time we took a look at the larger picture when it comes to base realinements. It is time to stop proposing realinements for the sake of study and to make the moves only where there is a definite advantage to be had which is not outweighed by disadvantages to the community. Finally, it is essential to put a stop to discrimination in the selection of bases to be studied and to prevent regional imbalances.●

HEATING WATER WITH SUN POWER—DOES IT PAY?

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a lot of attention has been focused on the use of

solar technologies to help reduce our costly use of fossil fuels. But from my own experience I believe that most people still think in terms of promise and not capability. I keep hearing that solar will be great in the future—10 years from now, but that we cannot justify it today. This is simply not true. For many applications solar energy is cost effective today. I was delighted to find a sound analysis of the economics of solar hot water heating by Mr. E. J. Sanaghan, Jr. in the May 1978 issue of Arizona Business/Industry Magazine. I would like to share Mr. Sanaghan's analysis with my colleagues.

HEATING WATER WITH SUN POWER . . . DOES IT PAY?

(By E. J. Sanyhan, Jr.)

Is a solar water heater a good investment?

Let's take an average household with an electric water heater, modern appliances, and 2 to 4 members. With a premium solar water heater consisting of two solar collectors, a 66 gallon tank, and all miscellaneous components necessary to make a fully automatic system. . . . What are the costs? What are the advantages? Cost [1] for this unit is $35 a month, 8 years finance. $45 a month, 5 years finance. $1800 to purchase outright.

As of January '78 this unit will reduce the electric bill approximately $25 a month, based on 450 KWH consumption by the water heater only. (The exact amount would depend on billing demand, time of year, and total KWH consumption for a given billing period.)

Cost of solar water heater, based on 8 year finance would be as follows:

Cost of solar heater, $35 month.

Less savings incurred, $25 month.

Additional expense for using solar to heat water $10 month.

The State of Arizona has enacted incentives to provide for rapid utilization of solar equipment. Chapter 81 Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) Section 43–123.37, 43–128.03, 43–128.04 provides a 35% tax credit for installations of residential solar devices during 1978.

On the above described system this equates to a $630 refund, not a deduction, a refund. If the homeowner should owe the state only $400 this year, he will receive the remaining $230 next year.

Just for discussion purposes, let's spread out the $630 over a 2 year period. $630–24= $26.25 a month. Moving back to our $10 a month additional expense and deducting our tax credit which has been spread out over 2 years:

Outlay for solar vs. electric, $10.00 month.

Tax credit subtracted, $26.25 month.

Surplus, $16.25 month.

Yes, it is true, it is possible for a homeowner to make money for 2 years by purchasing a solar water heater. But what happens after the 2 years? Are there still tax advantages? Yes there are.

Before applying the tax credit, the new solar heater left this household with a liability of $10 a month, but I showed how that switched to income because of the tax credit. Now that all tax credit is received, we are back where we started, but now it is January 1980 and during the past two years the utilities have raised their rates at the same pace they did for period of January '75 through January '78 which was 20.74% annually.[2] (This is considered a conservative estimate by many.)

When the solar unit was initially installed we replaced our $25 a month electric bill with a $35 a month payment. Now we see by updating to 1980, our basic costs are:

Cost of solar heater (unchanged), $35.00 a month.

Less savings incurred (up to 20.74%), $36.25 month.

Surplus, $1.25 month.

In addition to the surplus shown above there are other factors. Let's say the homeowner did not purchase his solar heater in January '78 and it is now January 1980. The following statements could be made:

(1) There would be no solar water heater in this home which would now add $2000 to $3000 in real estate value.

(2) Allowable tax credit has dropped 5% each year as prescribed by law and the present (1980) credit is only 25%. A loss of $180.

(3) The homeowner would have $662.82 in cancelled checks from his utility company, which would be worth nothing. No deductions on federal income tax due to interest paid, and no equity in real property has resulted.

ARS sections 42–123.01, and 42–123.37 provides exemption from property tax increases which may result from the addition of solar systems to new or existing housing. As assessed values continue rising it can amount to substantial savings.

This analysis brings to light some startling facts. The advantages mentioned are only the obvious ones which apply to nearly every homeowner. There are others also which are too complex to figure in here. Can you afford not to seriously check into the foregoing? Remember, the energy you save is everyone's, the money you save is yours.●

[1] Exempted from sales and use tax, ARS Chapter 42 Sections 42–1312.01, and 14–1409.

[2] January '75 through '78 increases, APS—18.06% annually, SRP—22.89% annually. The above obtained from APS and SRP customer information centers.

SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago today, 189 Members of this body voted for passage of a conference report to raise social security levies an additional $227 billion over the next decade. To date, 134 of those Members have announced their support for a rollback of the scheduled tax hikes, and another 14 Members who originally "paired for" the conference report have also signaled their support for a rollback.

When these commitments are added to the 163 Members who, like myself, cast a vote against the conference report and the 22 Members who "paired against" it, it is evident that a clear majority of the House is on record as favoring another look at social security financing.

Despite this miraculous conversion of our House brethren, there is no indication that social security financing will be reconsidered in this session of Congress. Four weeks ago, the Ways and Means Committee, in reversing an earlier vote, voted against a rollback of the payroll tax increase scheduled for 1979 and 1980.

But, a review of the December 15 debate and subsequent events clearly demonstrates that social security financing needs to be rethought and that the leadership of both Houses should afford the Congress that opportunity.

During the debate on the conference report, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee said,

I want to assure the Members that we will be able to come in with a better financing mechanism. We will be able then to bring the payroll tax into a more reasonable posture.

The chairman went on to assure the Members of this body that we could instruct our constituencies that,

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has assured them publicly that he will move as expeditiously as possible, certainly within the next 5-year time frame, toward adopting a new revenue mechanism whereby we can back off from these major increases. . . .

Mr. Speaker, the chairman's job-like patience is not shared by the taxpaying public. By 1982, at the end of the chairman's 5-year time frame, the maximum employer and employee contribution will both have risen to $2,130 from the 1978 ceiling of $1,020—a 108-percent increase.

If there is a lesson to be learned from the recent Jarvis-Gann initiative in California it is this: taxpayers will no longer tolerate irresponsible and unresponsive fiscal management. Does anyone in this body question how the social security conference report would have fared if it had been offered as a national referendum? It would have been defeated. The American people would have thrown the proposal back in to the lap of Congress with this message: Come up with a workable solution that does not entail a mammoth tax increase—that is what the Congress is paid for.

Mr. Speaker, there is such a solution. We can restore the financial integrity of the social security system without resort to oppressive tax increases and we can do so without a raid on the general revenues. It can be done through a sound fiscal plan that balances the needs of the social security recipients with the concerns of the contributors.

The alternative that I am suggesting is not new. It was offered last fall in the House debate by our Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee. It is, I think a reasoned response to an admittedly difficult problem.

The time for the consideration of this alternative is now. The Congress, for once, should anticipate, rather than react to, taxpayers grievances.

The first of the scheduled increases from the social security bill goes into effect, cleverly enough, in January of next year, some 2 months after the fall congressional elections.

That should give the new Congress a 2-year breathing period in which to defuse the issue before the next election. But let the Congress beware: the voting taxpayer is becoming more discerning, more conscious of the tax burden and tax laws. Like Abe said: You can fool some of the people all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

I insert into the RECORD an earlier statement on the Conable-Archer Republican alternative:

STATEMENT ON A NEW REPUBLICAN INITIATIVE ON SOCIAL SECURITY BY CONGRESSMEN RHODES, CONABLE, ARCHER, STEIGER, KETCHUM AND SCHULZE

We believe that the nation's social security system should be restored to financial stability on a long range basis. We owe this not only to the 100 million Americans who support the system and the 34 million who already benefit from it, but to the next generation as well. They deserve no less.

We also believe that a number of long-standing inequities in the system, especially those related to the treatment of women, should be corrected.

We further believe that the system should be adjusted to changing American life styles, that beneficiaries no longer should be penalized for continuing to lead productive lives, and that we should move closer toward truly universal social security coverage.

And we believe these desirable goals can—and should—be attained without: (1) altering the basic structure or nature of the system; (2) adding heavily to tax burdens in the future; or (3) requiring any tax increases over the next several years, in light of an uncertain economy and current payroll levies on both employers and employees.

Toward these ends we are presenting, for the consideration of the Congress and the American people, a comprehensive 15-point social security proposal. It would place the system on a sound financial footing for at least the next 75 years, it would solve the immediate financial shortfall in the trust funds, it would strengthen the system's insurance character, and it would correct a number of inequities. It would do all this with no tax increase until 1982 and with less than a 1¼ percent increase through the year 2050.

The proposal does not, it should be emphasized, offer the myth of something-for-nothing. It is realistic. There are prices to pay for the problems it solves. But we feel the prices are reasonable, especially in view of obvious alternatives: (1) a drastic lowering of benefits, (2) a heavy increase in payroll taxes now and in the future, or (3) the illusory use of general revenues, which would require substantial borrowing by the Treasury, an even bigger public debt, and eventually higher taxes and more inflation for all.

Our proposal, which includes a number of "tradeoffs," should be considered as a unit. Its parts—interdependent and not interchangeable—have been blended carefully into a particular whole, and it should be judged as such.

As far as we know, this proposal stands alone. If there is another—to solve the system's financial problems, to correct so many of its inequities, and yet to cost the taxpayers so relatively little—it has remained well hidden from public view.

Specifically, our proposal would.

A. Meet the immediate financial needs of the Social Security Trust Funds by:

(1) Reallocating taxes collected, between the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Fund (OASI), and the Disability Insurance (DI) Fund, which is expected to become exhausted soon if preventive steps are not taken.

(2) Temporarily diverting three-fourths of a Medicare tax rate increase (0.2% per employee and employer) already scheduled to take place next year, to the OASI and DI Trust Funds. This diversion, which would not damage the Medicare Fund, would continue only through 1981.

(3) Permitting any of the three major Trust Funds (OASI), DI and Medicare) to borrow from another if necessary and with appropriate arrangements for repayment with interest. This would be a permanent provision, which should serve as a "fail safe" device against the insolvency of any of the funds.

B. Put the system on a sound financial basis at least 75 years into the future by:

(1) Decoupling the automatic benefit adjustment mechanism (to correct a flaw in the mechanism) and indexing workers' earnings records to wage trends. These changes follow generally the recommendations of both the Ford and Carter Administrations. This proposal would, however, adjust the ultimate benefit level to account for overexpansion that has occurred since the automatic adjustment flaw was enacted. A savings clause would be included guaranteeing that no future retirees would receive lower benefits than they would have received under the present-day benefit formula as it was at the time of the change. (Decoupling and wage indexing would reduce the system's long-range deficit by slightly more than half.)

(2) Advancing gradually and slowly—from 65 to 68—the age at which full retirement benefits would be payable. The adjustment would not begin until 1990 and would not reach maturity until 2001. Each year during that span the full benefit retirement age would be advanced by one quarter year. Workers could continue to retire as early as age 62 but with slightly greater actuarial reductions than at present. Gradual and distant implementation of this change, which is in keeping both with efforts to abolish mandatory retirement policies and with increased longevity and productivity of American workers, is designed to permit orderly retirement planning. (This provision would further reduce the system's deficit by about 20%.)

(3) Permanently reassigning one-fourth of the Medicare tax rate increase, scheduled next year, to the OASDI Trust Funds. This amount approximately equals additional money which would enter the Medicare Fund because of other provisions of this proposal.

(4) Increasing tax rates for employees, employers and the self-employed in three stages; 0.5 percent in 1982, 0.3 percent in 1990, and 0.4 percent in 2000. This means that tax rates would rise, under this proposal, less than 1-and-¼-percent over a 75-year span. The Medicare tax reassignment and the three-stage rate increase would reduce the remaining deficit to less than 0.5% of taxable payroll—an actuarily sound margin.

C. Make four significant improvements in the treatment of women under Social Security, by:

(1) Providing a new benefit—a "working spouse's benefit"—designed to give adequate recognition to wives who work outside the home. The benefit would be equal to (a) the higher benefit amount due either as a worker or the spouse of a worker, plus (b) 25 percent of the smaller of those two benefits.

(2) Reducing from 20 years to five years the duration-of-marriage requirement for one spouse to receive a benefit based on the other's earnings record. This provision is designed to remove what many divorcees have come to view as an unfair and arbitrary requirement.

(3) Ending the cutoff or reduction of benefits for beneficiaries who remarry. This provision is included largely because many widows who rewed before reaching age 60, and divorced wives who remarry at any age, lose entitlement to their benefits under current law.

(4) Amending the Social Security Act to remove all remaining sexually discriminatory language.

D. Move the nation's social insurance system closer to the ideal of universal coverage by providing for the participation of all federal government employees, including Members of Congress not otherwise covered, by 1979. The objective is integration of the Civil Service Retirement and Social Security systems without reducing benefits or protection for, or increasing contributions from, participants in either program.

E. Remove the earnings limitation imposed on beneficiaries. Under present law, benefits are reduced and eventually eliminated for earnings above $3,000 per year. (The limitation is adjusted annually.) This proposal would boost the limit to $5,000 in 1978, to $7,500 in 1979, and remove it entirely in 1980.

F. Freeze the minimum primary benefit at its current level of $114.30 per month, but increase the special minimum benefit from a maximum of $180 to $219, and make it subject (as are other benefits) to automatic annual adjustments in the future. The minimum primary benefit goes, in large numbers, to governmental employees who either "moonlight" or retire early and work just long enough under Social Security to meet minimal eligibility requirements. The special minimum applies only to those who have worked many years at relatively low wages under the system.

G. Limit disability and survivorship benefits to the maximum primary benefit payable to a worker reaching age 62. Under present law, some younger beneficiaries receive benefits substantially higher than those awarded older beneficiaries who have worked longer under the system. This provision would remove that disparity.●

APPLICATION OF THE WAR POWERS ACT TO AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN ZAIRE

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, along with Congressman JOHNSON of Colorado, I have written today Chairman ZABLOCKI of the House International Relations Committee and Chairman SPARKMAN of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee to request that hearings be held on the possibility that the President has violated the War Powers Act with respect to actions recently undertaken in Zaire.

Under the War Powers Act, the President is required to report to Congress within 48 hours after the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces "into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances." Section 8(c) of the act stipulates that the introduction of Armed Forces encompasses those situations where American personnel are used "to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged in hostilities."

Reports, under this act, shall be submitted in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate, setting forth—

First, the circumstances necessitating the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces;

Second, the constitutional and legislative authority under which such introduction took place; and

Third, the estimated scope and duration of the hostilities or involvement.

Mr. Speaker, no one can responsibly condone Cuban and Soviet activity in Africa. However, the issue facing American decisionmakers is how to respond appropriately and at the same time in a constitutional fashion. In this regard, the assignment of almost a hundred military support personnel to Zaire and the airlifting of Belgian, French, and Moroccan troops may be appropriate. But there is real question whether the failure of the President to notify Congress and clarify administration intentions, as required by statute, represents an abridgement of the constitutional authority of the Executive.

For the first time since passage of the War Powers Act its provisions are being tested. The precedents we establish today will set a model for future Executive action.

There are indications that what was initially described as a rescue operation in Zaire has been transferred into active American involvement in a controversial civil war. Whether American action is too strong or not strong enough is not at issue here. What is at issue is compliance with the law and the precedent that is established for Presidential action at a later date.●

THE ESTONIAN EXPERIENCE

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, in February of each year, many of us in the House of Representatives pay tribute to the people of Estonia by calling the Nation's attention to the anniversary of Estonia's independence. Unfortunately, Estonia's independence was short lived.

Today, I would like to remind my colleagues of a sad date in Estonian history when approximately 1½ percent of the total population of Estonia was deported to slave labor camps in Siberia and other northern regions of Russia in 1941. Earlier, the Soviets had subverted the legitimate Estonian Government which left the doors wide open for the terror to come.

In June of 1940, a Soviet ultimatum asked for the reconstitution of the Estonian Government and the formation of one friendly to the Soviet Union and "able and willing to secure the honest application of the Soviet-Estonian mutual assistance treaty." Almost immediately, the Soviet Army occupied the country.

Soon after the Soviets had established their military installations in Estonia, the number of arrests mushroomed. It is estimated that 60,000 Estonians were arrested, imprisoned and herded into freight cars and exiled to distant parts of the Soviet Union. Others fled to Sweden and still more crossed into Germany. Historical accounts also tell us that many of the fleeing Estonians were killed before they reached their destinations.

The Estonians who remained behind were drawn into the Nazi war effort and forced once again into more labor camps. Nonetheless, they retained their strong desire for independence and freedom and soon a resistance group was organized. However, these dreams were crushed again when in 1944, Estonia was overrun by the Soviet Army.

Soviet domination of Estonia continues to this day although conditions are not as bad as they were under the original Soviet occupation. The United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of Estonia. Consequently, recognition of the Estonian Republic by the United States in 1922 has never been invalidated.

There will be no public ceremonies in Estonia today to mark this infamous date. But others around the world who appreciate what freedom and independence mean will remember the brave Estonian people and how they fought against the twin tyrannies of communism and nazism.●

WASHINGTON BULLETS—WORLD CHAMPIONS

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, in the past week the suburban Maryland and Washington area has been unified in spirit by a unique group of individuals—the Washington Bullets. This team has put a smile on every area sports fan's face by achieving the ultimate in professional basketball—the world championship.

What has made the Bullets so exciting over the past few months is not that they have been winning so much as it is how they have been winning. This championship was the result of a team effort all the way, with every member of the team contributing to the final victory. The Bullets team has its share of stars, of course, but those stars are always willing to sacrifice personal achievement for the good of the team.

The spirit of this year's Bullets epitomizes the good side of athletic competition. A group of talented individuals working together for a common goal. This is the essence of team spirit, and the Bullets have proven what team spirit can accomplish.

The team has given my constituents and myself many hours of excitement over the past year. In spite of injuries and several other unfortunate twists of athletic fate, the Bullets put it all together when they had to, and swept past Atlanta, San Antonio, Philadelphia, and Seattle on the way to their first world championship.

I know I speak for all the people in Prince Georges and Anne Arundel Counties in congratulating the Bullets, and I know the fans in those areas are, as I am, secure in the knowledge that this is but the first of many, many championships.●

CARTER: LET ME MAKE IT PERFECTLY CLEAR

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1978

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the prevailing thoughts that American citizens have been voicing in recent months is that President Carter does not speak in clear and consistent terms. It usually takes a few years for the public to catch up with double talk, reversals in position and just plain political demagoguery. In the case of Mr. Carter, the leadtime was cut to a bare minimum for this process. The public has caught on and his credibility has plummeted like a burned out meteor.

The scores of campaign promises which have been repudiated are now legend. None sticks out so clearly as the tortured and ambiguous path of the President's positions on the issue of deregulation of natural gas. They wend all over the place from his original letter to the Governor of Oklahoma during the campaign, a letter which said, in the old cliche "I am with you boys" to outright opposition, to compromise to succesive repudiation of his last stated position.

Here are some of his more lucid statements on this significant national issue:

"I will work with the Congress . . . to deregulate new natural gas."—Jimmy Carter, October 1976.

"Deregulation of natural gas is something that I'm committed to for a limited period of time."—President Carter, March 1977.

"I will work carefully toward deregulation of newly discovered natural gas as market conditions permit."—President Carter, April 1977.

"The unnecessary action to deregulate natural gas is particularly serious . . . the President considers that action to be a direct and extremely serious deviation from the basic fairness of the energy plan."—Press Secretary Jody Powell, June 1977. (Comment on House subcommittee vote in favor of deregulation.)

"I hate to veto a bill that a Democratic Congress passes, but you can depend on it, I'll protect your interests when the bill comes to my desk."—President Carter, July 1977. (Comments to political rally on what he would do if Congress approved deregulation.)

"If we deregulate natural gas prices, then the price will go to 15 times more than natural gas prices were in 1973."—President Carter, October 1977.

"I don't have any inclination to abandon support of the anti-deregulation House position."—President Carter, November 1977.

"Q. Mr. President, are you willing to accept energy legislation that in a few years would lead to the deregulation of natural gas?

"The PRESIDENT. Yes, I am. This was a campaign statement and commitment of mine."—President Carter, March 1978.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committees scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 15, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 16

9:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the recent change of methodology used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for computing unemployment figures and the effect of such change on the distribution of CETA funds.

4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 747, S. 3064, and H.R. 8729, proposed Aircraft and Airport Noise Reduction Act.

235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To mark up of S. 2900, proposed Oil Spill Liability Fund and Compensation Act.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume hearings on S. 72, to restrict the activities in which registered bank holding companies may engage, and to control the acquisition of banks by holding companies and other banks.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on relations between the Department of Energy and segments of the energy industry.

3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Arms Control, Oceans, and International Environment Subcommittee

To receive a report from Ambassador Richardson on the Seventh Session of the UN Law of the Sea Conference.

4221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on economic change, including demographic, employment, and inflation.

S-207, Capitol

JUNE 19

9:00 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee

To hold hearings on pending proposed tax legislation.

2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 3107, to insure the bankruptcy offices shall be maintained separate and apart from the offices of the U.S. district court clerk.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

To hold hearings on S. 836, to improve the surety bond program provided by the Small Business Investment Act.

424 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Regional and Community Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1493, to provide financial and technical assistance to States, local governments, and Indian tribes to manage impacts caused by energy development.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Rural Housing Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the impact of solar energy on rural housing.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 3046 and 707, granting the power of eminent domain to coal slurry pipelines in certain circumstances.

3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1766, proposed Federal Computer Systems Protection Act.

457 Russell Building

JUNE 20

9:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 3100, to provide greater discretion to the Supreme Court in selecting the cases it will review.

2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Resource Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the environmental impact aspects (section 5) of S. 3077, proposed Export-Import Bank Act Amendments.

4200 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 3146, 2761, and 2804, to expand the jurisdiction of the NRC over nuclear waste storage and disposal facilities.

1114 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

Monopoly and Anticompetitive Activities Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the Federal Government patent policy.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Rural Housing Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the impact of solar energy on rural housing.

5302 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume markup of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Criminal Laws and Procedures Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1766, proposed Federal Computer Systems Protection Act.

1318 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on economic change, including demographic, employment, and inflation.

1202 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 3153, the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

JUNE 21

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee

To resume hearings jointly with the Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency on S. 2778, and other proposals, to tighten controls on and to increase penalties for the manufacture and distribution of the drug PCP (angel dust).

2228 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

Monopoly and Anticompetitive Activities Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the Federal Government patent policy.

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Financial Institutions Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 10899, the International Banking Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To mark up S. 499, 1500, 1546, 1787, 2465, and 2944, to designate or add certain lands in Alaska to the National Parks, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Wilderness Preservation systems.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the Federal acquisition and renovation of Union Station in Nashville, Tennessee.

4200 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

To mark up S. 2 and S. 1244, to require periodic reauthorization of Government programs, and to consider other committee business.

301 Russell Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings on economic change, including demographic, employment, and inflation.

S-207, Capitol

10:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

2300 Dirksen Building

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.

*Environment and Public Works.
To consider S. 1493, to provide financial and technical assistance to States, local governments, and Indian tribes to manage impacts caused by energy development and to consider pending nominations.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3162 and 3164, proposed Citizen's Privacy Protection Amendment.
2228 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
Compensation and Pension Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 879 and H.R. 6501 to provide increased awards of service-connected compensation to certain veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of paired extremities, and S. 2828, the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume markup of S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2873, proposed Ocean Shipping Act.
235 Russell Building

Energy and National Resources
To continue markup of S. 499, 1500, 1546, 1787, 2465, and 2944, to designate or add certain lands in Alaska to the National Parks, National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Wilderness Preservation Systems.
3110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To continue hearings on economic change including demographic, employment, and inflation.
318 Russell Building

Select Small Business
To mark up H.R. 11318, to amend and extend through FY 1980 authorizations for the SBA; S. 836, to improve the surety bond program provided by the Small Business Investment Act; S. 2156, the Minority Enterprise Venture Capital Act; and S. 2259, to expand and revise procedures for insuring small business participation in Government procurement activities.
424 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nominations of Santiago E. Campos, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico, and Louis H. Pollack, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.
2228 Dirksen Building

JUNE 23

9:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2857, proposed Customs Courts Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 72, to restrict the activities in which registered bank holding companies may engage, and to control the acquisition of banks by holding companies and other banks.
5302 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1592, to terminate further construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project.
4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.

Select Small Business
Monopoly and Anticompetitive Activities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the Federal Government patent policy.
318 Russell Building

JUNE 27

9:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2857, proposed Customs Courts Acts.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume mark up of S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 28

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the procedures of EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission as relates to chronic hazards.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear power reactors.
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3065, 2608, and 2428, proposals affecting taxation of capital gains.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
To continue mark up of S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 29

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on auto odometer requirements.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear power reactors.
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 3065, 2608, and 2428, proposals affecting the taxation of capital gains.
2221 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging
To resume hearings on the degree to which older Americans are purchasing more private health insurance than needed to supplement gaps in the Medicare programs.
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Bureau of Prisons, with emphasis on west coast prison facilities.
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 12

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear power reactors.
6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear reactors.
6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 18

10:00 a.m.

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume mark up of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

10:00 a.m.

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume mark up of S. 2775, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

10:00 a.m.

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue mark up of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 22

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To continue hearings on H.R. 10899, the International Banking Act.
5302 Dirksen Building