

provisions of this section shall not apply to a substantially rehabilitated project assisted under such section 8 if such rehabilitation is carried out, directly or by contract, by a neighborhood-based nonprofit organization".

(c) Section 212(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this section shall not apply with

respect to rehabilitation activities financed by a mortgage insured under this Act and carried out, directly or by contract, by any neighborhood-based nonprofit organization."

H.R. 12433

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

—Page 20, in line 10 strike out "and", and in line 13 strike out the period and insert in

lieu thereof "; and", and after line 13 insert the following:

(5) by adding the following new sentence at the end of the first paragraph thereof: "Of the additional authority to enter into contracts for annual contributions provided on October 1, 1978, and approved in appropriations Acts, the Secretary shall make available not less than \$50,000,000 for modernization of low-income housing projects."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GEORGE W. BREWSTER RETIRES FROM PUBLIC LIFE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since 1970 the city of Torrance has been fortunate enough to enjoy the leadership of George W. Brewster, whose expertise in the field of transportation and deep concern over civic affairs have been the hallmarks of his service on the city council. Although he recently retired from his duties, the benefits he leaves for the people of Torrance will continue to work on in their behalf.

Thus, when his former colleagues on the Torrance City Council honor George at a dinner on June 29, 1978, the gratitude and respect which will be expressed will come from a community well aware of his outstanding contributions.

Born on August 7, 1932, in Washington, D.C., George received his early schooling in the area around our Nation's capital. He earned his Bachelor of Science Degree in Business from Northwestern University, and received his MBA from Harvard Business School in 1960 after spending 4 years as an aviator for the U.S. Navy.

He has been a resident of the South Bay area for over 17 years, and during much of that time he has been active in civic affairs. Besides his 8 years on the city council, George previously served for 6 years on the Torrance Planning Commission, as well as the Torrance Youth Commission, and the Torrance Environmental Quality Commission. As a councilman, George Brewster served on several committees, including transportation; police, fire and public safety; public works; community development; and finance. He has served as chairman of the Public Works Committee; the Police, Fire and Public Safety Committee; and the Airport Noise Abatement Committee. The latter committee, under his able leadership, drafted a municipal code governing noise control at Torrance Municipal Airport. George has also worked with the Legislative Liaison and Taxation Committees of the Torrance City Council.

George Brewster brought many positive qualities to city government, including his own strong determination, leadership, and ability not only to work with others, but to inspire maximum effort by his own example. His background also

includes almost 10 years of experience as systems analyst, senior economics adviser, and special assistant to the director of transportation developments for North American Rockwell, as well as special assignments in technical analysis and research functions. As the city of Torrance possesses both its own general aviation airport and a public transportation system, George's extensive background in transportation has been a tremendous asset to the council.

George has contributed to many transportation studies at various levels of government, including the California Transportation Study, conducted while I served as California's Lieutenant Governor. At the Federal level he worked on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Frontiers of Urban Transportation Technology Study. He has participated in various other studies on V/STOL aircraft, general aviation aircraft, high-speed trains, electric autos, people-movers, surface-effects ships, commercial aircraft, and mass transportation systems.

As a councilman, George has sought to balance environmental needs with those of economic growth. He has been active in developing transportation improvements not only in Torrance, but throughout the South Bay area. George has been a highly effective spokesman for providing accessible public transit to the elderly, handicapped, and disabled.

Since 1963, he had been a member of the board of directors, Southern California Rapid Transit District, and has served as vice president of the board. He was chairman of the Marketing and Advanced Planning Committee of the R.T.D., and served on the Finance; Facilities; and Governmental Affairs Committees. George was also a member of the Governmental Affairs Committee, American Public Transit Association.

Among his other affiliations as a public official were the Los Angeles District Attorney's Advisory Committee; the Southern California Association of Governments Transportation and Utilities Committees; the League of Cities; and the Los Angeles County Transportation Committee.

As president of Advisers General Management Corp., a business management firm, and as an active officer, director or stockholder in three companies, it is hard to see how George has the time to devote to community service. Yet he was always willing to agree to serve when asked to do so. Somehow, in addition to his business responsibilities and many civic roles, George always

found time for community affairs. He is a past president of the Torrance Junior Chamber of Commerce; a former chairman of the Torrance YMCA Board of Managers, and has served the American Red Cross in three capacities—as a past chairman of the Lomita Branch, as a member of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chapter, and as a member of the Southern District. He is an active member of the Christ Episcopal Church, Redondo Beach.

Mr. Speaker, George M. Brewster can look back on a long list of positive achievements in his 14 years in civic government. He has exemplified the highest ideals of elected officials, and donated much time and energy toward the benefit of his community. The entire South Bay community will long remember him.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating George Brewster and in wishing him the best of fortune in the years ahead. We would also like to extend our greetings to his lovely wife, Sheila, and their three children, George, Douglas, and Sandra. They can be justly proud of the accomplishments George W. Brewster has achieved in his careers in both local government and private industry.●

THE SALEM CROSSROADS HISTORICAL RESTORATION SOCIETY

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay a fitting tribute to a group of men and women in my congressional district who have dedicated themselves to preserving a rich part of our American heritage.

The Salem Crossroads Historical Preservation Society, founded in 1971, is a nonprofit organization devoted to restoring the original community of Salem Crossroads. In addition, the society is studying the feasibility of establishing a living historical farm to recreate rural living during the first part of the 19th century.

The village of Salem Crossroads, now known as Delmont, Pa., was a thriving rural community during the period 1830 to 1870. It grew up on the northern pike stage route between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Originally the crossroads provided fresh spring water for travelers and horses. As the community developed around the springs, Salem Crossroads

served as a resting place where weary passengers could enjoy food and lodging.

The 40 years which spanned Salem Crossroads existence were among the most dynamic in American history. They witnessed the Civil War and the westward expansion. During this period America grew from a rural economy to a bustling industrial giant, much of which was centered in western Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the growing interest in our history and the renewed interest in preserving the past, makes the restoration of Salem Crossroads a very worthwhile project. Many of the original buildings are still standing in the village cluster and should indeed be restored and preserved. An authentically restored Salem Crossroads would provide more than just a visual depiction of the past. Properly planned and executed, it would also give one a better appreciation of the hopes, fears, ideals, and values of those who came before us. Such a restoration would not only benefit the people of the area but would serve as a reminder to all who visit there. Ultimately, it would earn a high place on the list of early American communities that have been restored.

The Salem Crossroads Historical Restoration Society has received expert advice on its plans from such noteworthy organizations as the Council of the National Trust of Historic Preservation, the Smithsonian Institution, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Landmarks Planning, and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. Salem Crossroads has been included on the Pennsylvania Register of Historic Places, and has been nominated for inclusion on the National Register.

The men and women of the Salem Crossroads Historical Restoration Society deserve the thanks of the Nation for the work they are doing. They have dedicated themselves to preserving a part of American history not only for our current generation, but for generations yet to come. I am proud that they are among my constituents and I wish them all the best in their endeavor. ●

THE LITHUANIAN STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to once again bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of the freedom-loving people of Lithuania. It seems to be a fact of human nature that we tend to forget or ignore the difficulties of people whose problems we do not personally share. Since Americans have great individual liberties, it is necessary that we be constantly reminded of our less fortunate friends, lest we forget their need.

After decades of subordination to the Russian Empire, the nation of Lithuania proudly proclaimed its independence at

the conclusion of World War One. However, after only 22 years as a self-governing republic, Lithuania was invaded by the Soviet Union and once again forced into subjection. Since 1940, the Lithuanian people have had to endure the loss of political, religious, social, and economic freedom.

The fate of Viktoras Petkus serves as an example of what has happened to the individual rights of Lithuanians under Soviet domination. Petkus was first arrested in 1947 for his activities in the Catholic Youth Organization. He was released in 1953 after serving 6 years in prison. Petkus was arrested again in 1957, this time for possession of "anti-Soviet" literature—a collection of poems by Jurgis Baltrusaitis written in 1912. He remained in prison until 1965. In late 1976, Petkus and a number of colleagues announced the formation of the Lithuanian Public Group to monitor the Helsinki Agreements and seek their implementation. The Soviets, however, quickly put this activity to an end. Petkus was arrested on August 23, 1977 and is now in prison still awaiting trial.

Viktoras Petkus is only one of literally thousands of Lithuanians who have felt the authoritative hand of Soviet oppression. It is easy to be discouraged after many years of little or no apparent progress in the Lithuanian struggle for human rights. Yet the struggle must continue. We who enjoy so much freedom must take the responsibility to aid others in achieving it for themselves. Let us look for inspiration to the thousands of Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans who have not given up hope. They are a proud people with a glorious past, a defiant present, and, I am confident that with the help of the free world to overcome their current hardships, they will have a bright future. ●

ED KINZIE WILL BE MISSED

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the name Joel Edward Kinzie will never appear in any history books. The memory of Ed Kinzie for what he gave to a small rural community in Indiana will be remembered much longer than the deeds of some of the names that will appear in those history books.

Ed Kinzie was always around to help out his friends, delivering coffee to barber shops, beauty shops, and others in the business section of little Flora. He raked leaves, shoveled snow, washed windows, swept floors, moved furniture, and helped anyone that needed a little extra help regardless of how menial the task might be—the kind of person that there are so few of any more. He was the kind of guy one appreciated being with and sharing a friendship.

He was more than all of these things, just nice to have around and appreciated by all. He loved his fellow man. He wanted to share with others, went to

church, revivals, dinners, reunions, and participated in all the activities in his small community.

Ed will not be helping his friends of Flora any more. The smile, the nod, the gesture, and the helping hand of the friendliest guy in town was silenced as he was walking with his Bible in hand along a road near Kokomo. He apparently was on his way to attend a friend's funeral when he was fatally injured. Ed did not drive but frequently walked wherever he desired to go regardless of the weather or distance. Friends usually would recognize him and pick him up. Last Friday evening he was struck and died later in a Kokomo hospital.

Ed Kinzie, 60, had been silent in voice since a childhood illness left him a mute, but his spirit and his name will be remembered for a long time by anyone who ever had the opportunity to meet him.

Joel Edward Kinzie of Flora, Ind., was a great guy. I am glad I knew him and could call him a friend. ●

FEDERICO DEGETAU FEDERAL BUILDING

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the Senate Resolution No. 226, approved on May 30, 1978 by the Senate of Puerto Rico.

This resolution is a further expression of endorsement to my bill H.R. 4270, which was passed by the House on June 5, 1978.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

"I, Hector M. Hernandez Suarez, Secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify:

That the Senate of Puerto Rico in its Session of May 30, 1978, approved S.R. No. 226 which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

To express the Senate of Puerto Rico's endorsement of H.R. 4270, which proposes that the structure that houses the offices of the Federal Government in Puerto Rico and the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, be denominated the "Federico Degetau Federal Building" ("Edificio Federal Federico Degetau").

STATEMENT OF MOTIVES

There is a Bill before the Congress of the United States, H.R. 4270, presented by the Honorable Baltasar Corrada del Rio, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Washington, which proposes to designate the new Federal Government Office Building, located in Hato Rey, as the "Federico Degetau Federal Building" ("Edificio Federal Federico Degetau").

If H.R. 4270 is approved, it will honor the memory of the eminent Puerto Rican, don Federico Degetau, who was the first Puerto Rican Resident Commissioner in the United States, and who served in said office from March 4, 1901 to March 3, 1905.

The Senate of Puerto Rico joins this noble gesture, by endorsing the proposal that the new structure, located on Carlos Chardón Street in Hato Rey, which houses the Federal Government offices in Puerto Rico and the United States District Court for the Dis-

trict of Puerto Rico, be denominated as the "Federico Degetau Federal Building" ("Edificio Federal Federico Degetau").

Be it resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico:

Section 1. The Senate of Puerto Rico expresses its endorsement of House Resolution 4270, which proposes that the structure that houses the offices of the Federal Government in Puerto Rico and the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, be denominated the "Federico Degetau Federal Building" ("Edificio Federal Federico Degetau").

Section 2. A copy of this Resolution shall be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Chairman of Public Works and Transportation Committee, to the Honorable Baltasar Corrada del Rio, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, and to the information media for its general diffusion.

Section 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately after its approval by the Senate of Puerto Rico.

And for transmittal to Honorable Baltasar Corrada del Rio, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, I issue this Certificate in my office at the Capitol Building in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and set my hand and the Seal of the Senate, this thirty-one day of May of the year nineteen hundred and seventy-eight.

HECTOR M. HERNANDEZ SUAREZ,
Secretary of the Senate. ●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS—VI

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the lack of concern by the Government of Turkey for the fundamental human rights of Americans serving harsh prison sentences in Turkey is deeply distressing. I would like to include for my colleagues a copy of a letter which I received from our Ambassador to Turkey, Ronald I. Spiers, which contain the faint suggestion of the possibility for negotiations of a prisoner exchange treaty with Turkey. As you will note, the letter is dated February 6, 1978.

I think, perhaps, that the emphasis of this letter intimates that the most advantageous time has arrived for favorable conclusion of this important agreement. We cannot afford to pass up this opportunity. While this matter is in the immediate attention of these officials, we should pressure for the most immediate settlement possible. Treaty guidelines are already intact, as they were established in treaties concluded by Turkey with other countries.

As should also be noted, Ambassador Spiers mentions that he feels "confident that tangible results can be achieved before summer." This has not been the case. These delays cannot continue. I cannot emphasize enough the desperate situation in which we are placing both the American women imprisoned in Turkey, as well as their families. We must make it obvious that we will no longer tolerate such delays by either the Government of Turkey nor our own Department of State.

Ambassador Spiers' letter follows:

EMBASSY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Ankara, Turkey, February 6, 1978.

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAWYER: Thank you for your letter concerning Katherine Zenz and JoAnn McDaniel, and your thoughtfulness in providing a copy of Public Law 95-144.

The Government of Turkey has indeed expressed interest in entering into a transfer of prisoners treaty with U.S. A treaty of this type breaks no new ground for the Turks as they are signatory to a similar treaty among the Council of Europe countries which they ratified last year. A draft proposal has been prepared by the Ministry of Justice in response to our initial discussions, and is presently under consideration by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

We are in constant touch with Ministry officials and urge them as much as possible to expedite negotiations. While there have been delays I still feel confident that tangible results can be achieved before summer.

I am concerned though about how long, once negotiated, such a treaty will take to go into force. Parliamentary action is outside the control of technocrats and even routine cultural treaties can take two years or more for ratification. I cite this only as an example of the deliberate nature of Turkey's Parliament. On the positive side I think the change in government will be a definite advantage. It was the former Ecevit government (1974) that was responsible for the general amnesty resulting in a reduction of the girls' sentence to 24 years, and it is possible that the new Ecevit government will be more receptive in matters of this kind.

Meanwhile, we continue to explore alternatives for achieving the early return home of the girls and other Americans serving long sentences in Turkish prisons.

Sincerely,

RONALD I. SPIERS,
American Ambassador. ●

CHECK LIST FOR TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF UNITED STATES AND COCOM EXPORT CONTROL CASES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, from time to time I receive inquiries from American business regarding the criteria that are applied by our Government in determining whether or not to grant licenses for the export of advanced technology which might be strategically significant.

Too much of the export-licensing process is shrouded in secrecy. Too often our exporters have no way of predicting whether their product will receive an export license, or of knowing the reasons for a rejection of their license application. There is a fundamental lack of accountability and openness in the process. The subcommittee has been working to remedy this and will continue to do so.

Recently the Department of Defense made available to the industry a list of technical guidelines it uses internally to arrive at a DOD position on license ap-

plications. I commend the Department for its openness in this respect. While I do not necessarily endorse the list in its entirety, I wish to place it in the RECORD so that all interested parties will have access to it.

The material follows:

CHECK LIST FOR TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF UNITED STATES AND COCOM EXPORT CASES

For each case requiring technical programmatic and combat effectiveness evaluations all of the following questions will be answered. Where appropriate, notations of "Not Applicable" or "Don't Know" will be entered. In formulating answers to questions regarding military significance, the factors listed in Appendix I will be expressly considered.

1. Relationship to US/Weapons System and Military Significance:

What predominant or important military or military supporting end-use does this item currently have?

2. Stated End Use:

Is the stated civil end-use reasonable and appropriate?

3. Diversion Potential:

(a) Could this item easily be diverted from the stated civil end-use to a military or military supporting program in the country of destination? If so, how?

(b) Can adequate safeguards be devised either before or after the export to preclude diversions?

4. Technology Transfer:

(a) Does this item contain extractable technology of significance for military or military supporting production in the country of destination?

(b) Would follow-on operation and maintenance instructions, overhaul data, training or US plant visits connected with this export involve a transfer of significant technology?

5. Previous Releases:

(a) To what countries/foreign companies has similar US equipment or related technology been released?

(b) Is there evidence of attempts at illegal acquisition of the items or technology? If so, by whom?

6. Foreign Availability:

What is the present foreign availability of the item in quantity and quality?

7. Recommended Position:

(a) What DoD position (approval, disapproval, or approval with provisos) on this case would be consistent with this technical evaluation?

(b) Would this position represent a departure from previous policy? If so, how and to what extent?

8. Name, Organization, Office Symbol, Date and Signature.

APPENDIX I—FACTORS RELATING TO QUESTIONS ON MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE AND RELATIONS TO U.S. WEAPONS SYSTEMS

1. Relationship to US Weapons Systems:

(a) With respect to US military systems is the item or the technology within the item critical? As applied to questions (1) and (2) in the following its absence would degrade the performance of at least one of the primary missions.

(1) Current systems;

(2) Future systems;

(3) Research and Development;

(4) Diagnostic or maintenance systems, training, or operating instructions for either current or future systems? or,

(5) Design, manufacturing processes or utilization know-how relating to any of the above items?

(b) Would release of equipment/information reveal U.S. military equipment (vulnerabilities) (deficiencies) (tactics) (intelligence information) on our first line weapons or space systems?

(c) Was the product specifically designed for U.S. military equipment or has a commercially developed version of the product been modified for the military application? In either case is there a significant trend toward commercial exploitation of the product or embedded technology?

2. Military Significance/Technology Transfer:

(a) With respect to the recipient country will the sale create a new or significantly higher regional combat capability?

(b) Is this item related to:

(1) Nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons.

(2) Weapons or systems which provide strategic reconnaissance or missile delivery capability.

(3) Weapons or systems with a significant tactical capability.

(4) Technical data or specialized equipment which could contribute to indigenous design, development or manufacture of items (1), (2) and (3) above.

(c) Is this transaction related to any of the items on the preliminary list of dual-use (military-commercial application) critical technologies generated during Defense Science Board Study (Bucy Report). Implementation Effort (Appendix 2). Please describe the relationship.

APPENDIX 2

Description and No.:

ACOUSTICS & UNDERWATER

- Acoustic Displays, 1*.
- Acoustic Propagation, 2*.
- Acoustic Reception (Incl. Towed Arrays), 3*.
- Acoustic Transmission (Incl. Transducers), 4*.
- Deep Ocean (RUWS/WSP), 5*.

ADVANCED DESIGN & MANUFACTURING

- Design:
 - Advanced Airfoil & Three-Dimensional Wing Design, 6*.
 - Computer-Aided Design (other than for I.C.'s and machine tools), 7*.
 - Control Configured Vehicle (e.g., fly-by-wire), 8*.
 - Deep-Drawn, Thin-Walled Metal Parts Design, 9.
 - Fracture Control Design Processes, 10*.
 - Platform Stabilization, 11.

MANUFACTURING

- Airframes (e.g., Wide Body Transports), 12*.
- Bearingless Rotors, 13.
- Composite Filament Winding, 14.
- Diffusion Bonding (Incl. Titanium), 15*.
- Electrocatalysis, Chemical Modification of Electrodes, 16.
- Electroforming, 17.
- Electrostream Hole Drilling, 18*.
- Glass/Ceramic Applications, 19.
- High-Energy Rate Forging, 20.
- High-Performance Welding (Incl. Explosive Welding), 21.
- High-Precision Manufacture of Large Pressure Vessels, 22.
- High Vacuum Processes, 23.
- Hot Isostatic Processing, 24*.
- Inspection of Advanced Composite Structures, 25*.
- Non-Destructive Evaluation Technology, 26*.
- Numerical Control of Machine Tools (Incl. Adaptive), 27.
- Plasma Spraying, 28.
- Replicated Optics, 29*.
- Thixocasting & Rheocasting of Ferrous Materials, 30.
- Vacuum Casting (Especially Air-Cooled Turbine Blades), 31*.
- Vapor Deposition (Physical & Chemical), 32.

*Indicates high priority items.

ADVANCED MATERIALS

- Amorphous Metals, 33.
- Boron Fibers, 34.
- Corrosion/Erosion Resistant Coatings, 35*.
- Cubic Boron Nitride for Tooling, 36.
- Fiber Optics Materials, 37*.
- High Temperature Coatings for Superalloys & Titanium, 38*.
- Metal-Matrix Composites (Incl. Carbon-Carbon, Organic), 39*.
- Optical Thin Film Materials, 40.
- Polyimides (Incl. Kevlar), 41.
- Polymers (Incl. Piezoelectric, Pyroelectric and High-Temperature Elastomers), 42.
- Powder Metallurgy (e.g., High Cooling Rate), 43*.
- Radiation Detection Materials, 44.
- Solid State Microwave Device Materials, 45.
- Ultrahigh Carbon Steels (e.g., Superplasticity), 46.

ANTENNA & RADAR

- Conformal Antenna Arrays, 47.
- High Dynamic-Range Receivers, 48.
- High-Performance Clutter-Rejection Radar, 49.
- Solid State Transmitters & Frequency Amplifiers, 50.
- Specialized Space Antennas, 51.
- Synthetic-Aperture Radar, 52.
- Wide-Band Low-Noise Receivers, 53.

COMPUTERS

- Artificial Intelligence Software, 54.
- Biocybernetic Communication, 55.
- Computer Disc Systems, 56.
- Computerized Exchange Switching (Incl. Packet Switching), 57*.
- Distributed Data Base Systems, 58*.
- Large Memory Design (e.g., 10¹⁵ Bits), 59*.
- Memory Technologies (Incl. Bubble Memory & Logic, High Density Cores, Rapid Access Erasable), 60*.
- Natural Language Communications with Computers, 61*.
- Optical Computing, 62.
- Photo Interpretation by Computers, 63.
- Photo-Recording Materials, 64.
- Processor Architecture, 65*.
- Speech Processing Technology, 66.

DETECTORS AND FILTERS

- Infrared Detectors and Materials (Incl. High Resistivity Silicon), 67*.
- Intensified Array Detectors, 68*.
- Low Light-Level Imaging, 69*.
- Tunable IR Filters (Acousto-Optical or Electro-Optical), 70*.
- Wide-Angle Narrow-Band Filters, 71*.

ELECTRONIC AND OPTICAL COMPONENTS

- Solid State:
 - Beam Lead Integrated Circuits, 72*.
 - Charge-Coupled Device Signal Processing and Imaging, 73*.
 - Gallium Arsenide Devices (Incl. Microwave FET's), 74.
 - Large-Scale Integrated Circuits (Incl. Microprocessors, High Performance IIL, Schottky TTL).
 - Metal Oxide Threshold Switches (MOTS), 76.
 - Millimeter Wave Devices (e.g., 35 and 95 GHz), 77.
 - Solid State Light Modulators, 78.
 - Solid State Microwave Devices (Incl. Diodes, Silicon Bipolar Amplifiers and IC's).
 - Surface Acoustic Wave Devices and Technology, 80*.
 - Optical:
 - Adaptive Optics, 81.
 - Fiber Optics/Integrated Optics, 82*.
 - High-Density Optical Recording, 83.
 - High-Power Optics, 84.
 - Infrared Focal Plane Arrays, 85*.
 - Optical Fiber Cable Assemblies, Devices and Fiberguide, 86.
 - Plasma Displays, 87.
 - Other Electronic Components and Related Instruments:
 - Advanced Microwave Transmission Line Components (Incl. Microwave Tubes), 88.

- Arc Plasma Spray Technology, 89.
- Coherent Microwave Memory Technology, 90.
- Fast Fourier Transform Processors, 91*.
- High Performance A/D Convertors, 92*.
- High-Performance Cathode Ray Tubes, 93.
- High Performance Travelling Wave Tubes, 94.
- Millimeter Wave Tubes (e.g., 35 and 95 GHz), 95.
- Phase Control Components, 96.
- Ultra-Stable Oscillators, 97.

INSTRUMENTATION

- Electron Accelerators, 98.
- Flash Radiography, 99.
- Gravity Gradiometers, 100.
- High-Precision Clocks and Frequency Standards, 101.
- Inertial Navigation Systems (Incl. Gyro and Accelerometers), 102.
- Nondestructive Thin-Film Measurement, 103.
- Remote Sensing, 104.
- Scanning Electron Microscope, 105.
- Seismic Intrusion Sensors, 106.
- Structural Analysis and Integrity Assessment Systems Using Microprocessors, 107*.
- Ultra High-Speed Photography, 108.
- Very Wide-Band Tape Recorders, 109.
- Vibration Test Equipment, 110.

LASERS

- Coherent Sources with Wavelengths Shorter than 1000 A, 111.
- Electrical Excitation Technology for Lasers, 112*.
- Far IR Lasers (more than 50 micrometers), 113.
- Frequency Multipliers for Infrared Lasers, 114.
- High-Energy Lasers (Incl. Electrical Discharge, Gas Dynamic and Chemical), 115*.
- Laser Gyro Technology (Incl. Ring Laser Gyros), 116.
- Solid State Laser Diodes (Injection Laser Development), 117.
- X-ray Laser Technology, 118.

MAGNETICS

- High Magnetostriction Rare Earth Alloys, 119.
- Normal-Conducting Homopolar Electrical Machinery, 120.
- Rare-Earth Alloy Permanent Magnets, 121.
- Segmented-Magnet Motors and Generators, 122.

POWER GENERATION

- Centrifugal Compressors for Small Turbine Engines, 123*.
- Closed-Cycle Brayton Turbine, 124.
- Electrolyte Battery Developments (Incl. Lithium-Inorganic and Low-Temperature Solid), 125.
- Photoassisted Electrochemical Cells, 126.
- Photochemical Enhancement in Air-Breathing Engines, 127.
- Propulsion Controls, Materials and Systems, 128*.
- Pulsed Power Generation, 129.
- Thermoelectric Energy Conversion, 130.
- Turbojet Engines (e.g., Composite Materials, Polyamides, Bearings), 131*.

SUPERCONDUCTORS

- Polymeric Superconductors, 132.
- Superconducting Electrical Machinery, 133.
- Superconducting Sensors and Oscillators (Incl. Josephson/Tunnel Junction), 134.
- Superconducting Magnetometer Technology (Incl. Quantum Interference Devices), 135.

WINDOWS, COATINGS, AND MATERIALS

- Cooled Metal Mirror Fabrication, 136*.
- High-Speed Diamond Turning of Large Mirrors, 137*.
- Uncooled Mirror Materials, 138*.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 16, 1978, I was unavoidably absent from the House. Had I been present, I would have voted on matters coming before the House as follows:

"Yea" on rollcall No. 468, passage of H.R. 12927, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979.●

BUREAUCRATESE CREATES OVER-ABUNDANCE OF LAWYERS

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this article sent to me by the Honorable James E. Bromwell, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. This item was written by the very distinguished David M. Elderkin, who has practiced law in Cedar Rapids since 1937. He is past president of the Iowa State Bar Association, a member of the board of governors of the Iowa Academy of Trial Lawyers, and a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers.

Mr. Elderkin speaks out for the necessity of lawyers in our ever-increasing complex society. He points out "that until the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several States stop spewing such monstrous quantity of new legislation, we will need more lawyers, not fewer." This is a point well taken.

I wish Mr. Elderkin well and thank Mr. Bromwell for making this article available to us. The piece from the Cedar Rapids Gazette of June 4, 1978, follows: [From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, June 4, 1978]

KICKING LAWYERS SATISFIES, BUT FREEDOM RIDES ON WHAT THEY DO

(By David M. Elderkin)

Whatever one may think about President Carter, one must admit he is highly resourceful. Since he took office, he has been constantly criticized as a man in retreat. His own party (Jackson, Moynihan) has accused him of retreating before Soviet pressure on the issue of human rights, the neutron bomb and strategic arms limitation negotiations.

Critics challenge him with having retreated before the Soviet-Cuban rampage in Africa, abandoning Taiwan at the insistence of China and running away from South Korea. He has, of course, been accused of succumbing to pressure from Saudi Arabia, Panama, Angola, and, mostly recently, Zaire.

Domestically, he has been bullied by industry on voluntary price controls, by big labor on voluntary wage controls, and by Congress on everything, including energy, Social Security, food stamps, welfare, employment, education, hospital costs, urban policy, defense and taxation.

To get back in the ball game, the president's advisers (no doubt Hamilton Jordan, the tiger of the Washington, D.C., singles lounges) advised the president to go on the offensive. On being so advised, so he did. On big labor, big business, the oil cartel? Mr. Brezhnev, perhaps, or maybe even Fidel Castro?

Heck, no. He took out after the lawyers. Big deal.

In the first place, it's about as dangerous as attacking a geriatrics ward with a sharp stick. No one ever really loses, because the lawyers never fight back—they are too busy writing the speeches of the people attacking them.

Nor is it exactly a novel idea. Everyone at times gets some mileage out of it. For 5,000 years or more, everyone periodically has been attacking the lawyers—kings, emperors, presidents, congressmen, editorial writers, public opinion polls.

The Iowa Legislature schedules a regular time for hate-lawyers discussion, right after the morning prayer. Even lawyers attack lawyers. It's a time-honored custom, sometimes deserved, and even when not it has its uses. Society needs a scapegoat for the perplexities and frustrations it creates.

It's hard to know just exactly if Mr. Carter has any real antipathy toward lawyers. When he was campaigning for office and appeared before the American Bar Association Convention, he was most flattering. Come to think of it, however, that was in the days when he was promising the Iowa farmer his undying support.

Seriously, his charge that the country is over-lawyered is quite true. I join with anyone who wonders why he can't make out his income tax return without a lawyer, or run a business without hiring lawyers to explain (if they can) OSHA, ERISA or the present Tax Reform Act of 1976. Parenthetically, if I am asked why a man can't confess to a crime without a lawyer, I can quickly tell you why he can't, but I won't claim it makes much sense.

But the quantity of lawyers comes from the demands of society. Congress enacted 200 bills in the last session with 7,000 rules and regulations all of which require knowledge and interpretation. Among them are the most complex and, in some instances, the most monstrous pieces of legislation ever known to tax the brains and souls of mankind.

They are written in bureaucratise which bears only a tantalizing resemblance to any spoken language. Do not believe the canard that they were written by lawyers—they were not; as a matter of fact they stagger the patience even of Philadelphia lawyers numbing them to acquiescence. The Iowa Legislature unfortunately is not far behind.

Definitely as Mr. Carter suggests there are too many lawyers. But until the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the several states stop spewing such monstrous quantity of new legislation, we will need more lawyers, not fewer. Someone must purport to study, understand and advise the rest of us on our rights, duties and obligations under all of this new legislation and the resultant administrative rules. A lawyer, in this connection, is simply a person who, by study and training, is able to properly advise us and many are needed.

But I suspect that these are not the kind of lawyers the president refers to. I am sure that he really finds his hostility toward those of us who practice that branch of the law we call advocacy—the representation of people and people's problems in the arena of the courtroom. It is in the courtroom, of course, that the public sees the law in action; and it is there that the public, as well as Mr. Carter, forms its judgment of the legal profession.

In the area of criminal law, for example, no matter how brutal the crime, the criminal

always seems to show up with a lawyer, increasingly at public expense, who files writ after writ, delaying and sometimes defeating what appears to be quick and simple justice. In the eyes of the public, if it were not for the lawyer and his hanky-panky, more criminals would be held responsible for their crimes.

"How," the lawyer is always asked, "can you defend a man you know is guilty?"

But if freedom is to be maintained, the lawyer must take seriously the constitutional commandment that every man is presumed to be innocent; it is not and cannot be the role of the lawyer to usurp the judge and the jury's province of determining guilt or innocence.

This, however, seems to have been the thrust of Mr. Carter's comment when he spoke with disdain of the lawyers who represented the people in the South who were resisting integration. He forgot, or ignored, the lawyers who went into Mississippi and the other Southern states to defend unjustly accused blacks and others who supported integration, as the public is inclined to overlook the fact that the lawyers involved in Watergate were prosecuted, sent to jail and disbarred by other lawyers; and the President of the United States, while represented by lawyers, was at the same time forced out of office by lawyers.

Which is the point I am trying to make.

The right, constitutionally guaranteed, to a fair and impartial trial, carrying with it the presumption of innocence, cannot exist without the right of every person to be represented by a lawyer, no matter how unworthy the person or ignoble his cause. It is the lawyer's duty to use every legal and honorable means at his disposal to protect his client's rights. If you would deny or limit this right, where would you draw the line?

We have, at best, a difficult, uneasy society. There is a vast potential of disorder that lies beneath an ordered surface. The tensions on the surface are a mirror of the reconciliations, the balances, the disciplines for which all civilized societies on every scale must forever search. It is not the responsibility of the lawyer, at least the trial lawyer, to make this search and strike these balances. This is the role of government.

Yet, it has long been a grave question whether any government strong enough to balance and control the tensions and the vast potential for disorder lying beneath the surface is not too strong for the liberties of its citizens.

Herein lies the lawyer's role—to preserve individual liberty. Is our effort always of high quality? Obviously not. Yet quite often. All in all, the American citizen, of whatever economic status and of whatever race, creed or color, has more individual liberty than any citizen of any other country on the face of the Earth.

There are many factors and many influences that bring this about, to be sure, but it is also true—and not generally appreciated—that at any given time, no person's liberty amounts to any more than he or she can get a lawyer to stand up—alone if need be—and defend.

This is true, Mr. President, from Sam Berkowitz to Bert Lance. For the role of the lawyer is not to make society virtuous, but to try to keep it free to be. If it chooses.●

THE STANFORD DECISION

HON. DAVID L. CORNWELL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. CORNWELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand in the opinion that the day of May

31, 1978, will also be a day that will "live in infamy." On this day, the Supreme Court destroyed the protection granted under the first and fourth amendments to the Constitution by reversing two lower court decisions requiring police officials to obtain a subpoena duces tecum to search innocent third party property: the Stanford decision. The Court, in a 5-to-3 decision, interpreted the fourth amendment to hold that innocent third party property may be legally searched with the aid of a search warrant. It is with this narrow interpretation of the Constitution that the American free press will suffer unless immediate action is taken.

My highest regards go out to Senator ROBERT DOLE, Senator BIRCH BAYH, Representative ROBERT DRINAN, and specifically Representative ANDY JACOBS for their action in response to the Stanford decision. Through the action of these distinguished colleagues may freedom of the press continue to bless the United States of America.

I wish to enter the remarks of Marvin Stone, reporter for the U.S. News & World Report, who exemplifies the ramifications of the courts decision and promulgates some insight to our colleagues proposals:

The remarks follow:

A PERIL NOT ONLY TO THE PRESS
(By Marvin Stone)

It is starting to sink in—with some in Congress at least—that the recent Supreme Court decision approving search and seizure in a newspaper office has frightening implications. The decision is being rightfully regarded as one more move to cancel safeguards of the First and Fourth amendments, not only for the press, but for all citizens.

The details require a brief review. On April 12, 1971, police came unannounced to the offices of the *Stanford Daily*, armed with a search warrant. They thought the *Daily*, though not itself suspected of crime, might possess photographs showing who helped beat up nine policemen. The invaders ransacked photo labs, cabinets, desks and wastebaskets, found nothing and left. The paper sued local authorities. It won in U.S. district court and appeals court. But the Supreme Court now has ruled that no clause in the Constitution bars what happened to the *Daily*.

The potential peril to every individual became evident in Justice Stevens' dissent: "Doctors, lawyers, merchants, customers, bystanders . . . may have documents in their possession that relate to an ongoing criminal investigation." You could interpret that to mean that police, armed with search warrants from judges or magistrates—any judges or magistrates—could invade the homes of third parties and rummage through their files, letters, photos and documents as if they were no better than common criminals.

The Boston Globe saw, as well it might, a "step toward a police state." Sam Dash, once the Senate's chief counsel in investigating Watergate, concluded that the new decision puts innocent people in a worse plight than criminals.

How did we come to such a state?

The Fourth Amendment, written out of bitter experience, declares: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be

searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

For many years, this was interpreted to mean that only weapons or the plunder of crime could be hunted. But in 1967 the Courts sanctioned the seizure of "mere evidence." The Stanford raid and other, similar cases followed, broadening the searches to papers and other effects of innocent third parties, and now the Court has approved these also.

The Court's majority—commendably—did invite legislative action. It was not long in coming. Representatives Drinan and Jacobs and Senators Dole and Bayh, occupying a pretty wide political spectrum, are offering legislation to guard the personal privacy made vulnerable by the Court. Cosponsors are many.

Any of these bills would give welcome aid; the only question is whether they go far enough. Drinan's plan, for instance, confines itself to the press—a vital consideration but only part of the problem.

Dole and Bayh would require a hearing for the innocent party before a search could be conducted, but would permit this to be skipped if the police showed that the party, given warning, might destroy the evidence.

This arrangement would provide little safety against the most feared threat, an unscrupulous administration and a compliant magistrate. But the Jacobs bill may have a solution: Where the wanted evidence cannot be found without exposing other private papers to inspection, all must be sealed without examination until after a hearing. If properly structured, this procedure, which parallels the model code of the American Law Institute, averts danger of destruction while protecting the individual.

Whatever the action—and it must be weighed with utmost care—now is the time. Liberties that Americans treasure are being threatened and could easily be stolen away. ●

TWENTY-FIVE TO BE HONORED AT 16TH ANNUAL COTILLION

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to draw the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to the 25 young people from in and around Flint, Mich., who will be honored at the 16th annual Cotillion this Saturday. Nineteen young women and six young men will receive special recognition from the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, whose Flint chapter sponsors the annual affair. The Flint chapter has contributed substantially to a better life for many in the Flint area and is a respected and valued voice in the business community as well as the community at large.

The 1978 Cotillion Debutantes are Iva Alexander, Cassandra Barker, Sherri Bryant, Angela Franklin, Marcia Hedrick, Debra Jackson, Tanya Edwards, Roxann Jenkins, Edda Johnson, Cornelia Monroe, Phyllis Oliver, Eleanor Powell, Lucille Shamley, Renee Turner, Kathleen White, Tanya Woodson, Lisa McCloud, Melody Smith, and Rhonda Conner.

The young men being honored this year are Joey Edwards, Craig Fields, Greg Renick, Greg Simmons, Greg Tucker, and Wendell White. ●

MEDICARE—LOW VISION COVERAGE FOR THE LEGALLY BLIND

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Ms. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide medicare coverage of low vision lenses and illumination aids for legally blind individuals together with coverage of accompanying low vision services.

Research has established that approximately 80 percent of those persons termed "legally blind" have some degree of useful vision which can be maximized through the use of low vision aids and training. Legal blindness is most prevalent among the elderly. However, there are an additional 117,000 persons under the age of 65 who are eligible for medicare through the Social Security Disability Insurance program as a result of legal blindness.

To address the needs of these persons, specialists have developed a wide variety of optical lens systems which can enable legally blind individuals to make use of residual vision for reading and other activities. Low vision aids may range from hand-held magnifiers to more complex microscopic lens systems mounted on spectacles.

The American Foundation for the Blind estimates that the average combined cost of optical aids and professional services is approximately \$200 per person. Thus, we could provide low vision services to a person enrolled in medicare at a cost of only \$10 million. Such coverage could restore sight to nearly 50,000 elderly Americans and permit them to enjoy the same daily activities and independence that nonhandicapped persons take for granted.

The legislation follows:

H.R.—

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage, under the supplementary medical insurance program, of certain lenses and illumination aids for individuals suffering from severe limitation of central visual acuity and of the services of an optometrist in prescribing such lenses and aids

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1861(s) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (8),

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and",

(3) by inserting immediately after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

"(10) lenses prescribed by a physician to aid the condition of limited central visual acuity, if the individual for whom any such

lens is prescribed suffers from blindness (as that term is used in section 216(1) (1) (B)).", and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (13) as paragraphs (11) through (14), respectively.

(b) Section 1861(r)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "or establishing the necessity for and prescribing lenses (as well as any illumination aid to be used in connection therewith) to aid the condition of limited central visual acuity of an individual who suffers from blindness (as that term is used in section 216(1) (1) (B))" immediately after "lenses".

(c) Section 1864(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraphs (10) and (11)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (12) and (13)".

(d) Section 1862(a)(7) of such Act is amended by adding immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "(except that this paragraph shall not be applicable to lenses described in section 1861(s)(10), and illumination aid prescribed by a physician to be used in connection with any such lens, nor to services of a physician in determining the necessity for and prescribing any such lens or aid)".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only to services furnished on or after the first day of the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.●

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE GARRETT

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in recognizing an outstanding public servant in my district, Mr. Charlie Garrett. On July 13, he will be retiring from his position of president of the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce after a distinguished term of service.

One certain reason for Charlie Garrett's tremendous success as president of the chamber of commerce, and his other public service positions, is his colorful background. After completing his formal education, he worked in a variety of positions from coal miner to boatswain's mate in the U.S. Navy. From these experiences he molded a valuable talent, the ability to understand and work with people. This personal characteristic has been a contributing factor to his remarkable success as chamber president.

In recognition of this tremendous potential, in 1972, Mr. Garrett was selected to attend the prestigious Institute of Humanistic Studies in Aspen, Colo. This experience served to further increase his knowledge of human interaction.

Charlie Garrett has voluntarily offered his service as a member of the board of directors of the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce for the past 7 years. As the 1977-78 president, he led the organization to what has been called its most successful year.

His dedicated service has extended beyond the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce and reached the entire community. He has been an active member of the board of directors of the South Bay

Association of Chambers of Commerce and has been a valuable participant in the Redondo Beach Round Table.

As Charlie Garrett's term as chamber of commerce president comes to an end, I ask the Members of this 95th Congress to join me in this commendation for his outstanding community service, and wish him continued success in his future endeavors.●

ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION REPORT ON "INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ON BREEDER REACTORS"

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned about the implications of the administration's nuclear policy which has caused grave doubts on the part of the Soviets and Japanese as well as our friends in Western Europe. In my discussions with European Government officials last summer and this winter the bankruptcy of the Carter nuclear policy was starkly evident. The recent decisions by the British and Japanese on nuclear reprocessing have "broken the dike" on this misguided policy. The Japanese decision to invest in French and British reprocessing facilities was predictable to everyone but the Carter administration. I cannot imagine how the United States could expect the Japanese to turn their backs on the energy in spent nuclear fuel. They are an island nation with no fossil reserves and it is only common sense for them to look to conserving their enriched U.S. uranium and reactor-made plutonium.

I have submitted a report to the Science and Technology Committee on my European oversight findings and have prepared a companion report on my Soviet discussions which I shall submit to the committee this month. My findings on the question of breeder reactor development are strongly corroborated by the recent Rockefeller Foundation report on "International Cooperation on Breeder Reactors." This is a particularly important and timely document and contains the following major points.

The United States had the early lead in developing experimental FBRs. It has put no new breeder reactors in place for some time and has, at present, no firm plans for doing so.

Measured in terms of successful reactors of progressively increasing scale, the French and the Soviets have a clear lead now. Moreover, both nations have firm plans for continued demonstration of scaled-up reactors.

Measured on the same scale, the British are not far behind the French and the Soviets. However, the U.K. does not currently have a reactor in construction and so may not keep pace. (The British do have a 250 Megawatt electric reactor operating at Dounreay, Scotland.)*

*Mr. Wydler's comment.

The F.R.G. and Japan have started programs more recently than France, the United States, the U.K. and the U.S.S.R. Germany progressed rapidly at first but is experiencing some difficulty with its SNR-300 schedule. Japan built its first breeder reactor, JOYO, in a relatively short time; its second effort, MONJU, is in construction and is expected to progress rapidly.

Of central importance to the future prospects for international cooperation on breeders are the following: the close existing association between France and the F.R.G., together with Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands; the U.S. indecision; and the relative position of Japan.

The recommendations from chapter 7 of the report are:

The U.S. should continue to develop breeders as insurance against possible future resource depletion. For such an approach to be credible, breeders should be proven as an option through the demonstration of commercially sized units.

The present LMFBR reactor and fuel cycle technology should be further developed in its most proliferation-resistant form as the technology of choice and in light of the INFCE process.

The U.S. should take steps to move back into a position of technological leadership on the breeder reactor and particularly on the breeder fuel cycle and nonproliferation measures. These steps should include:

Adoption of a policy which does not encourage premature commercial breeder deployment but fosters appropriate RD&D;

Articulation of a policy of intent to support development of proliferation-resistant breeder technologies, including plutonium-fueled LMFBRs; and

Careful and deliberate preparation of a breeder research, development and demonstration program plan.

The U.S. government should recognize that continued exchange and cooperation on R&D, demonstration, and safety and licensing may make nonproliferation-related agreements easier to achieve.

Current international cooperative activities in R&D are judged to be effective and no specific recommendations are made in that regard.

The U.S. and Japan, and possibly the U.K., should plan a joint breeder demonstration plant program. Eventual participation of additional countries, particularly the U.K., should be provided for.

The continental European breeder program is already closely integrated, and no specific recommendation is made in this regard. However, the U.S. and others should recognize that the group is open to additional interchanges, particularly on a commercial basis.

The U.S. and Japan, and possibly the U.K., the F.R.G., France and the U.S.S.R., should form a working group, possibly under IAEA auspices, among their respective licensing agencies which would explore the merits of increased cooperation in developing licensing standards and procedures.

A clear international understanding of the nonproliferation issue as it relates to LMFBR fuel cycle should be sought by forming an international working group, perhaps organized through INFCE ** (or otherwise independently by the U.S., the F.R.G., France, the U.K., the USSR and Japan). The group's goals would be to standardize the assumptions, terminology and perspective of the issues, to identify specifically areas of agreement and differences of opinion, and to seek means of resolving the differences.

Consideration should be given to forging an industrial consortium or cooperative, suitable for the purpose of international fis-

**International Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE).

isile material supply and control, out of certain existing or planned sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities—specifically Barnwell, Windscale, LaHague, Eurochemic, Tokai-Mura, Gorleben and perhaps the planned Japanese reprocessing plant—and including provision for future participation and supply options.

A feasibility study should be undertaken on the establishment of an international fuel cycle authority responsible for the control of fissile material. The analysis should be detailed and specific beyond the broad conceptual work already done on this topic by the IAEA and other organizations. ●

SOLAR POWER SATELLITES—THE PUBLIC REACTION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week on June 14, I had the privilege of appearing on public television's MacNeil/Lehrer Report with my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. FLIPPO. The topic of the discussion was the proposed solar power satellite and Mr. FLIPPO's bill, which would in effect give the go-ahead to the SPS program. Since this bill will soon be considered by the House, I thought I would share with my colleagues a representative sample of the mail I have since received about the broadcast.

The first letter gives one citizen's estimate of \$40,000 as the cost per homeowner using the SPS system—calculated with the designer's own cost figures, by the way. This means that it would cost far less for the Federal Government to purchase a solar collector for every home in the Nation than it would to finance the solar satellite program, it is calculated.

The second letter contains an article from the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times, of May 28, 1978, which was forwarded to me by the subject of that article, Jan Reiner. Again comparing the cost of satellites versus the advantages of terrestrial solutions.

Both these letters, as well as many others I have received, reiterate my feeling that the solar power satellite concept is a wasteful extravaganza.

BILL PILOT Co.,
Rockford, Ill., June 15, 1978.

Representative RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I saw you on the McNeil/Lehrer report on Public TV. After I got some of the figures that were presented on cost I made the following analysis.

I assumed cost per satellite station is 25 billion dollars. One hundred stations are needed in this country. I assumed 60 million homes in the country. I know from personal experience that the cost of a comprehensive solar system in the Rockford area can be built for approximately \$8,000 per large home. It will supply 60% of the heat and hot water needed.

Simple arithmetic shows that satellite power (100 stations) would cost 2.5 trillion dollars. That's \$40,000 per household. However it would only cost 480 billion dollars to equip every home in the United States

with solar heating (\$8,000 each) if the Federal Government paid the total bill.

That leaves over two trillion dollars to solve the R&D problems to upgrade the storage capacity of existing solar systems and to develop solar cells for private home use to provide the necessary electrical power. It is obvious when one examines the economics that it is more advantageous by far for the Federal Government to buy everyone a solar home heater than to build a satellite system.

I can't believe that Congress intends to waste our money in this manner.

Yours truly,

BILL PILOT.
BETTY PILOT.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, May 28, 1978]

PREPARATION FOR FUTURE MUST BE ON "EARTHLY SCALE"

(By Charles Benbow)

A willful computer named HAL was the villain of outer space in 2001: *A Space Odyssey*. More likely though, catastrophes in space colonies will originate for the same reasons they occur on Earth.

So said Jan Reiner, architect and educator, during a luncheon lecture last week at the Arts Center in St. Petersburg. In the course of preaching his humanist's philosophy he reviewed some of the projects proposed for development of gigantic Earth satellites. He is not, however, an advocate of such projects. Better to spend the money on rebuilding the cities of Earth.

Despite precautions as to the nature of the "colonists" on these satellites Reiner said, warfare could develop—wars within a colony between members of the population with conflicting interests; wars between the colonies over resources; wars between the colonies when "nationalism, chauvinism or control of resources divide their sponsoring nations in times of trouble on Earth." He even noted the possibility of war with extraterrestrial beings.

Recalling that the colonization of America was "real-estate ventures" of Old World entrepreneurs, Reiner foresees that multinational corporations could build orbiting industrial colonies with the promise of high dividends to their stockholders. The American colonies rebelled and Reiner hypothesizes that inhabitants of self-sufficient, industrial colonies in space might refuse to pay tribute to Earth.

Reiner used handsome colored slides and diagrams from NASA, Boeing, Rockwell, Lockheed and others to illustrate the utopias the American military-industrial complex is working on. They are vast cities with their own farms and factory components built on man-made planets sufficiently large enough to provide a comfortable "gravity" by means of their own axial rotation.

We're being "conditioned" to accept all this, Reiner suggested. The urban crises, the pollution debates and the oil and energy crises are helpful to this end, he said. "Scare people enough about national security," Reiner said, "and you can get money out of them."

Scientist-authors have made various suggestions about the type of people who might inhabit these artificial planets, Reiner points out—the extremes being persons with computers surgically implanted in their brains or, to save shuttle payload costs, they might be preconditioned, test-tube embryos carried into space in "shoeboxes."

Reiner said, orbiting solar energy collectors alone will cost "trillions of dollars" for the "acres" of solar cells needed to satisfy Earth's power needs.

Reiner concluded with a review of the work needed to "entirely rebuild" cities on Earth to make them livable. He prefers that

the "trillions of dollars" be spent on new concepts for earthly transportation, agriculture, and political structures. "Whatever is done, cannot be done solely on a national basis," he says "A preparation for a better future must be on a (whole) earthly scale." ●

OPERATION YOUTH

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, in this time of great cynicism about our governmental processes, I think it is appropriate to call attention to a positive development, the annual Operation Youth which recently took place in my district. The conference, held this year June 10-17 at Xavier University in Cincinnati, has for 18 years provided interested young men and women the opportunity to learn about our system of government.

Seventy-seven high school juniors and seniors from Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana participated in the program. Included in the agenda were speeches by leaders of government, industry, and education on such topics as "Political Image in America," "Freedom Preserves Values," and "America's Ethnic Heritage." The students were provided forums in which to discuss these topics and other current issues. In addition, the students participated in a political simulation as they formed political parties and elected officials to a mock municipal government. I am proud to recognize those students who were elected to office as well as those who participated in all other aspects of this valuable program.

They are as follows: Kevin Rue of Hamilton Baden High School, mayor; Maria Del Carmen Hidalgo of St. Ursula Academy, vice mayor; Cathy Hines of Talawanda High School, city manager; Brian Kokensparger of New Lexington High School, clerk of council; and council members Phil Bunes of Goshen Local High School, Tom Gardner of Madeira High School, Jenifer McKittrick of Greenville High School, Jeff McMahon of Loveland Hurst High School, Colleen Moosbrugger of Charminade-Wyoming High School, John Morgan of Wyoming High School, and Sardina Rivizzino of Bishop Fenwick High School.

Also participating in the conference were Allison Behm, Kenneth Belleman, Randy Berning, Cheryl Broka, Roy Brown, Timothy Bruggeman, Lisa Bruemmer, Craig Calcaterra, James Corso, Gregory Delev, Thomas Fisher, Julie Franz, James Gabel, Paul Gerbus, Jill Gerhardt, Leonard Geshan, Mike Gilbert;

Gregg Greivenkamp, Joseph Gruber, Shelly Harker, Evelyn Hassett, Patrick Haverland, Kimberly Hill, Roy Hobbie, Kent Johnson, Lynn Jones, Kathy Kearney, Mike Killian, William Klaus, Barbara Kolbe, Janice Lahna, Lori Louis, Laurie Marggrander, Sharon Mikula;

Sieanna Miller, Barry Milliron, Christine Murphy, Dennis O. Connor, David Oka, Cynthia Okuley, Patricia Olvera,

Michael O'Rourke, Connie Race, Troy Richburg, Jeff Scholles, Monica Sertell, Precia Shenk, Mark Skoroz, Suzanne Splain, Sharon Stanton;

Mary Ellen Stoehr, Thomas Suciello, Beth Szymanowski, Sue Tepe, Sandy Tye, Brad Van Etten, Patty Vesper, Martin Vettel, Suzanne Wahle, Baron Wair, Judith Ward, Michael Weber, John Werment, James Wilch, Susan Wilp, and Paul Woodworth.

I would especially like to honor Mr. William E. Smith, director of Operation Youth and professor of accounting and education at Xavier University. His efforts, as well as those of his staff, Bryan Adrick, Brian Marrero, Leo Bowden, Allen Burke, Jan Thompson, Mark Waters, Marilyn Mayer, Maureen Murphy, Paula Schimpf, and Stephen Wilson, enabled 77 young citizens to gain new insight into the workings of democracy. With programs such as Operation Youth, I am optimistic about the future of America.●

LIMITING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, the House voted to prohibit the use of legislative branch funds for televising House proceedings if the cameras are controlled by persons not employed by the House.

I was very disappointed by this action.

This action is, in my opinion, a limitation on the freedom of the press. And, it could have a chilling effect on broadcast journalism.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following, which appeared in the June 16, 1978, Washington Post:

THE SOUNDS OF CONGRESS

Some new sounds have been heard across the land this week: the voices of members of Congress in House debate. Until Monday, citizens outside the Capitol galleries had no way to hear proceedings on the House floor. They had to rely on broadcasters' summaries or statements that lawmakers recorded elsewhere. Now Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill (D-Mass.) is letting broadcasters use the sound carried on the official system that transmits floor proceedings to members' offices. Some networks and stations have already carried excerpts from this week's debates.

The new system is a welcome first step. But it has practical limitations. The microphones do not pick up the background sounds that convey a real sense of the chamber's atmosphere. More important, reporters may broadcast only from a gallery off the floor, where they cannot see what is going on. In contrast, the Senate, during its Panama debates, allowed National Public Radio to broadcast from a balcony. The correspondent could watch events, identify all speakers instantly, describe roll calls and inform listeners of off-mike events such as quick conferences among senators. That kind of on-the-spot, gavel-to-gavel coverage is practically ruled out in the House so far.

The system also embodies Mr. O'Neill's

view, affirmed by the House on Wednesday, that Congress itself should operate the mikes and, in the future, television cameras. As a matter of principle, we and most broadcasters object to that. What remains to be seen is how much day-to-day difference House control will make. If the House does provide first-class technical services and grants broadcasters enough access and flexibility, the public will certainly gain. We trust that Mr. O'Neill will move quickly to expand broadcast opportunities so people everywhere can hear and eventually see more of their representatives at work.●

ANOTHER VOICE OF REASON IN ALASKA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the proposed new national parks and wildlife refuges to be created in H.R. 39, the "Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act" are in remote, interior Alaska. The lifestyle of rural Alaskans, those people who inhabit the scattered "bush" villages throughout interior Alaska, will be directly affected by the outcome of this legislation. They, after all, are the ones who actually live in these areas. How do they feel about this landmark conservation initiative?

The newspaper of rural Alaska, the Tundra Times, perhaps best sums up the feelings of "bush" Alaskans in a recent editorial that concludes "...delay in drawing final park and refuge boundaries will only keep the brakes on Alaska's postpipeline efforts to build financial stability and security for the future."

Following is the complete text of the editorial:

[From the Tundra Times, May 31, 1978]

SENATE D-2 FILIBUSTER

Alaska's two Senators have been threatening for weeks to block passage of an Alaska federal lands bill in the Senate. The House has already passed such a bill by a hefty margin.

Senators Ted Stevens and Mike Gravel, who are strongly opposed to the House version of the comprehensive land classification package, seem hopeful that after this fall's general election, the halls of Congress will be inhabited by a greater number of pro-development legislators, assuming that throwing the d-2 issue back to the House to start from scratch, which their delaying tactics would do, would result in a "better" House bill. On this assumption, the Senators want to stop the momentum that has developed to complete d-2 work this year. In other words, they want to:

- (1) prolong the uncertainty over how subsistence resources are going to be managed by state and federal agencies, and threaten the protection of millions of acres of habitat needed to support fish and wildlife;
- (2) delay Congressional blessing of the State of Alaska's long awaited Statehood land entitlement program;
- (3) complicate, rather than simplify, the fight over some of the d-2 questions which the Senators feel the House has not answered in the best interests of Alaska;
- (4) put off consideration of amendments

to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act designed to make the cumbersome machinery of ANCSA implementation serve the original, honorable purpose for which it was intended—protection and recognition of Native land rights.

We hold the assumption that next year's Congress will be more sympathetic to the Senators' pro-development stance to be tenuous at best. This premise is particularly shaky considering that veteran Washington Representative Lloyd Meeds, who fought long and hard, albeit unsuccessfully, in the House for the type of d-2 bill that Gravel and Stevens want, will retire this year.

Senators Stevens and Gravel, should they choose to pursue their ill-conceived and short-sighted filibuster, would surrender a far better chance at altering the d-2 bill than that provided by waiting for a different Congressional attitude that might never materialize. Should they go along with the 1978 d-2 deadline, they might find it relatively simple to extract concessions from environmentalists anxious to have a bill on the Presidents' desk by the end of the year.

A last point not accounted for in the Senators' strategy is that prolonging the uncertainty over this federal land legislation can only add to the deep-rooted pessimism one now finds throughout Alaska's economic community. Far more than large parks and wildlife refuges themselves, which will have positive economic value for the state, delay in drawing final park and refuge boundaries will only keep the brakes on Alaska's postpipeline efforts to build financial stability and security for the future.●

JEWISH LEDGER'S ANNIVERSARY

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the long-cherished freedom of the press has always been a pinnacle among the achievements of our society. The result has been the publication of diverse material representing and reflecting upon all aspects of American life. One area which has been the focus of numerous periodicals is that of our various ethnic-religious backgrounds. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize one of Connecticut's foremost such periodicals.

The Connecticut Jewish Ledger celebrated its 49th anniversary in its June 15, 1978 edition. This weekly paper is a paragon of ethno-religious journalism and has long been the voice of Connecticut Jewry. It diligently reports events and issues of concern to its relevant audience; strives to educate and entertain; comments on current events; and endeavors to develop and maintain a sense of community among its readers. Furthermore, it has often served as a liaison between Connecticut's Jewish community at large.

Any truly beneficial institution must prove itself in the test of time, and the Connecticut Jewish Ledger's celebration of its 49th anniversary is a testimony to its success. I congratulate the Ledger on its accomplishments and look forward to many more years of its astute and enjoyable publications.●

CARTER'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, writing in the Bulletin of American Professors for Peace in the Middle East, Mark Siegel, formerly deputy assistant to President Carter, has characterized the President's Middle East policy "erratic" and "unpredictable."

Siegel says that Brzezinski and Carter are "the ultimate obstacle to peace in the Middle East." Those are pretty harsh words from an ex-White House insider, but Siegel makes a strong, organized case in support of his statement.

Because I think the Siegel critical analysis is worthy of the attention of the House, the article follows:

WASHINGTON'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY

(By Mark A. Siegel)

In the current respite (to put it optimistically) in the Middle East negotiating process, we can take stock of the Carter Administration's record on the issues, successes and failures, and attempt at least to evaluate alternative plans for U.S. action in the short and long terms.

When the Carter Administration came to power in January 1977, the President, his National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and his Secretary of State Cyrus Vance were persuaded that 1977 was a year of major opportunity for a breakthrough in the Arab-Israeli stalemate, for a number of reasons: (1) a coincidence of "moderate" Arab leadership in the region; (2) the desire for peace of all the parties to the conflict (including President Assad of Syria and, at least initially, Yasser Arafat of the PLO); economic dysfunction in the region, particularly in Egypt and Israel linked, at least in the mind of the Carter Administration, to wartime economic constraints; (3) military stalemate; a balance of military power, making war an unacceptable alternative for both sides, and (4) the positioning of the U.S. as a third party trusted by both sides, to act as a mediating force for change in the rigid negotiating positions that had produced the stalemate in the first place.

The President's first goal was to limit the issues of the conflict. The Administration adopted the Brookings formula, of three overriding issues—the definition and obligations of peace, the relationship between territory and security, and the Palestinian question. Secretary of State Vance was sent to the Middle East in February of 1977 to try to get the parties to adopt this structure for negotiations and then a program for conflict resolution. Vance did achieve this limited (and limiting) goal. Through his efforts, and follow-up bilateral summit meetings between Carter and Middle East heads of state, the issues were so narrowed (if one could call it narrowed—since the three Brookings "super-issues" in fact encompassed all peripheral issues of the thirty-year conflict).

The President, in his effort to expand the U.S. mediating role into a catalytic role, began to articulate innovations in U.S. policy specifically designed, at least in terms of the Administration's retroactive explanation, to shake the status quo. Hence the Clinton, Mass. endorsement of a Palestinian homeland, inconsistent with the traditional Israeli position; hence the expansion of the defini-

tion and obligations of full peace as the goal of the process, inconsistent with the traditional Arab position; hence the interpretation of the U.S.-moderate Arab "special-relationship," hence the U.S. arms commitments, breaking with past U.S. foreign policy behavior, and hence the Administration's systematic and prolonged overtures to the PLO.

However, despite this retroactively justified diplomatic method, it is difficult to view the Carter Administration's behavior as far removed from diplomatic madness, or at least as erratic and unpredictable swervings that acted to destabilize the potential peace process. Inconsistency in strategy and goal, best exemplified by the ill-conceived joint Soviet-American communique on Geneva, seemed to characterize U.S. diplomatic behavior.

What is claimed to be the most dramatic "success" of the Administration to date—the Sadat peace initiative—was not only not encouraged by U.S. foreign policy planners, but was viewed, at least initially and probably still, as inconsistent with the U.S. goal of reconvening the Geneva Conference and the achievement of a comprehensive, multi-lateral Middle East peace settlement.

The failure of the U.S. enthusiastically to endorse and publicly to embrace the Egyptian-Israeli bilateral peace initiative is the most significant error in a host of past and continuing Carter errors in Middle Eastern policy. The failure of Carter and, in this case, more specifically Brzezinski, to respond to the changing demands of the situation, raises questions as to the competence of this set of U.S. foreign policy decision-makers to act effectively in the region.

The clumsy and misguided U.S. Middle East arms sales package, introducing new and complicating variables into the peace negotiations, further inhibits Israel from taking the quantum leaps of faith that many believe may be in order. The goal of the sales, and most notably its timing and packaging, seem to me to go far beyond the arms sales question, and indicate a simplistic tactic of pressure on Israel and an attempt at deliberate confrontation with the American Jewish community by Carter and Brzezinski that can only have counterproductive consequences in an Israel already consumed with self-questioning about territorial, political, military and, ultimately, psychic security.

The incessant and overt U.S. criticism of Israeli positions, large and small, without any corresponding attempt to criticize Arab intransigence (which, to date, makes Israeli inflexibility appear mild indeed by comparison) has led to the distinct impression in this nation and in the Middle East that traditional U.S. government support for Israel has significantly eroded. It has made many American Jews feel that Carter has, in deed and in spirit, "tilted." Carter would have done far better in generating more Israeli negotiating innovation and change, by reinforcing, not destroying, the inevitability and continuity of the U.S.-Israel special relationship. And the President's incoherent negotiating style with the Israelis—cold and aloof to Rabin, warm and effusive to Begin, icy and brutal to Begin, glowing and spiritual to Begin—has left Middle Eastern policy watchers not only dizzy, but incredulous. Announcing a U.S. memorial to the victims of the Holocaust while, at the same time, continuing a full-court lobbying press on the Hill to arm the Jidda-oriented Saudis with an abundant number of our most sophisticated air-to-air and air-to-ground war planes may be viewed by some in the White House as good public relations. But it is viewed by a great many others, outside the White House, as warped cynicism.

It would seem in the interest of American strategy in the Middle East for President Sadat to be encouraged to perceive that contrary to his January Camp David expectations, Jimmy Carter cannot negotiate a better deal for Egypt than Egypt can negotiate for itself. It would seem in the interest of peace in the Middle East for President Carter again to assume a reasonable and fair mediating role, and to drop his self-appointed mantle of compulsory-arbitrator.

If there is to be peace in the Middle East, it will be because Sadat and Begin have matured and adapted their positions in the long-term interests of their nations. It will be because they have come to decide that patronizing dogma about negotiations emanating from Washington cannot lead to mutual and reciprocal response by Egypt and Israel, but only to a rigid "let Jimmy change them" attitude that will further prolong the stalemate. Unless and until Carter and Brzezinski re-evaluate their positions and adjust their "bull-in-a-china-shop" incoherence, their efforts will remain what I believe they are today—the ultimate "obstacle to peace" in the Middle East. ●

FORMER SOVIET SALT NEGOTIATOR URGES AMERICAN REARMAMENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I was privileged to meet Dr. Igor Glagolev, until October 1976 the top expert on disarmament issues in the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He was a principal analyst for the U.S.S.R. in the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and not given to mincing words. As a Soviet analyst, he supported equality of armaments between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, because he "never imagined that the United States would be so stupid as to agree to Soviet superiority in this field." Furthermore, Dr. Glagolev had firsthand experience as to how the Soviet Union uses its "peace" initiatives and World Peace Council (WPC) as an instrument of war and arming of terrorists and armies of invasion in Southern Africa.

Statements and analyses Dr. Glagolev made to me are elaborated in the following interview with veteran investigative Journalist John Rees, published in the May 10, 1978, edition of the weekly news magazine, the Review of the News. I highly commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

FORMER SOVIET SALT OFFICIAL URGES UNITED STATES TO ARM

(By John Rees)

(Dr. Igor Glagolev, in his first published interview, discusses what the Soviets are really trying to do with the SALT negotiations.)

The mailbox at the house where your reporter met Igor Glagolev was unmarked. His telephone is unlisted, and his address is known to perhaps a dozen people in the

world. Igor Glagolev is not hiding, but he is taking every reasonable precaution so that he can live to accomplish what he knows to be an urgent task. He has deliberately chosen to leave his own country to warn Americans that they are in great danger.

At the height of a distinguished career which took him to the top of the Disarmament Section of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Science, Dr. Glagolev realized that he must sacrifice himself to take a stand against the oppressive Communist Government that controls his country. One of the Soviet Union's most important political analysts, he managed to reach the United States, and since his arrival he has briefed authorities on the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT), human rights issues, and other important matters.

Igor Glagolev forcefully reminds us that there is no freedom of thought or advocacy in the Soviet Union and that the existence of strong factions of "Kremlin doves" is a fantasy created by K.G.B. disinformation agents in order to deceive Western leaders and Western public opinion. Of the "peaceful" intentions of the Soviet leadership, Dr. Glagolev says:

"The diplomats of the U.S.A. and of other democratic countries have ceaselessly appealed to the present Soviet Government to reduce, or at least not to increase, the vast weaponry of the U.S.S.R. Such requests, however, have been systematically rejected by the Soviet leadership. Overt support by any Soviet citizen for an American proposal to reduce Soviet arms is inevitably interpreted by the party leadership as a sign of political unreliability. In the past, support of U.S. proposals by some Soviet scholars has resulted not only in their removal from the decision-making process but also in accusations of pro-Americanism, party penalties, transfers to interior positions, reductions in salary, and prohibition of travel abroad. If members of a given section of a public institute or commission should express a desire to accept U.S. proposals, or even to discuss such proposals seriously, that section, institute, or commission may be completely abolished. Articles or books which express approval of American proposals—where those differ from the Soviet position—do not get published. In the actual process of diplomatic negotiations, the proposals of the United States are accepted only in those cases where they do not hamper the military programs of the Soviet Union."

As a result of his intimate familiarity with the Soviet leadership's policy-making process and goals of expansion and domination, and the privileged position which enabled him to travel in the Free World, examine our political and economic freedoms, and have ready access to Free World publications, Dr. Glagolev determined to do what he could to fight Communism where it would hurt the most. In October of 1976 he was given an opportunity to travel again to the West, making his way to the United States. In the following exclusive interview he tells of the dangers that face Americans as our leaders succumb to Soviet deception and yield to Communist aggression.

It should be kept in mind that while Igor Glagolev has a large English vocabulary, English is not his first language and some of his uses of words and phrases are different from that of native-born Americans. For example, Dr. Glagolev employs the term "democratic countries" to include such mixed concepts as the Western allies of N.A.T.O., democratically elected representative governments, what is called the Free World, and non-Communist countries in general.

Q. Dr. Glagolev, when and why did you come to the United States?

A. I came to the United States in October 1976. As a historical and political researcher I recognized that Communism was and is a reactionary movement, and I was in favor and am now in favor of representative democracy.

Q. You were involved in the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks on the Soviet side. What was your role as a planner and what was the Soviet purpose of SALT?

A. I wrote several analytical papers for the Central Committee of the Communist Party and for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and published articles on the subject of strategic arms limitation agreements. I was in favor of a limitation agreement, and in all my papers and articles advocated a balance of strategic weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States. But the U.S.S.R. was allowed more missiles than the United States, and the aggregate yield of those missiles was by agreement much larger than the aggregate yield of the missiles of the United States.

We who were analyzing disarmament supported the idea of actual equality of weapons, never imagining that the United States would be so stupid as to agree to Soviet superiority in this field. After that, papers on the Soviet side advocating equality were not published; were in fact suppressed. And the fact of the agreed to Soviet superiority was not told to the Soviet people. When I tried to publish this in my articles to tell the people, I was told: "Oh no, this is not to be published, this is an error in the article." And, when I quoted American sources for the protocol Brezhnev had signed, they insisted this was not to be published for the Soviet people.*

That is the tactic now. However, I believe that once the Soviet Union has increased its SALT-guaranteed strategic superiority over the United States the Soviet leaders will say so openly and will use that superiority to blackmail the Free World. It is important that Americans understand this because, at the present time, a relatively small increase in U.S. defense spending for production of the delayed weapons, and for research, would close the gap and make such blackmail unlikely.

Q. How do you view President Carter's decision to stop production of the neutron bomb and the B-1 bomber?

A. These are examples of unilateral reductions in the means of defense. The American decision not to build the B-1 bomber will lead logically to the elimination of the whole strategic aviation of the United States because the B-52 bombers will not be replaced by any other comparable bombers and almost the whole fleet of medium-range strategic bombers has already been liquidated.

The neutron bomb also involves a unilateral decision since the Soviet Union has not reciprocated. There are other decisions of a similar kind, like the postponement of the Trident submarine program and the MX missile program. The United States has decided not even to build replacements for the American land-based strategic missiles. It may mean that the whole force of such missiles will be allowed to deteriorate as they become old and obsolescent without any replacements. We are talking about unilateral disarmament of the United States in the face of a heavy Soviet buildup.

Q. Are you familiar with the activities of the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which has basically replaced the former functions of the Comintern?

A. Yes, I am familiar with these activities because I worked for many years for this

* It might be retranslated back to the American people to demonstrate to them the undeniable evidence of their betrayal by their own leaders.

department in its central offices. It tries to coordinate the activities of foreign Communist Parties. The leaders of these parties are invited periodically to Moscow and the members of the International Department discuss key problems with them and give them instructions.

Q. How does the International Department work with the K.G.B.? Does it have oversight functions of some activities? Can you describe the chain of command down from the Politburo?

A. In my opinion, the International Department and the K.G.B. cooperate very closely, but it is difficult to say who oversees because Andropov, who is chief of the K.G.B., is a member of the Politburo, the highest organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, while Boris Ponomarev, who is chief of the International Department, is only a candidate member of the Politburo.

The chain of command is very difficult to determine. For example, previously in some cases of which I know the Foreign Ministry subordinated to the International Department; Gromyko was invited to the International Department and just told to sign some documents. But now he has become a member of the Politburo, and the Politburo uses both the Foreign Ministry and the International Department of the staff of the Central Committee. The influencing of foreign governments is usually done through the Foreign Ministry, and the influencing of the Communist Parties is usually done through the International Department of the Central Committee.

Q. You were an official of the World Peace Council (W.P.C.), an organization which works with a number of U.S. groups ranging from the Communist Party, U.S.A., through the disarmament coalition, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, to the disarmament and anti-nuclear power Mobilization for Survival. What can you tell us of this operation?

A. I know this program very well. The World Peace Council is an organization which is officially considered international and non-political, but is actually subordinated to both the International Department of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee and to the K.G.B.

The aim of the World Peace Council is to influence masses of people in the democratic countries. The leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union try to suppress the peace movement in the Soviet Union itself but they are interested in enlarging its influence among the population of target countries. The W.P.C. is used because the Communist Parties are not very popular, but the slogans of "peace" and "disarmament" are really popular both in the Soviet Union and worldwide.

The International Department of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U., chooses members or prospective members of the World Peace Council. It actually appoints them, both the Soviet citizens and the citizens of the foreign countries.

There is a special fund the Central Committee uses. The money is collected by the churches in the Soviet Union and the believers think this money will be used for a real peace movement. However, the Central Committee usually invites only members of the foreign Communist Parties to the meetings of the World Peace Council or people who do not officially belong to the Communist Parties but who work for the Soviet Union, for the Soviet leadership.

And it is interesting that this World "Peace" Council is also used for arming terrorist groups in the foreign countries. For example, they use this World Peace Council to organize arms supplies for the terrorist groups in Africa. I participated in negotia-

tions to provide arms to such terrorists in the name of "peace."

Q. Last year we found out that the World Peace Council was acting as a conduit for funds provided to the Chilean K.G.B. agent Orlando Letelier; funds he was using to pay expenses of a United States Congressman, Michael Harrington (D.-Massachusetts), to a meeting sponsored by W.P.C. Are you familiar with World Peace Council activities in the United States?

A. Yes, the Communist leaders of the Soviet Union try to influence the people of the United States through the World Peace Council, and in general through the so-called "world peace movement."

I participated in thousands of discussions with Americans when I was a member of the Soviet Peace Committee of the W.P.C. The ideas of peace and disarmament are very popular in the United States and some Americans work for the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union without knowing it because they support the suggestions of the Soviet leaders in these fields. But "peace" suggestions may be directed against peace. For instance, during the war in Vietnam, the Soviet leaders organized the movement in the United States to stop resistance to the aggression of the North Vietnamese Communists. In the Soviet Union, however, the same "peace movement" advocated continuation of Hanoi's aggressive war against South Vietnam.

Q. Recently leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that their intent was to urge such restrictions on F.B.I. intelligence gathering that never again could the Communist Party, U.S.A., be investigated on grounds of its "affinity" for the Soviet Union. Presently the C.P.U.S.A. itself claims to have 18,000 members and over 100,000 sympathizers. In a population of 220 million, this is small. How is the Communist Party, U.S.A., useful to the Soviet Union?

A. The Soviet leaders try to use the members of the Communist Parties in the United States and the other democratic countries as their agents. The leadership of the Communist Party of the United States is directly subordinated to the International Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. However, sometimes they have some difficulties. And sometimes the Soviet leadership works through the Socialist parties, not through the Communist parties, in certain countries.

Q. When International Department chief Ponomarev was in this country recently, ostensibly as a "Soviet parliamentarian," he met not only with Congressmen but later with leaders of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in New York. Was this usual for his activities?

A. He gives them commands, instructions, so this meeting was quite natural.

Q. Dr. Glagolev, what is the Soviet goal in Africa?

A. It is well known that the main purpose of the Soviet leadership's foreign policy is to control the whole continent of Africa. It organizes several armies in Africa; it arms existing armies of dictatorial governments in Africa; and, it influences these governments, these terrorist groups, and these armies through its military advisors. One of these Soviet advisors actually commands the whole Ethiopian army.

The purpose of Soviet policy in Africa is to establish pro-Soviet dictatorships in almost all of the African countries. It is especially important to control South Africa, Rhodesia, and certain other key countries because of their huge mineral resources like gold, uranium, platinum, and other rare and valuable resources.

Q. Does the small and illegal South Afri-

can Communist Party play much of a role in the development of propaganda?

A. Yes, it plays an important role. I met personally with its secretary, who worked in London, and conveyed the instructions of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. to their agents, black and white, in South Africa. The Communists use racial hatred very widely in South Africa. They deceive its black population so that some of its members think they are struggling for the interests of black people, but in reality many of them are supporting the interests of the white leadership of the Soviet Communist Party.

Q. What sort of timetable of developments do you see for southern Africa?

A. There is, of course, a Soviet scenario that is explained quite openly in *Pravda* and other Soviet publications. They speak of their agents coming to power in all these countries—Rhodesia, Namibia, and South Africa. They speak openly about their armies of invasion.

However, I think democratic elements are growing stronger and stronger. For instance, important black leaders in Rhodesia decided to organize a multi-racial Government. One can hope that pro-Communist terrorist groups will have some trouble in these countries because they will encounter strong resistance from the majority of the population.

Q. Dr. Glagolev, which Soviet agencies or departments coordinate manipulation of the press and communications media in the Free World?

A. Many agencies; the International Department and the Department of Propaganda and Agitation of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee; the press agency Novosti; TASS; and, many others. All of them try to influence Western public opinion. They try to bribe certain journalists and they try to use "Liberal" attitudes to organize a psychological surrender and to prevent resistance to Communist expansion. In Africa, the other continents, and in Europe, where there are several Communist Parties which may come to power, they seek to have Communists included in the Governments, such as France and Italy.

So the Soviet agencies which try to influence Western public opinion try to picture Communism as a "peaceful" political movement. Of course they never mention the huge human losses connected with the establishment of Communist regimes in many countries. It is very well known that about 60 million people were killed—tormented to death in the concentration camps or died from artificial famine—in the Soviet Union alone. In China, the same figure, 60 million, is mentioned. Here too there was a civil war organized by the Communists, several waves of terror against the population and the democratic opposition, and of course malnutrition caused by Communist agricultural policies.

Now they are killing millions of people in the Indo-China countries of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos; and carrying out wars of terrorism in the African countries of Ethiopia, Chad, Morocco, Mauritania, Rhodesia, South Africa, and Angola.

This is a Communist offensive though the Soviet propaganda describes it as a series of "national liberation movements" and suggests that the democratic countries either do not resist this offensive or actually support it!

Q. What are the Soviet agencies responsible for recruiting journalists in the West to the Soviet cause?

A. The K.G.B. of course is heavily involved in this process. Sometimes they use journalists who are already in favor of Communism, giving them materials. Sometimes

they bribe them, paying certain journalists for placing their stories.

By the way, it is very easy to see that certain journalists ALWAYS support the Communist line—always. Thus it is quite clear that they are somehow connected with the leadership of the Soviet Union. Of course they try to use Western terms, Western ideas about democracy, peace, *détente*; but they ALWAYS support the Soviet line and Soviet suggestions.

Q. What are some recent examples of disinformation or propaganda?

A. It is being done every day. For example, the correspondents of the Western newspapers and magazines who work in Moscow may be invited to lunch in luxurious restaurants by agents of the K.G.B. and simply given a lot of false "information." A recent case involved prices of meats that do not exist in the Soviet Union. Gullible journalists automatically repeat such nonsense. I read the imaginary meat prices cited in the leading American newspapers recently. Or they describe Brezhnev or K.G.B. boss Andropov as "Liberals". Really. The use of psychiatric asylums for mental and physical tortures is *not* a "Liberal" measure. But those asylums are being run by leaders described in American newspapers as "Liberals".

Q. Do you think there is a Soviet policy of encouraging U.S. groups and journalists to make attacks on American policies first, before the Soviet media picks them up, in order to increase the "credibility" of the attack?

A. Yes, I think this is being done very often. For instance, some American newspapers attack practically every major weapon of U.S. defense, sometimes even before the Soviet Union has time to attack such weapons. Just enumerate the new major weapons of defense under consideration by the United States—the Trident, the MX program, the B-1 bomber, the so-called neutron bomb—every one of these weapons is being actively attacked by certain American journalists, systematically attacked and successfully attacked. The production of some of these weapons has already been stopped and other programs have been delayed. At the same time the Soviet Union continues to produce the same or more powerful weapons at a growing rate.

Q. Dr. Glagolev, have you any suggestions as to how the Communist policy of expansion, of promoting dictatorships, can be blocked?

A. Yes. It is urgent that the people of the West unite to create an informed public opinion that can make their Governments respond to this challenge. It is not too late. We have great opportunities, but we must start immediately. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, when the House voted on final passage of H.R. 39, the Alaska National Interests Lands Conservation Act, I was unable to vote because I was back in my district fulfilling some longstanding commitments. However, had I been present, I would have joined my colleagues and voted for final passage of H.R. 39. ●

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES:
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE DIS-
GUISED AS "WHISTLEBLOWING"

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 19, 1978, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) opened a conference in the Rayburn House Office Building. The conference was designed to encourage middle-level officials in this country's intelligence and law enforcement agencies to unilaterally divulge secrets under the cloak of "whistleblowing."

It should be remembered that the Institute for Policy Studies has operated for 15 years as a consortium of Marxist intellectuals who variously look for political direction to Cuba, North Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and toward the Soviet Union. While IPS has made a priority of using its network of contacts in the executive and legislative branches of Government to influence policies in ways favorable to the Communists.

The Information Digest, a newsletter on U.S. political and social movements published by John Rees, provided the following report on the IPS conference which I commend to the attention of my colleagues who are doubtless interested in the distinction between "whistleblowing" and counterintelligence fronts:

IPS CONFERENCE ON WHISTLEBLOWING

In the early 1970s, the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) became concerned about the problems faced by such "national security whistleblowers" as Daniel Ellsberg [The Pentagon Papers]; Victor Marchetti [The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence, with John Marks]; Perry Fellwock, better known as Winslow Peck of Counter-Spy magazine and the National Security (NSA); Morton Halperin [National Security Council]; and Robert Wall [Federal Bureau of Investigation—Washington, DC, Field Office].

To meet the needs of people such as these, IPS formed its Project on Official Illegality under the direction of Ralph L. Stavins, an IPS fellow and lawyer. In 1976, this project was expanded beyond the national security agencies to include other branches of government and was renamed the Government Accountability Project (GAP).

GAP, now directed by Ralph Stavins and Margie Bernard and operating from IPS's offices at 1901 Q Street, NW, Washington DC 20009 [212/234-9382], organized its first conference on whistleblowing in June, 1977. The second GAP gathering, the "Whistleblowers Conference on National Security," was held on May 19 and 20, 1978.

The first part of GAP's 1978 conference, organized by Stavins and Christy Macy of the Center for National Security Studies (CNSS), opened in a Capitol Hill meeting room under arrangements made by Rep. Ronald Dellums [D-CA] with some 258 people in attendance. Because of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, drawn to attention by Rep. Larry McDonald [D-GA], IPS's GAP was unable to collect the \$25 registration fee for the "Whistleblowers Conference on National Security." Somewhat grudgingly, GAP provided a coffee, cheese and sandwich reception for free.

Despite the inevitable late start, the conference keynote speaker, Daniel Ellsberg, was even later, not appearing until two hours after his scheduled 7:30 pm address. As a result, the evening's agenda was revised with

IPS's newest intelligence agency defector, John Stockwell, getting star treatment; Morton Halperin talking about that day's conviction of David Truong and Ronald Humphrey of spying for the Vietnamese Communist government; Stavins extending his opening remarks (including a glowing tribute to his "dear friend," IPS co-founder Marcus Raskin; and finally Ellsberg appearing to give his keynote address.

A feature of the program was a showing of the GAP film, *The Case Officer* [director: Saul Landau; producer: Ralph Stavins; filmed by Haskell Wexler]. The film, which includes considerable footage of fighting in Angola credited to the Cuban government, concerns Stockwell's CIA career from recruitment through assignments in Vietnam and Angola to his defection in June 1976.

According to the film and to an IPS resume, Stockwell spent his childhood in the [Belgian] Congo [now Zaire] with his missionary parents. He graduated from the University of Texas and then joined the U.S. Marine Corps where he served as a junior officer. On his leaving the service, he joined the Gates Rubber Company in Denver, CO, as an executive.

He was first contacted by the CIA while a student at the University of Texas, but not until he was employed by the Gates Rubber Company in 1964 was he recruited. His first CIA assignments were in Africa where he claims to have had personal contacts "providing services" to an African head of state.

From 1972 to 1973, Stockwell was the Chief of the Kenya-Uganda Section at Langley. From 1973 through the evacuation of Saigon, he served as a CIA case officer in charge of activities in Tay Ninh province in South Vietnam. On his return to the U.S. in 1975, he was chosen to be chief of the Angola Task Force and "so ran the CIA's secret war in that country."

From the film, it would appear that Stockwell was a military adviser to Holden Roberto, chief of the FNLA guerrillas and brother-in-law of Zaire president Mobutu, and to Jonas Savimbi, leader of the UNITA forces, and that he was responsible for paramilitary operations. However, under questioning, Stockwell admitted to "running" a number of locally enlisted agents as an intelligence network in Luanda, Mossamedes and Cabinda—indicating a most unusual combination of "case officer" and paramilitary adviser roles.

After twelve years in the Agency, Stockwell resigned in April 1977, writing an open letter to CIA Director Stansfield Turner that was published in the Washington Post explaining his resignation. He then "kept his head down" in a summer cabin in Texas; took a \$10,000 advance from the W. W. Norton Co. for his book (just published). In *Search of Enemies: A CIA Story*, [35,000 hardcover copies sold as of May 19]; and with the IPS team made the film, *The Case Officer*, probably in the early summer of 1977 in Houston. Stockwell has two sons from his former marriage and an adopted Vietnamese daughter.

According to Stockwell, his income since April 1977 has been the \$10,000 publisher's advance and \$15,000 from his savings: this as compared to the \$33,000 plus a year he earned at the CIA.

In response to a question, Stockwell indicated that he had last had access to CIA documents in June 1976. He offered no explanation as to why it was ten months later that he resigned.

It is noted that in January 1976, the IPS-related CNSS published a newsletter, *Intelligence Report* [Vol. 1, No. 1], subtitled "CIA's Secret War in Angola," that in many small details parallels the information now being given by Stockwell. The CNSS publication cited unnamed "official sources" as providing such operational details as that by December 12, 1975, the CIA had sent "five

artillery spotter planes piloted by Americans into the Angolan battle zones" and that the CIA had use of U.S. Air Force C-141 transport jets which landed supplies at the Kinshasa airport for retransport into Angola via small plane.

A December 17, 1975, article in the Los Angeles Times by John D. Marks, director of the CIA Project of CNSS, quoted an unnamed "knowledgeable official" describing the Angolan operation as "a mutual anteraising, an inconclusive situation and a hell of a lot of dead Angolans." The CNSS publication [contributors to that issue included John Marks, Christy Macy, David Klaus, Courtland Cox and Robert Borosage] quoted "an official directly involved" as warning that "neither Savimbi or Roberto are good fighters—in fact, they couldn't fight their way out of a paper bag. It's the wrong game and the players we got are losers." In his film narrative and in his live remarks to the IPS/GAP conference, Stockwell used markedly similar phraseology.

The film showing was followed by Stockwell answering (and evading) questions from the audience. Later he was joined by Donald Jordan, a former CIA officer from the Agency's San Diego office; and Frank Snepp, a former CIA analyst and author of the recently published book, *Decent Interval*; on a panel moderated by American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) attorney Mark Lynch, of the joint ACLU and CNSS Project on Civil Liberties and National Security, who has been representing Snepp.

Speakers slated to take part in the May 20 GAP conference to be held at Washington's International Inn include:

Raymond J. Connolly, former analyst, Army Security Agency.

Mike McDougal, former U.S. Army Officer. Lt. Ronald McRae, U.S. Navy.

Renault Robinson, officer, Chicago Police Department.

Sgt. Leah Wainwright, U.S. Army.

Christopher Pyle, professor, formerly with Army Intelligence.

John Bradley, formerly of the Defense Communications Agency.

Robert Aldridge, former top Lockheed missile engineer.

John Bennett, nuclear technician, U.S. Navy.

James Conrad, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

Dr. Tom Mancuso, nuclear scientist, formerly with Atomic Energy Commission.

Dr. Ted Taylor, Princeton University, 1975 project director, NRC Safeguard Study.

Senator James Abourezk [D-SD].

Daniel Schorr, author and TV commentator, leaker of House Intelligence Committee report.

Charles Brennan, former director of the FBI's domestic intelligence program.

Adm. William P. Mack, former commander, 7th Fleet, Vietnam.

Robert L. Borosage, listed as "Director, Institute for Policy Studies."

Marcus Raskin, "political philosopher," IPS.

Gloria Emerson, author.

Emory Swank, former U.S. Ambassador to Cambodia.

Distributed at the conference was a pamphlet, "A Whistleblowers Guide to the Federal Bureaucracy," price \$3, with its printing "donated by the Playboy Foundation," and supportive "blurbs" from Ralph Nader, Rep. Morris Udall [D-AZ], Ernest Fitzgerald of C-5A cost overrun notoriety, and American University law professor Robert G. Vaughn.

The pamphlet, by GAP staffer Mark Ryter, states it is designed to be the "ideal complement" to showings of GAP's films, *The Swine Flu Caper*, and *The Case Officer*, available for rent or for sale (prints cost \$400 and \$500 respectively).

In an introduction to the pamphlet, GAP's Stavins and Bernard announce that in ad-

vance of this "Whistleblowers Conference on National Security," IPS has set up a Government Employees Advisory Committee of "government employees, lawyers, labor leaders, legislators and public interest groups" to aid any who may wish to continue in the tradition of Marchetti, Halperin, Ellsberg, Stockwell and company.

The second day of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) Government Accountability Project (GAP) "Whistleblowers Conference on National Security" took place in Washington's International Inn on Saturday, May 20, 1978, with some 175 people present.

Following an opening speech by Robert L. Borosage, director of IPS (and until recently director of the Center for National Security Studies (CNSS)), panels on military and police intelligence and nuclear energy "threats" were held. The featured luncheon presentation was by Senator James Abourezk [D-SD].

The Senator launched an attack on the Carter Administration for suppressing the Lyle Report which he said "chronicles the Civil Service Commission's involvement and participation in illegal patronage activities, possible perjury and document destruction." Before concluding, the South Dakota Senator paid homage to the CIA's newest defectors, saying:

"Frank Snapp, John Stockwell or anyone else who joined the national security establishment did not sign away their First Amendment rights. They did not waive their due process rights. And they did not vow loyalty to Agency actions which were above the laws of this nation."

He did not elaborate as to how these statements applied to Snapp or Stockwell's actions.

During the afternoon, three workshops took place which were described by GAP in the following terms:

The Congressional/Executive Connection for Whistleblowers—This workshop will focus on how to improve the channels of communication between Congressional staff, White House personnel, and the federal employee who wishes to report abuse. The historical situation has been that directors or top level persons within a government agency are the only voices heard on Capitol Hill. In the past, their testimony has often been misleading or incomplete at best. There is therefore a serious need to open up new channels between policy makers in Congress and the Executive, and middle-level employees of the government. Is there a way that this process can be systematized? Who should whistleblowers go to? * * *

A panel of Congressional staff and executive personnel will respond to questions and help with suggestions on the above issues. The panelists will include:

Frank Silbey, staff, Cong. John Moss' Office.
Jessica Josephston, staff, Senator Jim Abourezk's Office.

Bill Funk, staff on the Legislative Committee, House Intelligence Committee.

Mark Gittenstein, staff, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Paul Rosenthal, staff, Senate Government Affairs Committee.

Steve Simmons, White House staff.

The Legal Options for the Whistleblower—The workshop will explore some of the legal considerations about which potential whistleblowers should be aware. The workshop is geared toward helping whistleblowers to anticipate and avoid unnecessary problems. The following types of issues will be discussed.

Legal expenses.
Attorney selection.
Timing of disclosures.
Congressional revelations.
Gathering documentation.
Suits against superiors.
Internal remedies, etc.

A panel of Washington attorneys will re-

spond to questions and, when appropriate, make suggestions about ways of blowing the whistle as effectively and safely as possible. The panel will consist of the following attorneys:

Mr. John Bodner of the law firm of Bodner and Bruce. Mr. Bodner represented Mr. Ernest Fitzgerald in his successful legal struggle for reinstatement at the Pentagon.

Mr. George D. Crowley, an associate in the law firm of Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge. Mr. Crowley is presently representing Mr. Robert Sullivan, the GSA investigator who publically disclosed the wasteful and unlawful contracting practices of his Boston office.

Mr. Joseph D. Gebhardt of the law firm of Dobrovir, Oakes, Gebhardt and Scull. Mr. Gebhardt is the co-author of two publications: *The Offenses of Richard M. Nixon: A Guide to His Impeachable Crimes* (1973, 1974) and *Blueprint for Civil Service Reform: An Analysis of How Politics Have Made a Mockery of the Civil Service Merit System*.

Mr. John Shattuck is the director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Caring for the Personal Needs of Whistleblowers—The purpose of this workshop is to explore various methods of dealing with the personal needs of the whistleblower. Most individuals, when going through periods of stress, experience varying degrees of anxiety and uncertainty. This is doubly true of the whistleblower. * * * In addition to experiencing the awesome weight of the federal bureaucracy directed toward discrediting them, the whistleblower often experiences loss of communication with co-workers, strained relationships with family and friends, financial difficulty, long legal battles, long-term unemployment, and fear about the future.

The workshop panelists to provide analysis of services needed to support the whistleblowers were listed as:

Margie Bernard—[IPS] Government Accountability Project, moderator.

Steve Boyan—Washington Ethical Society.

Doug Carmichael—psycho-therapist.

Bruno Heidik—Washington Pastoral Counseling Service.

Edwin Mikkelsen—psychiatrist.

Representative of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE).

The IPS/GAP conference was concluded with a panel discussion entitled, "Personal Conscience and National Security," in which Charles Brennan, a former FBI Director of Domestic Intelligence, gave a spirited defense of FBI policies under its late Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

As the conference was ending, GAP director Ralph Stavins announced the formation of the National Security Association or League which he said would provide assistance to members of the intelligence community, "especially those who have signed secrecy oaths," who "have something that they wish to disclose and need assistance."

Stavins noted that three conference participants, Frank Snapp, John Stockwell and Donald Jordan, had agreed to become founding (and by implication, organizing) members of this new IPS project; and that the ACLU and IPS had agreed to provide assistance. In concluding, Stavins remarked that the new group would help offset the "pernicious influence" of the "other organization that represents Intelligence Officers in the Washington area."

A few days after the conference, participants received a mailing requesting a donation of \$10 to offset the loss of over \$1,000 caused by GAP's inability to require participants to pay to attend the first session held on Capitol Hill in the Rayburn House Office Building. Said IPS/GAP's Margie Bernard:

"The conference expenses represented a sizable portion of GAP's current operating budget, and * * * we suffered a financial loss of approximately \$1,000." ●

HISTORY OF INDIANA'S CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following article written by Prof. Philip A. Grant, Jr., concerning historical aspects of Indiana's delegation to the Congress. Professor Grant, at his own expense, has paid for the marginal printing costs of this insertion; a thoughtful gesture by a responsible citizen:

HISTORY OF INDIANA'S CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

On March 9, 1933, the Seventy-Third Congress was called to order.¹ Summoned into emergency session by newly inaugurated President Franklin D. Roosevelt, this Congress was to enact an impressive array of major laws and thus begin the momentous era of the New Deal. Between March 9, 1933 and the adjournment of the Third Session of the Seventy-Sixth Congress on October 10, 1940, the nation was destined to experience a wide variety of serious economic and social problems, undergo the most sweeping domestic reform movement in its entire history, and witness the ominous rise of totalitarian aggression in Europe and the Far East.

During this historic seven and one-half year period the State of Indiana had a fourteen member congressional delegation. Like their colleagues from other parts of the nation, Indiana's two United States Senators and twelve members of the House of Representatives had the ultimate responsibility of approving or rejecting the multitude of legislative measures proposed by President Roosevelt. A substantial number of these individuals chaired standing committees in their respective bodies and were identified with significant legislation.

Among the Indiana congressmen taking their oaths of office on March 9, 1933 were Representatives Eugene B. Crowe of Bedford, John W. Boehne, Jr., of Evansville, and Glenn Griswold of Peru, Crowe, Boehne, and Griswold were staunch supporters of nearly all the New Deal innovations of the first two Roosevelt Administrations.

A banker by profession, Crowe compiled a virtually unblemished record of support for both the domestic and foreign policies of the New Deal. By 1940 he had become the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Territories. Crowe's most noteworthy achievement involved a pivotal role in the enactment of the National Defense Housing (Lanham) Act of 1940.² He was also instrumental in the passage of numerous bills vital to the welfare of two future states, Alaska and Hawaii.³

Boehne was elected by his constituents in southwestern Indiana to six consecutive terms in the House.⁴ He was the only Indianan assigned to the prestigious Committee on Ways and Means.⁵ While obviously lacking sufficient seniority to exert dominant influence on the Ways and Means panel, Boehne did actively participate in the deliberations culminating in two landmark New Deal measures, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act⁶ and the Social Security Act.⁷

An Attorney, Griswold was a former member of the Indiana Railroad Commission.⁸ Throughout the period between 1933 and 1939 he served on the Committee on Labor. Griswold had the distinction of being designated to serve on the House-Senate conference committees having the responsibility of

Footnotes at end of article.

finalizing the details of the two foremost labor statutes of the New Deal period, the National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act⁹ and the Fair Labor Standards (Wages and Hours) Act.¹⁰

Also present at the opening ceremonies on March 9, 1933 were three other Indiana congressmen, Representatives William H. Larrabee of New Palestine, Charles A. Halleck of Rensselaer, and Arthur H. Greenwood of Washington. Larrabee, Halleck, and Greenwood were destined to spend an aggregate total of sixty-two years on Capitol Hill.

Prior to entering Congress in 1931, Larrabee had been engaged in the general practice of medicine.¹¹ Although representing a traditionally Republican district he was acknowledged as one of the most steadfast New Dealers in the House. During the second Roosevelt Administration Larrabee became Chairman of the Committee on Education and ranking Democratic member of the Committee on the Census. In these capacities he presided over lengthy hearings on the question of federal aid-to-education¹² and assisted in the passage of the Census Act of 1940, providing for the mandatory tabulation of population and various economic statistics.¹³

First sworn in as the Representative of Indiana's Second District in August 1935, Halleck was one of the youngest members of Congress.¹⁴ From 1935 to 1939 he was the sole Republican on the Indiana congressional delegation. Halleck eventually to serve a decade as Republican Floor Leader, was a fiercely partisan combatant and a highly accomplished extemporaneous orator. A harsh and relentless critic of New Deal domestic programs,¹⁵ he was especially vociferous in denouncing the Roosevelt Administration's labor¹⁶ and welfare policies.¹⁷ Halleck initially attracted nationwide attention at the 1940 Republican National Convention. At this gathering he delivered the principal nominating for his fellow Indianan, Wendell Willkie of Elwood.¹⁸

Greenwood, at the time of his retirement in January 1939, had completed sixteen years of continuous House service and was dean of the Indiana delegation.¹⁹ More importantly he was a senior member of the powerful Committee on Rules, the organ vested with the prerogative of determining which of the various bills and resolutions reported by the other standing committees would be approved for floor consideration.²⁰ Greenwood assumed personal responsibility for urging House consideration of three high priority New Deal measures, the Agricultural Adjustment Act,²¹ the Bituminous Coal (Guffey-Vinson) Act,²² and the Farm Tenancy (Bankhead-Jones) Act.²³ Genuinely respected for his parliamentary expertise, Greenwood was also frequently selected by the Speaker to occupy the post of Chairman of the Committee on the Whole.²⁴

The three most renowned congressmen from Indiana during the New Deal period were Representative Louis L. Ludlow of Indianapolis and Senators Frederick Van Nuys of Indianapolis and Sherman Minton of New Albany. Ludlow, Van Nuys, and Minton certainly rank as three of the most illustrious public servants from Indiana over the past half century.

After a lengthy and distinguished career in journalism, Ludlow in November 1928 had been elected to the first of ten terms in the House.²⁵ A member of the Committee on Appropriations, he was Chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee, 1933-1935, and the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee, 1936-1940. While chairing these organs, Ludlow successively authored the annual laws to fund the operation of the two houses of Congress²⁶ and two of the existing executive departments.²⁷ Especially well-publicized were Ludlow's activities as one of the most outspoken leaders of the bipartisan isola-

tionist bloc in Congress. In addition to his sustained efforts in behalf of strict neutrality legislation²⁸ and in opposition to peacetime military conscription,²⁹ Ludlow proposed the constitutional amendment requiring a nationwide referendum as a precondition to a declaration of war.³⁰

Van Nuys, a former United States Attorney for Indiana, served in the Senate between 1933 and 1944.³¹ During the second Roosevelt Administration, he was Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and a member of the Committees on Foreign Relations and the Judiciary. Although generally sympathetic to the New Deal, Van Nuys was distinctly independent in his approach to certain sensitive issues. He incurred the wrath of the Roosevelt Administration by strongly opposing the controversial plan to enlarge the membership of the United States Supreme Court³² and strenuously objecting to the President's decision to seek an unprecedented third term in 1940.³³ As a longstanding member of the Judiciary Committee, he co-authored the Federal Anti-Lynching (Wagner-Van Nuys) Bill, a pioneer piece of civil rights legislation,³⁴ and reviewed the credentials of several prominent gentlemen nominated by President Roosevelt to fill vacancies in the Department of Justice and the United States Supreme Court.³⁵

During the final two years of the second Roosevelt Administration, Minton was Assistant Democratic Leader (Whip) of the Senate and Chairman of both the Committee on Pensions and the Special Committee to Investigate Lobbying Activities.³⁶ Along with Senators Alben W. Barkley of Kentucky, Robert F. Wagner of New York, and George W. Norris of Nebraska, Minton was an articulate and unwavering spokesman for the New Deal. He readily challenged the President's conservative critics on the floor of the Senate³⁷ and staunchly defended the propriety of Roosevelt's quest for a third term.³⁸ Not only did he enthusiastically favor the President's domestic policies, but also, unlike most members of the Indiana delegation, he loyally supported Roosevelt's foreign policies. Perhaps his most notable effort occurred in 1940, when, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, Minton helped guide the Selective Service Act through the Senate.³⁹ Largely because of his close identification with the New Deal, Minton was narrowly defeated in his campaign for re-election in 1940.

Collectively the Indiana congressional delegation compiled a record of firm support for New Deal legislation. A survey of thirty key votes in the House of Representatives between March 1933 and October 1940 establishes the fact that members from Indiana favored the Roosevelt Administration on 80.1% of the roll calls,⁴⁰ while an examination of thirty important votes in the Senate indicates an 85.5% level of support.⁴¹ Among Democrats the figures were 87.3% in the House and 91.5% in the Senate. On purely domestic issues the proportions in the House and Senate were 93.1% and 92.7% respectively.

In addition to the obvious talents and abilities of the aforementioned gentlemen there were two major factors why congressmen from Indiana wielded influence during the New Deal period. These factors were affiliation with the dominant political party and possession of desirable committee assignments.

Between March 1933 and January 1939 the Indiana congressional delegation consisted of thirteen Democrats and one Republican. The 13-1 Democratic advantage (92.7 percent) was considerably in excess of the national average of the party's representation in Congress which varied from 310-117 (72.6 percent) to 331-89 (78.4 percent) in the House and 60-35 (63.1 percent) to 76-16

(82.6 percent) in the Senate.⁴² Some, if not most, of Indiana's Democratic congressmen probably realized that they owed their seats to the landslide Roosevelt victories of 1932 and 1936,⁴³ and therefore were inclined to support or at least resolve their doubts in favor of the New Deal. In November 1938, however, the Republicans gained six House seats in Indiana, and in the following two years the popularity of the New Deal declined appreciably. Notwithstanding these 1938 reverses, the Democrats in Indiana from 1932 to 1938 won all three Senate races and thirty-nine of forty-eight House contests. The successes registered by Democratic candidates seeking House and Senate seats in large measure explains why the Roosevelt Administration enjoyed such steadfast support from the Indiana congressional delegation.

In addition to the political complexion of its delegation, Indiana was fortunate to have so many of its congressmen assigned to major standing committees. Among these panels were the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, and the Judiciary and the House Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Rules, and Labor. Inasmuch as these seven committees were responsible for producing approximately half of all New Deal legislation, it was certainly understandable why the Indiana delegation had the opportunity to attain such prominence. Even under ordinary conditions these seven committees would have been quite important. Their importance was greatly accentuated by the numerous crises accompanying the Great Depression and the advent of World War II.

The aforementioned members of the House of Representatives and United States Senate were chosen by the citizens of Indiana to serve in Congress during one of the most legendary periods in the country's history. Between March 9, 1933 and October 10, 1940 each of these gentlemen compiled records of genuine accomplishment.⁴⁴ Although Indiana accounted for less than three percent of the nation's total population, its congressional delegation exerted profound and disproportionate influence on Capitol Hill.⁴⁵

FOOTNOTES

¹ United States Congress, *Congressional Record*, Seventy-Third Congress, First Session (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1933), LXXVII, 41, 67.

² House of Representatives, *Conference Report on the bill (H.R. 10412) to expedite the provision of housing in connection with the national defense*, October 7, 1940; *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 11868, 11874, 13339, 13394; *The Statutes at Large of the United States of America, 1939-1941* (Washington: 1941), LIV, 1125-1128.

³ *Statutes at Large*, L, 258, 508, 900-902; LII, 590-591, 1174, 1230; LIII, 1219.

⁴ Lawrence F. Kennedy (comp.), *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1971* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 881.

⁵ The Ways and Means Committee had original jurisdiction over all taxation, foreign trade, and social insurance bills. A scholarly account of this committee is John F. Manley, *The Politics of Finance; The House Committee on Ways and Means* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970).

⁶ Report on the bill (H.R. 8687) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, March 17, 1934; *Congressional Record*, LXXVIII, 4754; *Statutes at Large*, XLVIII, 943-945.

⁷ Report on the bill (H.R. 7260) to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment com-

pensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue, and for other purposes, April 5, 1935; *Congressional Record*, LXXIX, 5155; *Statutes at Large*, XLIX, 620-648.

⁸ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1037.

⁹ *Conference Report on the bill (S. 1958) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes*, June 27, 1935; *Congressional Record*, LXXIX, 9682, 9688, 9694-9695, 9864, 10297-10300; *Statutes at Large*, XLIX, 449-457.

¹⁰ *Conference Report on the bill (S. 2475) to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes*, June 14, 1938; *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, 8657-8661; LXXXIII, 6389, 7770, A2106-2108, A2883-2885; *Statutes at Large*, LII, 1060-1069.

¹¹ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1265.

¹² *House of Representatives, Hearings on Federal Aid to the States for the Support of Public Schools*, March 30-April 13, 1937.

¹³ *Report on the bill (S. 2505) to amend an act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress, approved June 18, 1929, so as to change the date of subsequent apportionments*, March 14, 1940; *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 2916; *Statutes at Large*, LIV, 162.

¹⁴ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1265.

¹⁵ A well-written account of Halleck's activities between 1935 and 1940 may be found in Henry Z. Scheele, *Charlie Halleck; A Political Biography* (New York: Exposition Press, 1966), pp. 47-103.

¹⁶ *Intermediate Report of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board*, March 29, 1940; *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 7513-7515, 7711, 7733-7736, 7775, 7781-7782, 7793, 7797.

¹⁷ *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, A1119; LXXXIV, 264-265, 7181-7184, A1826-1827; LXXXVI, 6316-6320.

¹⁸ *Official Report of the Proceedings of the Republican National Convention, 1940* (Washington: 1940), pp. 203-211; *Post*, Washington, D.C., June 27, 1940, pp. 1, 5.

¹⁹ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1031.

²⁰ A definitive study of the Rules Committee is James A. Robinson, *The House Rules Committee* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1963).

²¹ *Report on the resolution (H. Res. 136) providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 3835*, May 3, 1933; *Congressional Record*, LXXVII, 3052, 3055, 3060.

²² *Report on the resolution (H. Res. 146) for the consideration of H.R. 4985*, March 3, 1937; *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, 1808, 2026-2030.

²³ *Report on the resolution (H. Res. 261) for the consideration of H.R. 7562*, June 24, 1937; *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, 6299, 6431-6443.

²⁴ *Congressional Record*, LXXIX, 506, LXXX, 1490; LXXXI, 1233; LXXXIII, 456.

²⁵ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1314.

²⁶ *Congressional Record*, LXXVIII, 4427, 4966-4978, 5037-5046, 5047-5077, 5194-5200, 6337, 7186, 7238-7242, 9155-9158, 9861-9862; LXXIX, 7395-7425, 7504-7541, 7689-7718, 7746-7779, 9227, 10293-10297, 10660-10663; *Statutes at Large*, XLVIII, 817-834; XLIX, 459-477.

²⁷ *Congressional Record*, LXXX, 1489-1492, 1511-1535, 1597-1636, 1658-1693, 3868-3869, 7249-7275, 8863, 10026; LXXXI, 1201, 1233-1262, 1325-1350, 1356-1388, 1419-1449, 2851, 4165-4167; LXXXIII, 455-489, 520-564, 592-606, 643-675, 706-715, 2695, 3806-3807;

LXXXIV, 1852-1889, 1938-1966, 2016-2044, 2761, 4866-4878; LXXXVI, 570, 606-614, 619-649, 691-705, 1676, 2807, 2885-2887; *Statutes at Large*, XLIX, 1827-1854; L, 137-164; LII, 120-148; LIII, 654-684; LIV, 55-79.

²⁸ *Congressional Record*, LXXXIV, 8015-8018; LXXXV, 485-488; Francis O. Wilcox, "The Neutrality Fight in Congress, 1939," *American Political Science Review*, October 1939, pp. 811-825.

²⁹ *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 11466-11468.

³⁰ *H.J. Res. 199—A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a referendum on war*, February 5, 1937; *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, 9407-9408; LXXXIII, 276-283; Robert A. Divine, *The Illusion of Neutrality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 219-221; Manfred Jonas, *Isolationism in America, 1935-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 159-163.

³¹ *Biographical Directory of American Congress*, p. 1852.

³² *United States Senate, Report on the bill (S. 1392) to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government*, June 14, 1937; *Congressional Record*, LXXXI, 5639.

³³ Anticipating that Roosevelt would be renominated in 1940, Van Nuys announced that he would decline to be a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Acceding to his wish, Van Nuys was not included among Indiana's district or at-large delegates to the convention.

³⁴ *Report on the bill (H.R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching*, June 22, 1937; *Report on the bill (H.R. 801) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching*, April 8, 1940.

³⁵ Between 1937 and 1940 the Judiciary Committee examined the qualifications of Attorneys-General Frank Murphy and Robert H. Jackson and Supreme Court Justices Hugo L. Black, Stanley Reed, Felix Frankfurter, William O. Douglas, and Frank Murphy.

³⁶ A succinct biographical sketch of Minton is Richard Kirkendall, "Sherman Minton," *The Justices of the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1969* (4 vols.; New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1969), IV, 2699-2709.

³⁷ *Congressional Record*, LXXXII, 1934-1935.

³⁸ *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 11535-11536.

³⁹ *Conference Report on the bill (S. 4164) to provide for the common defense by increasing the personnel of the armed forces of the United States and providing for its training*, September 13, 1940; *Congressional Record*, LXXXVI, 9923-9924; *Post*, Washington, D.C., September 14, 1940, pp. 1, 4.

⁴⁰ Appendix A.

⁴¹ Appendix B.

⁴² Democratic congressional representation in other midwestern states between 1933 and 1939 was as follows: Ohio 82.1%; Illinois, 77.1%; Iowa 63.6%; Michigan 47.3%; Wisconsin 41.7%; and Kansas 40.7%.

⁴³ Appendix C.

⁴⁴ Halleck, Van Nuys, and Minton continued in public life after 1940. Remaining in the House until 1969, Halleck was Majority Leader, 1947-1949 and 1953-1955 and Minority Leader, 1959-1965. Van Nuys became Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in January 1941, a position he occupied until his death three years later. Minton was a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals (Seventh Circuit), 1941-1949, and an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1949-1956.

⁴⁵ According to the Census of 1940 Indiana had 3,427,696 inhabitants. Indiana therefore

accounted for 2.6% of the nationwide population of 131,669,275. As a consequence of the 1940 Census, Indiana lost one of its twelve congressional seats. ●

ANTINUCLEAR DEMONSTRATORS TO RETURN TO SEABROOK

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Clamshell Alliance, aided and abetted by the Marxist disarmament advocates of the Mobilization for Survival (MFS), is planning to hold another occupation of the construction site of the Seabrook, N.H., nuclear powered electrical generating plant. The arrogant leaders of the Clamshell Alliance, who make an elaborate pretense of being non-leaders, but merely spokesmen of "spokes" for the mass of antitechnology neo-Luddites who follow them, include Samuel Lovejoy, a veteran of the Veneceros brigade sojourns in Cuba and admitted saboteur of a Massachusetts nuclear powerplant construction site facility, who has been traveling around the country for 3 years urging local antinuclear groups to commit similar acts of violence which Lovejoy tries to excuse as "self-defense in advance" against the plants.

As the history of mass protests has shown, there is always a danger that groups or individuals associated with a cause may commit acts of violence during or in advance of the demonstration.

Columnist John J. Metzler has written a thoughtful analysis of the Clamshell Alliance and the various revolutionary groups who are attempting to colonize the antinuclear groups which will be present at Seabrook on June 24. Mr. Metzler's column appeared first in the June 14, 1978, issue of the Manchester Union Leader.

The article follows:

IS TROUBLE BREWING THIS TIME AT SEABROOK?

(By John J. Metzler)

Since its massive 1977 May Day weekend demonstration, the Clamshell Alliance has been actively preparing bigger and better publicity stunts aimed at stopping construction of the Seabrook nuclear facility. The Clamshell Alliance, an umbrella organization whose nearly 40 groups range from the pacifist to the violent, plans to stage a rematch between its militant and the State of New Hampshire's authority on June 24.

While American opposition to nuclear technology has not had the same violent tradition as that movement's European and Japanese comrades, the U.S. antinuclear movement could well be on the verge of violence. Occupations of nuclear sites ranging from Colorado's Rocky Flats to Seabrook are bringing together elements which when alone are not inflammatory but when linked could well provide the chemical reaction needed to produce an explosion.

Who comprises this latter-day Luddite Crusade about to swoop into peaceful Seabrook? For the most part, the Clams (as they call themselves) and their supporters are young students or professional people who have been active in ecology-related issues. Most Clams are well-off white lib-

erals, who, while genuinely concerned about the environment, are not interested in the movement's Marxist bedfellows nor in its violence potential.

Several radical strains are running throughout the clam beds of the Northeast. Groups such as the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF), and the War Resisters League are very much interested in directing the ultimate course of this very malleable movement. A high degree of competition among radical circles is a feature of this underground trend. Oddly the pro-Soviet U.S. Labor Party (USLP) has taken a firm pronuclear stand to a large degree due to their Moscow mentor's using much nuclear technology. The Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA) has likewise found itself in an uncomfortable position with anti-nukes at first again due to Moscow's position. The CPUSA now stresses disarmament issues and selectively uses anti-nukes through many front organizations.

Last year the SWP, an old line Trotskyist group with a tradition of violence and political expediency, tried to take over the Clamshell Alliance. While rapid exposure averted the bid, the SWP remains close to the Clam's heartbeat. SWP still seeks promising individual activists through the anti-Nuke crowd.

The Portsmouth-based Clamshell has been actively preparing for the June 24 Seabrook onslaught. Prominent in this campaign was the proliferation of Seabrook demonstration exhibit tables sponsored by various organizations at the recent Mobilization for Survival (MFS) Disarmament rally in New York. The MFS is actually one of a number of groups participating in the layer cake of CPUSA fronts—Clamshell is in turn a group working under the MFS banner.

Groups such as the War Resisters League, also in concert with the MFS, are offering "nonviolence training" for the Seabrook bout; militant anti-Nukes are required to undergo four to six hours of training for the action. The participants going into the Seabrook plant facility must be willing to get arrested and therefore make a time commitment of four days. Affinity groups ranging in size from 10 to 15 people are again to be the decentralized mode of action. Such groups were used by Anarchist factions during the Spanish Civil War.

While most participants are certainly going to Seabrook in a nonviolent spirit, the situation could get out of hand should violent emotions be stirred. Radicals within the Clam representing the violent trend frankly despise the nonviolent Clams and don't hide this indictment in their literature. Both Trotskyite and Maoist communists have shown their distaste for Clams who don't want to be involved in political action beyond the anti-nuclear issue.

Most interesting perhaps is the recurring theme taken by those radicals that the Clamshell has not widened its scope—in a lead article in Win Magazine (June 16, 23, 1977), an author lamented that "though we seek a revolution in our political and social institutions, this revolution cannot occur without solid educational development, which often proceeds in an evolutionary fashion before the revolution can occur... therefore, we urge the Clamshell Alliance to recognize the commonality of its struggle with other movements. Only when we join forces can we truly succeed in making the radical changes we seek."

Another author comments in the same issue, that the single anti-Nuke cause "certainly isolates the Clamshell Alliance from wider support." Further the writer states, "for now it would be premature for the Clam to declare itself a socialist organization."

(But sooner or later, organizations like the Clams are going to have to take that plunge.) "Then the true purposes in store for the majority Clams show through in brilliant crimson lettering: The central role which nonviolence plays in Clam politics can also be limiting." Using classic Marxist theory, the reader is treated to a smorgasbord of radical statements shedding needed light into the Clam's darker corners. After giving typical totalitarian reasons for the Clam's need for more directness, our writer says that individualism must be totally subordinate so collectivity can spring from the Clambeds. The author's personal conclusion, quite typical of radicals trying to make the Clams a Marxist battering ram, is "the Clamshell Alliance should be open only to people who want to contribute to its political direction and participate in its collective actions."

Extreme views are shown above are naturally at loggerheads with many of the counterculture Clams who still possess individuality. Leadership in the Clam is difficult as many members are anti-leadership of any sort. Nevertheless, anarchical trends, the countercultures and the ecology crowd pose a far different specter from organized bands of radicalized robots which many extremists yearn to create.

There stands a strong possibility that the Clamshell and other anti-Nuke organizations will soon be affected by the radical fallout being tirelessly advocated by the few planning to dictate to the many.●

GERARD JO O'BRIEN

HON. JOSEPH A. LE FANTE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Speaker, the development of communications throughout our Nation's history contributed significantly to our advancement as one of the great powers of the world. In the past, New Jersey has been noted for the scientific achievements of Thomas Alva Edison. Now the time has come to pay special tribute to another inventor from the Garden State who contributed immensely to our country's growth by resolving a communication problem that had baffled scientists for over a century.

In 1973, Gerard J. O'Brien of Jersey City, N.J., developed the "tap transducer," a modified version of the telegraph which acts as a voice transmitter without all the intricate mechanisms of Mr. Bell's telephone. In doing this, Mr. O'Brien not only contributed valuable knowledge to science, but also provided a means for creating energy conserving communication for an energy conscious people.

O'Brien's tap transducer looks very much like Morse's original telegraph, but works at a much faster rate so that it can transmit a voice much further and louder than the telephone, using one-third the energy. The tap transducer can also be used to detect earthquakes and find defects in airplanes and machinery. It has many communicative possibilities that will make communication less expensive and wasteful.

Born July 5, 1934, Gerard J. O'Brien graduated from St. Patrick's Elementary

School in Jersey City and then, after 1 year of high school, entered the work force. Despite his limited formal education, Mr. O'Brien displayed an ingenious talent for solving complicated engineering problems.

That talent was also evidenced in his other patented inventions which should not go unnoticed. These include a portable voice generator that aided deaf mutes in communication and an electromagnetic amplifier sound transducer used to convert acoustical waves into amplified electrical waves. Mr. O'Brien was also granted 11 other patents.

Gerard J. O'Brien deserves credit for his accomplishments and the role they play in keeping ours a well-informed and intelligent society. More importantly, however, he has proven to be an outstanding citizen in his pursuit for a more progressive, modernized system of communication.●

REV. ANZO MONTGOMERY: OUTSTANDING CHURCHMAN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to the Reverend Anzo Montgomery, of Cleveland, Ohio, who is one of our city's most respected churchmen. Reverend Montgomery has served as the distinguished pastor of the Lane Metropolitan CME Church for over 13 years.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Montgomery will be leaving our city shortly. He has recently been elected as the general secretary, board of evangelism of the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. Those of us in Cleveland who know and admire Reverend Montgomery are pleased that he has been selected for this significant honor. He will bring to his duties a solid background and wide experience in church and community relations. Nevertheless, I am certain that I speak for many when I say that we will also feel a sense of loss, for Reverend Montgomery is a strong and dedicated leader who has done much to promote the advancement of our city and the black community.

So that my colleagues in the House can better acquaint themselves with Reverend Montgomery's career, I would like to take this opportunity to cite some of the highlights of his life and career.

Reverend Montgomery was born and raised in Jackson, Tenn. As a young man, he was educated at Henderson Business College, Fisk University School of Religion in Nashville, and Washburn University. After pastoring several churches in Tennessee, he was called to Topeka, Kans., and the Lane Chapel. He also became the president of the Topeka chapter of the NAACP. During this time, Reverend Montgomery and five other area ministers questioned the constitutionality and morality of the segregated Topeka public school system and paved

the way for the historic Brown against the Board of Education case.

He also served as the pastor of St. Mathew's CME Church in Wichita, Kans., and continued his active leadership in community relations serving on the boards of the YM-YWCA, the Phyllis Wheatley Children's Home and the Urban League.

Mr. Speaker, when Reverend Montgomery was called to Cleveland in 1965, the Nation was going through one of the most tumultuous periods in its history. Urban unrest, violent assassinations, the mounting civil rights struggle all combined to make it an era of frustration and uncertainty. In our city, much of the burden fell on Reverend Montgomery and other prominent pastors to lead our community through a time of spiritual unrest.

During his 13 years at Lane Metropolitan CME Church, Reverend Montgomery served as the president of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance, the Methodist and CME Methodist Alliance, State president of the Ohio Leadership Conference and Urban Ministers Foundation, vice president of the Interchurch Council and the Board of Directors of the Urban League, Reverend Montgomery is married to Saphronia Goodwin Montgomery who is a composer and author.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 23, an appreciation banquet will be given in honor of Reverend Montgomery for his tireless and dedicated service to his church and to his city. At this time, I would like to ask that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to this outstanding churchman and to wish him well in his future pursuits. Our community has been immeasurably advanced by his presence and his deeds.●

AMERICAN FAMILY SOCIETY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you about a major effort just getting underway this week, to encourage the building of stronger and happier family relationships in every community of America. This commendable effort underscores the fact that further breakdown of family life in the Nation is not inevitable—that negative trends can and will be turned around by the right kind of leadership.

One of my very public-spirited constituents living in San Diego, Mr. Ray Kroc, is leading a salute to the families of America with a series of inspiring radio and television spot announcements, and in a major 4-week campaign that begins this week in 3,600 McDonald's family restaurants—located all over America.

During the campaign, Mr. Kroc's organization will sponsor reunions for more than 3,600 families, with travel arrangements being handled by United Airlines. McDonald's will distribute to millions of

people printed suggestions for activities that bring fun and strength to family life.

To help parents take positive steps to prevent family problems, participating restaurants will distribute a unique family checkup, developed in consultation with some of the Nation's leading authorities on family life. Entitled "Because Your Family Matters," the brochure was produced in cooperation with the American Family Society, a nonprofit, nonsectarian organization headquartered in the Nation's Capital. (A free copy will be sent to anyone who writes to: Family, Box 9873, Washington, D.C. 20015.)

I wanted you to know of this commendable effort by Mr. Kroc and other leaders in the private sector, because it will touch the lives of so many of the families you serve.●

HONORING GENERAL JASKILKA UPON RETIREMENT

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished serviceman who has achieved honors and high rank in the U.S. Marine Corps will soon retire. I speak to Gen. Samuel Jaskilka, a man I am proud to say is a constituent and a friend. General Jaskilka will retire from the Marine Corps on June 29, 1978.

Born in Ansonia in 1919, Samuel Jaskilka attended local schools and then went on to my alma mater, the University of Connecticut, from which he graduated in 1942 with a degree in business administration.

That same year, Sam Jaskilka attended Reserve officers' classes for the corps. He later fought in the Pacific theater during World War II, being involved in the Marshall Islands battles, the Leyte operation, and others.

In the Korean conflict, General Jaskilka was a battalion executive officer and a commanding officer of Company E, 2d Battalion, 5th Marines. His actions at this time earned him the Silver Star and Bronze Star Medal with a combat "V" for heroism.

Having served his country in two major military conflicts, the general went on to fight in yet one more. His contributions toward the American effort in Vietnam brought him the Distinguished Service Medal.

On July 1, 1975, Samuel Jaskilka became Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, and he was promoted to the rank of general on March 4, 1976.

The list of awards General Jaskilka has earned is an impressive one. The Distinguished Service Medal; the Silver Star Medal with one gold star in lieu of a second award; the Legion of Merit; the Bronze Star Medal with combat "V"; the Joint Service Commendation Medal with one oak leaf in lieu of a second award; the National Order of Vietnam; and the Vietnamese Army Distinguished Service Order, First Class are all his.

Furthermore, the general has developed an outstanding personal physical fitness record. Having been involved in athletics since his school days, he will become a member of the 10,000 Mile Club before he retires, designating that he has jogged over 10,000 miles.

Gen. Samuel Jaskilka's retirement marks the end of a long, illustrious career of dedicated service to our country. I am pleased to take this opportunity to pay him honor and to express thanks for a lifelong commitment to the United States. I wish him luck and happiness in his retirement.●

TELLICO DAM WOULD FLOOD SACRED CHEROKEE LAND

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a statement that was presented to the House of Representatives Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearings on the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act on June 20, 1978, by Jimmie Durham, director of the International Indian Treaty Council, as follows:

TSI YUNWYAH. I am a Cherokee. In the language of my people, Ani Yunwyah, or Cherokee as we are called, there is a word for land: Eloheh. This same word also means history, culture, and religion. We cannot separate our place on the earth from our lives on the earth nor from our vision and our meaning as a people. We are taught from childhood that the animals and even the trees and plants that we share a place with are our brothers and sisters.

So, when we speak of land, we are not speaking of property, territory, or even a piece of ground upon which our houses sit and our crops are grown. We are speaking of something truly sacred.

Is there a people anywhere in the world that does not revere its homeland? Is there a human being who does not revere his homeland, even if he may not return? We say that reverence is a great human characteristic. We say that reverence for ancestral lands, no matter how insignificant in our own daily affairs or how far from our own homes is vitally important to the whole of humanity.

The Cherokee people lived for thousands of years in what is now Tennessee, Georgia, and Carolina. In our own history, we teach that we were created there, which is truer than anthropological truth because it was there that we were given our vision as the Cherokee people. But, President Jackson illegally drove us out of that land, from Echota, the center of our world.

There is no Cherokee alive who does not remember that Trail of Tears, who does not remember and revere that sacred land and Echota.

Today the Tennessee Valley Authority plans to flood the sacred valley that held our two principal cities, Echota and Tenasi, after which the state is named. The Tellico Project would destroy an area of great religious importance, many settlement sites, cemeteries, rich farmlands, forests, and the river itself. This is an un-needed dam which can, at the whimsey of TVA, wipe out thousands of years of history of a great and currently oppressed people. To do so will be an insult not only to the Cherokee, but to all the people in the U.S. and to all humanity. Yes, I am

proud enough to state that the history and vision of my people are important to humanity.

I want to speak to my children and my grandchildren about Echota, and I want them to be able to go there and listen to their ancestors. The anthropologists have dug up some bones and some pottery at Echota and TVA tells us that we can visit those bones at a museum.

But the spirits of our ancestors are not in a museum. They live in the Pine and Hickory and Walnut trees and in those free-running creeks and rivers.

I will never live at Echota, anymore than a Greek in New Jersey will ever live at the Parthenon, but the hearts of our people say it must be there.

The fact that there is no stone monument or large ruins at Echota is itself a monument. Our reverence for the land and its life maintained it in an unspoiled state for those thousands of years. Maybe someone will think I am being too emotional, but there must come a time when the American government and the American people can be emotional about the destruction of land and of sacred things.

The flooding of our old valley has been stopped temporarily because of a little fish that lives there and nowhere else. I have seen Griffin Bell, The New York Times, and a national television network make fun of this little fish and I would like to ask why it is considered so humorously insignificant. Because it is little, or because it is a fish?

It is this incredible arrogance towards other life that has caused such destruction in this country. Who is Griffin Bell or the U.S. government to play God and judge the life or death of an entire species of fellow-being which was put here by the same power that put us here? Who has the right to destroy a species of life, and what can assuming that right mean?

Let me be emotional: to me, that fish is not just an abstract "endangered species", although it is that. It is a Cherokee fish and I am its brother. Somehow, it has acted to save my holy land, so I have a strong gratitude for that fish.

The Cherokee people in Tennessee, Oklahoma, the Carolinas, Georgia, and wherever we might be, are of one voice and of one mind that this dam, this degradation, be stopped. We want our universe, our Eloheh, with all of its fish and all of its life to continue. And, we are sure that this cannot be against the interests and wishes of the American people.●

LITHUANIAN OCCUPATION REMEMBERED

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 38 years since the Soviet Union invaded the independent Republic of Lithuania and forcibly deprived the Lithuanian people of freedom, self-determination, independence, and other basic human rights. Lithuania's attempts to retain independence have been in vain. Thirty-thousand Lithuanian freedom-fighters died in the resistance to Soviet annexation and an equal number perished in prison or in exile.

Documented cases of ruthless Soviet persecution of Lithuanians continue to

reach the West. Yet in spite of political and cultural repression, and religious persecution, the proud spirit of freedom and independence instilled in these people has survived and continues to flourish. Dissidents continue to fight valiantly for their basic human rights at great personal risk. Their just cause must not be abandoned.

As a nation which was founded on the primacy of individual liberties, the United States must never allow its dedication to human rights diminish. Lithuanians, like Americans, are devoted to the principles of personal liberty and freedom of choice. Lithuania presents an inspiring example of having maintained its "national pride" and its will to independence against overwhelming odds.

As a Congressman who has strongly supported resolutions to protest the illegal seizure of the Baltic States, I take great pride in honoring the courageous Lithuanians, and I salute the Lithuanian-American community for its constant efforts on behalf of its homeland.

With the support and cooperation of millions throughout this country and other nations, we can urge the Soviet Union to comply with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and insure that the just cause of Lithuanian self-determination will not be abandoned.●

JUSTICE—SOVIET STYLE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today in the Soviet Union another travesty of justice has occurred. Soviet Jewish refuseniks Ida Nudel and Vladimir Slepak, in separate trials in Moscow, were tried and convicted of "malicious hooliganism". Both were sentenced to terms of internal exile, Slepak for 5 years and Nudel for 4 years. As is becoming more and more familiar, the trials were commenced with little advance notice and in the case of Nudel, at least, no friends or observers were allowed to attend.

The actions for which Slepak and Nudel were arrested and which comprise, according to the Soviet Government, "malicious hooliganism" can hardly be considered criminal. Slepak and his wife, Maria, frustrated at having been denied the right to emigrate to Israel for over 8 years, hung a banner with the inscription "Let Us Go to Our Son in Israel" over the side of their apartment balcony in downtown Moscow. Police broke into the eighth floor apartment, tore the banner into three pieces and arrested Mr. and Mrs. Slepak. Both were charged with "malicious hooliganism." Mrs. Slepak, a physician, was released pending trial. Apparently, the Soviets intend to try Mrs. Slepak, who suffers from pancreatitis, alone.

Ida Nudel, who has been trying for over 7 years to emigrate to Israel where her husband and sister live, attempted

to take part in a demonstration with other refuseniks demanding their right to emigrate. The demonstrators were hustled away by KGB agents and later Nudel reportedly hung a protest poster in her apartment window. She was told on June 2 that she was being charged under article 206 of the RSFSR criminal code with "malicious hooliganism."

Both Slepak and Nudel have played important roles in the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. Slepak, one of the best known leaders of the refuseniks, is also a member of the Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreement in the U.S.S.R., headed by now-imprisoned Yuri Orlov. Nudel is known as the guardian angel of the Jewish Prisoners of Conscience. She regularly appealed to Soviet authorities and the West in their behalf, corresponded and visited with them. Both will be sorely missed by the Soviet Jewish community.

Despite the pledges made at Helsinki to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, which include the right to emigrate, and the promise to facilitate the reunification of families, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were deliberately separated from family members abroad. For protesting the denial of their rights, these courageous individuals are now forced to spend years in an isolated part of Siberia away from their homes, their families, and their friends. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out against this injustice and to join me in protesting conviction and sentencing of Ida Nudel and Vladimir Slepak.●

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE ADMINISTRATION ON BREEDER REACTOR DEVELOPMENT

HON. GARY A. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. GARY A. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Fossil and Nuclear Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration, I am concerned about the lack of administration support for the demonstration of fast breeder technology in a plant operating on a utility grid.

While I do not oppose the concept of the administration-supported study, I support such a study only if it is carried out concurrently with work on the existing small scale breeder demonstration project.

Our colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. WYDLER has, as ranking member of the House Science and Technology Committee, brought to light several of the concerns involved in the breeder issue in an exchange of letters with Mr. Harry E. Bergold, Jr., Department of Energy Assistant Secretary of International Affairs. I am appending copies of the correspondence as a portion of my remarks, and I urge careful consideration of the points raised in view of the continuing disparity between congressional and Executive views on breeder reactor development.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1978.

Mr. HARRY E. BERGOLD, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary for International Affairs,
Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BERGOLD: I read with considerable interest the reply that you sent me at the request of the President. I appreciate the courtesy but frankly I found some of your key points unconvincing.

Certainly the question of nuclear power demand is a chicken-egg issue. The difficult problems in delay of plant construction due to design licensing requirements have played a major role in slowing nuclear power demand by eroding utility and industry confidence.

Only the nuclear fuels resource assessment program will answer the question of the level of uranium resources we can project with confidence. As you know, several studies, including that of the National Academy of Science, place our reserves considerably lower than the Administration's optimistic figures. It will be five years before we can nail down this figure and I am surprised that you would contend that the reserves are "projected to be significantly higher than that used for planning the nuclear program including the Clinch River Breeder Reactor."

You failed to address the question of a focus for our breeder technology program. I have discussed this with officials of many foreign governments and regardless of the level of funding they will not take a breeder program seriously which does not involve a plant commitment. On that basis, I cannot agree with your statement that "the new program direction maintains our position as the world's leading nuclear power nation." I cannot believe we will maintain nuclear preeminence vs. the Russians, French, and British as they will accumulate considerable plant experience by the early 1980s.

I endorse U.S. emphasis on systematic and comprehensive R&D with extensive component testing but this activity is not inconsistent with parallel design activity to build a technology demonstration plant.

Finally, it is clear to me that the President's unfortunately strident rhetoric of last April 20th has got him "out on a limb" on nuclear policy. I am pleased to see his recognition of this in recent dealings with the Indian government. He can hardly afford to treat any of our nuclear friends with less courtesy than he is showing Premier Desai. The Japanese announcement to proceed with nuclear reprocessing is simple evidence of common sense. I am stunned that the Administration would have expected otherwise from an island nation with no fossil energy reserves.

I can appreciate that it is a most difficult chore for you and other officials to defend a policy which lacks a sound basis in technical fact or international political reality. I trust you will convey the substance of my reply to the President and Secretary Schlesinger.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. WYDLER,
Ranking Minority Member.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1978.

Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. WYDLER: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of April 4. You raise a number of important issues concerning your energy discussions with the Soviets, the future of the U.S. breeder reactor program, and the future role of nuclear power in this country. Let me assure you at the outset that the President shares your commitment to continued U.S. technological and industrial leadership in world nuclear markets.

In April 1977, the President announced a restructuring of the breeder reactor development program. Key factors involved in this decision were nuclear power demand, economic outlook, and proliferation concerns. Specifically, nuclear power demand had changed markedly since the decision was made to go forward with the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. Projections of electrical demand for the year 2000 are now between one-quarter and one-half of the presumed requirements when the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Project was planned. Moreover, the uranium resource base is projected to be significantly higher than that used for planning the nuclear program including the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. These considerations led to the conclusion that the sense of urgency regarding the CRBRP was unwarranted.

We now have additional time to develop options that assure the availability of an improved breeder that would meet our goals for low doubling time and proliferation resistant fuel cycles with safe and reliable reactor systems. This option is being assured by our present base program that includes conceptual planning, systems studies, system design studies, and development of plant components, fuels, and materials.

The new program direction maintains our position as the world's leading nuclear power nation. Nuclear electric generating capacity in the U.S. is unmatched by any other country. For FY 1979 the DOE has proposed a breeder reactor development budget of around \$400 million. It will support development of variations of the uranium/plutonium and uranium/thorium cycles. In carrying out this effort it will be necessary to draw heavily on CRBRP experience and professional staff. We will also continue research directed toward improving the efficiency and safety of light water reactors. We believe that this program will assure nuclear power options which can meet the requirements of the future.

The Soviet Union is also proceeding rapidly with the development of breeder reactors and the deployment of light water reactors. However, the U.S. and Soviet approaches have differed enough to make point-by-point comparisons difficult. The Soviets have preferred to construct reactors as quickly as possible and to correct the defects later. (The Shvchenko breeder has not operated without significant problems, including steam generator leakages.) By contrast, the United States has emphasized systematic and comprehensive research and development reinforced by extensive proof testing of components prior to building demonstration plants.

We do not believe that the United States and other Western supplier states will lose world markets to Soviet reactors. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 should enable the United States to restore international confidence in its reliability as an exporter of reactors and nuclear fuels.

The depth and breadth of our nuclear power program should clearly indicate to the world and to the American people that we take this source of energy very seriously. President Carter has stated that we do not regard the proliferation of nuclear explosive capability as an inevitable byproduct of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We intend to use our technological capabilities and our resource endowments to assure that international peace and security as well as world energy needs are served by the development and deployment of advanced, proliferation-resistant reactors, as well as sales of our current reactors.

Sincerely,

HARRY E. BERGOLD, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary
for International Affairs. ●

TUITION TAX CREDIT GETS STRONG SUPPORT FROM EXPERT ON DESEGREGATION

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as the case in support of tuition tax credit legislation continues to gain momentum, it pleases me enormously to be able to add to the growing list of active backers of this concept the name of James S. Coleman, a noted sociologist and professor at the University of Chicago, who is best known for directing an influential study in favor of school desegregation in the mid-1960's. The following article on Coleman's views on tax credits appeared in the Tuesday, June 21, 1978, issue of the Washington Post.

Coleman, speaking recently at a forum on desegregation sponsored by the Black Student Fund, expressed his strong support for tuition tax credits, particularly at the elementary and secondary levels of education. The sociologist effectively countered the argument that tax credits would in fact promote segregation with the statement that a tax credit "would increase the opportunity of black parents to escape from schools that they think hurt their children." I believe Coleman's remarks make a lot of sense and highly recommend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

DESEGREGATION EXPERT BACKS TUITION CREDIT
(By Lawrence Feinberg)

Sociologist James S. Coleman, who headed a massive influential study favoring school desegregation in the mid-1960s, yesterday strongly supported a tuition tax credit to aid parents of private and parochial school pupils.

Coleman, a professor at the University of Chicago, said he favors the tax credit—which has been voted by the House but is bitterly opposed by the Carter administration—because it would "increase the range of choice of low-income black parents."

Particularly in big cities, Coleman said, where large-scale public school desegregation is unlikely, a tax credit "would increase the opportunity of black parents to escape from schools that they think hurt their children."

Opponents of the measure have contended it would promote segregation, hurt public schools and mainly benefit middle- and upper-income groups.

But Coleman said that because of the relatively modest size of the proposed credit, \$100 to \$500 per student, "the principal effect would be on lower-income families" sending their children to relatively low-priced schools.

He said "a very large number of black children" already attend low-tuition Catholic schools in big cities, such as Chicago, New York and Washington, with generally positive educational results.

Coleman spoke at a forum on desegregation attended by about 60 persons at Georgetown Day School, 4530 MacArthur Blvd., N.W. The forum was sponsored by the Black Student Fund, which during the past decade has aided more than a thousand black students to attend private schools in the Washington area.

He was introduced warmly by Alice M. Rivlin, director of the Congressional Budget Office, who later asked him to deal with the "accusation" that programs to help blacks

attend private schools are "detrimental" to public education.

"That's not a valid argument," Coleman rejoined. "Anything that allows for an individual to have greater opportunity can't be bad for the country."

Besides favoring a tuition credit on federal income taxes, Coleman said he supported proposals to give vouchers to parents to use for tuition at public or private schools.

"Parents and children have a better sense of what's a good school context for them," Coleman said, "than do professionals who must deal with a very large number of children. I trust the parents and children more than the professionals."

"I think the stronger the private schools are the better it will be for the public schools because the public schools will be forced to be better to stay in business."

Overall, Coleman said, school desegregation since 1954 has had "no effect" on educational achievement of black students.

"In the absence of turmoil," Coleman said, "there seems to be an achievement increase." But so far, he said, this has been counterbalanced by reduced black achievement in places where desegregation was accompanied by conflict and fear and "distraction from study."

In general, he said, integration has been most successful in well-disciplined schools headed by strong principals.

Coleman stressed that the main finding of his 1966 report, issued by the U.S. Office of Education, was that black students had higher achievement in mostly white schools not because of the skin color of their classmates but because of the middle-class background and "educational resources" that the white children brought from home.

"Increasingly, class is less correlated with race than it was 10 years ago," Coleman said.

Widespread desegregation, he said, has been "enormously beneficial" to the South by aiding its transformation from a backward region to a thriving "Sun Belt."

But he repeated his view, which has attracted controversy for the past three years, that desegregation programs requiring "instant racial balance" through compulsory busing have caused "very serious harm" by speeding the exodus of whites from big cities.●

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LEADERSHIP IN BUENA PARK

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the installation of new officers at the Buena Park Chamber of Commerce. Many of the Members of the House of Representatives know Buena Park as home of some of the Nation's most famous entertainment attractions—Knott's Berry Farm, Movieland Wax Museum, and Movieland Cars of the Stars. However, Buena Park is also a balanced residential, commercial, and industrial community. Buena Park's success in attracting business is due in large part to the efforts of the Buena Park Chamber of Commerce and its leadership, such as outgoing president Bob Burbank.

This week the Buena Park chamber will install Gail Dixon as president, the first woman to ever hold that position. She is the manager of Great Western

Savings and Loan Association, Buena Park branch, and has long been active in civic affairs. Other officers being installed are Jon Dowell of Meade Packaging as president-elect; David Hannemann of Movieland Wax Museum as vice president; Al Whitmore of Al's Automotive as secretary, and Dick Pettit of the Automobile Club of Southern California as treasurer.

I ask the 95th Congress to join me in congratulating these new officers and wishing them success in continuing to make Buena Park a better city.●

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I participated in the National Conference on Technology Transfer which was held in Ann Arbor, Mich. This conference sought to discuss particularly the role of community colleges in technology transfer. Over 160 people from community colleges in 21 States participated in the conference.

It is my feeling that we must recognize and encourage the important role which these colleges can play in technology transfer. An article which appeared in *Science* (June, 1978 edition) expands on this concept and my belief. I would like to share this article with my colleagues in the hope that they also will work with their community colleges in the area of technology transfer. The article follows:

TECHNOLOGY IN RESPONSE TO LOCAL NEEDS

Before the period when President Johnson talked of the Great Society, federally sponsored research and development was concerned primarily with problem areas external to society, specifically those of defense posture and the space program. Since then the scope of federal R & D has broadened to include domestic problems such as urban economic development, transportation, and energy conservation. Several editorials in *Science* have illuminated aspects of this situation.*

Effective R & D, or technical assistance and technology transfer, on domestic problems is peculiarly difficult because the users are generally varied and dispersed. For example, in the area of energy conservation the clients include consumers, builders, heating and cooling contractors, architects, and utilities. This is typical of domestic problem areas; we must reach the grass roots. Yet the federal R & D community is not responsive to local needs. Rather, it is focused where the money is, in Washington, D.C. This incongruous situation is a major obstacle to progress. What is needed is a structure that integrates the R & D community with problems and people at the local level.

The major difficulty in designing an appropriate delivery system is that of providing a technology extension service which achieves intimate contact with millions of local businesses and thousands of state and

* R. L. Bisplinghoff, *Science* 190, 1045 (1975); J. G. Horsfall, *ibid.* 193, 637 (1976).

local government agencies. If a delivery system is designed from scratch, the costs are formidable and the problem of achieving the required rapport between the system and the people to be saved may be insurmountable. Both issues indicate that organizations which are already an integral part of the community should be used to provide the technology extension service.

A set of institutions that have become strong and well supported at the community level and are committed to community service are the 1200 community colleges located across the country and serving a major share of the people. It is recommended that the community colleges—which have the required geographic distribution, service orientation, constituency, and value system—should have a prominent role in a national R & D delivery system.

Universities, research institutes, and governmental laboratories would operate in concert with the colleges by conducting research that is responsive to local needs and by obtaining from the R & D community results and products that can be moved into the economic stream. Substantial costs would be involved in establishing such a delivery network; however, they would be a small fraction (perhaps 1 percent) of the cost of the current R & D enterprise. Also, the additional resources brought to bear are large enough to have a major impact. In terms of dollars, the operating budgets of the community colleges total over \$5 billion per year, and the enrollment is more than 4 million students, with the majority in vocational and continuing educational programs.

A pilot program has been in operation in Michigan with support from the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce. The program stresses cooperation with the activities and resources of the (agricultural) Cooperative Extension Service and other public and private assistance programs. The performance and institutional motivations thus far demonstrated are encouraging. Energy is a national problem area in which the community colleges could be very helpful in disseminating information and techniques. This is especially true of the effort to attain better conservation of energy in home heating and cooling. It is also likely that expanding applications of solar energy such as water heating and use of biomass would be facilitated if the community colleges were broadly involved.—William M. Brown, President, Environmental Research Institute of Michigan, Ann Arbor 48107, and Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. 20036.●

PETER STRUDWICK—MARATHON RUNNER

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share an amazing story that has recently come to my attention, a story of perseverance, courage, and endurance. This is a story of a marathon runner, Mr. Peter Strudwick. Pete has now run over 40 marathons. And, though his choice of sport is hardly unique these days, Pete is. He has no feet.

Born with only ankle stumps and two fingers on one hand, Pete Strudwick does

more than live with limitations—he literally runs beyond them. Three times he has accepted the challenge of the Pike's Peak Marathon, the roughest distance race regularly run on Earth. He is and may remain the only footless fellow ever to marathon over mountains.

What makes Pete run? Hunger for health. The cheers of friends and fans. A joyful defiance. At 39, his career as an aerospace engineer-psychologist ended in a massive business recession. His body weakened by worry and inactivity, Pete challenged his first marathon. Although he was last to start, last to finish, and last all the way, he finished and that is the victory of the Pete Strudwick story.

Now a junior high school mathematics teacher, Pete lives with his wife, Barbara, and their four children in La Palma, Calif., where he trains and writes and polishes his public speaking. From Alaska to Mexico, from San Francisco to Washington, D.C., Pete Strudwick has run and continues to run. The amazing accomplishments of this footless racer continue to be the subject of many news stories. He has appeared on numerous television and radio programs and continues to be an inspiration in the field of physical well-being. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH A. LE FANTE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Speaker, I missed a number of votes in the House last week due to the fact that I underwent some preliminary medical testing and as a result of my participation as a congressional adviser at the United Nations special session on disarmament. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 437, condemning violations of human rights in Uganda, "yes."

Rollcall No. 438, Toxic Substances Control Act, "yes."

The following votes concerning H.R. 12933, Transportation Appropriations, fiscal 1979:

Rollcall No. 439, to prohibition use of funds to require vehicles to be equipped with passive restraint systems other than seat belts, "no."

Rollcall No. 440, to permit use of funds for research and development relating to passive restraint systems, "yes."

Rollcall No. 441, passage of H.R. 12933, "yes."

The following votes concerning H.R. 12929, Labor-HEW appropriations, fiscal 1979:

Rollcall No. 442, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill, "yes."

Rollcall No. 443, to strike language prohibiting use of funds for abortions unless the life of the mother was in danger, "no."

Rollcall No. 444, to substitute the compromise language restricting use of funds

for abortions contained in fiscal year 1978 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, "no."

Rollcall No. 445, to prohibit the use of funds to implement quotas or other numerical requirements relating to race, creed, or sex with respect to hiring, promotion, or admissions policies, "yes."

Rollcall No. 446, to reduce controllable spending in the bill by 2 percent, "no."

Rollcall No. 447, to reduce the appropriation for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration by \$28.4 million, "no."

Rollcall No. 448, passage of H.R. 12929, "yes."

Rollcall No. 449, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of H.R. 12935, legislative branch appropriations, fiscal 1979, "yes."

The following votes concerning H.R. 12928, energy, public works appropriations, fiscal 1979:

Rollcall No. 461, approval of the bill, House Resolution 1236, "yes."

Rollcall No. 462, to delete \$90.8 million earmarked for three water projects, "yes."

Rollcall No. 463, to delete funds for eight water projects, "no."

Rollcall No. 464, motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of H.R. 12928, "yes."

Rollcall No. 465, to prohibit use of funds for production of enhanced radiation weapons, "no."

Rollcall No. 466, to recommit the bill with instructions to report back with an amendment to reduce total appropriations not required by law by 3 percent, "no."

Rollcall No. 467, passage of H.R. 12928, "yes."

Rollcall No. 468, passage of H.R. 12927, appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense, fiscal 1979, "yes." ●

PROPOSITION 13—NUCLEAR AGE "BOSTON TEA PARTY"

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, before and after the June 6, 1978, primary in California the cries of gloom, doom, and despair were heard up and down the State and across the Nation. In spite of all of these protestations, the people of California "shouted it out" loud and clear. Fortunately, many messages were included in the expression of public opinion. The citizens were warned that the tax savings would all be drained off by increases in Federal income taxes. Estimates ranged as high as \$2 billion. The prophets of doom pointed out that the Federal Government would receive the largess from California if proposition 13 carried. This would make it necessary for the public officials of California to go as "beggars" with "hat in hand" to Washington for a bailout as a

result of the windfall revenues that would now accrue to the U.S. Treasury.

We were told that all nonessential programs, services, and projects would be eliminated and many essential services and programs would be curtailed as a result of passage of proposition 13. Cutbacks, layoffs, unemployment, increased welfare rolls, and so forth, were predicted. Californians did not listen to all of this depressing and dismal propaganda, and one message that has not been enunciated in the media and did not receive the attention during the campaign that it deserved is that the benefit to the Federal Government is factual nonsense. The people want and demand more discretionary spending power of their hard-earned wages. They no longer accept the role of the faceless bureaucrat to continue making decisions over their lives about what is "good for them." They will decide which programs to support and which services to continue and which projects to reject. The money saved in taxes can be contributed to the community library, to the local youth band, to the civic symphony orchestra, to the little theater and little league, to the civic light opera, to the community center, and the lists continues on and on. The point is that they decide. The corporation, the business, the partnership, and professional and the common, ordinary, unnamed, unrecognized citizen decides in the "marketplace" by his voluntary contributions what his community is to provide for him. Tax deductions for all of these contributions may very well find that less money, not more, is going to Washington. This is the old-fashioned, radical American way. This is the nuclear-age "Boston Tea Party." Confiscatory taxation and bureaucratic decisions are not acceptable. This is the real spirit of America. Dreaming? Perhaps. But, if it is just a dream, it is the rebirth of the American dream. The time is now ripe for every citizen to become a "born-again" American.

If any should be in too big a hurry to say that Californians cannot measure up to this commitment, let me remind you that recent statistics reveal that only seven nations of the world rank higher in gross national product than the State of California. California is ahead of our neighbor Canada, No. 8, and just behind the United Kingdom, No. 7. Even the county of Los Angeles, my home county, is No. 14 in the same category, gross national product, ahead of the next country, the Netherlands, and following India. In per capita gross national product, the Los Angeles area is between No. 4 and 5 of these same nations. And, even using population and gross national product statistics, California and Los Angeles County rank among the top nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we will measure up to the responsibilities and obligations of the decision that we have made, but do not spend that increase in Federal income taxes just yet. Californians have very fine methods of keeping their dollars at home where they will be spent far more judiciously than being funneled through

the Federal bureaucracy. Far better that the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress find more tax deduction items for our tax returns and let us have even more discretion in how our own money is to be spent, than to search for new sources of revenue.

After saying all of this, let me insert for the edification of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column of James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Star of June 20, 1978, which also has some observations on "California aftershocks":

CALIFORNIA AFTERSHOCKS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Two weeks have passed since the California earthquake, and the tremors have at last crossed the Potomac. The House of Representatives last week voted to cut the Labor-Welfare budget by \$800 million. In terms of a \$500 billion budget, it wasn't much, but it was a start. Thank you, Howard Jarvis.

Mr. Jarvis, of course, is the cantankerous apostle of the new political religion known as tax limitation. Since California's landslide vote of June 6 for his Proposition 13, his voice no longer cries alone in the wilderness. All kinds of politicians have got religion, as an examination of the 220-181 vote in the House will suggest. Some of the 220 had never cast a vote for economy in their lives.

Here, as there, cries were raised that to reduce public spending, especially in areas of health, education and welfare, amounts to grinding the faces of the poor. In times past, such cries have proved marvelously effective; and as a consequence, the federal budget for welfare has become bloated beyond recognition. Until Brother Jarvis came along, there seemed no possibility that the Labor-HEW appropriation ever would be touched by fiscal sanity. Now the boys are running scared.

Some other things have been happening in these two weeks. The news that reaches us from California is mostly maddening news. Daily we are deluged by pitiful stories of libraries closing, of fire trucks immobilized, of police laid off, of school teachers dismissed, all as a result of that dreadful Jarvis man. On examination, it appears that most of these doomsday tidings have to do with possible closings and possible cutbacks and possible reductions in services, depending upon what the California legislature does to save the day.

If I were a California voter, witnessing this defeatist reaction from officialdom, I would start making lists—lists of those elected officials who have responded with vindictiveness or ineptitude, or both, to the results on Proposition 13. At the first opportunity, I would move heaven and earth to vote them out of office and to replace them with new officials dedicated to making the proposition work.

California's highly paid state legislators have the first responsibility for a sensitive, intelligent response to the situation, but local imagination and local leadership could count for vastly more. A dispatch from Corona, Calif., informs us dolefully that "the sleek new library on Main Street probably will close." Well, nonsense! The library won't close if Friends of the Corona Library will stop sniffing and raise the money voluntarily to take up the slack.

The inference one draws from the post-referendum news is that Californians have become so absolutely dependent upon government, so weak and enfeebled, so pathetically gutless, that they are unable to lift a finger in their own behalf. I do not believe it for an instant.

In every community affected by Proposition 13, there are local industries, stores, banks,

factories and well-heeled individuals who will benefit from substantial tax reduction. In many cases, these taxpayers can be persuaded to give large chunks of their savings back to their communities for parks, libraries, fire companies, or the like. Under federal income tax laws, such voluntary contributions would cost them nothing.

We hear lamentations about the cancellation of summer schools and adult education classes. So what? Generations of Americans grew up to a reasonable literacy without free summer school and free adult education. Charge a fee or let it go! What if Corona's Little League ballparks no longer may be watered or lighted at public expense? When I was a boy, all we had for second base was a busted-outpiece of an apple crate. Sweet are the uses of adversity! We raised some pretty fair infielders that way.

Here in Washington, politicians are nervous. They hear the tom-toms beating and they know the natives are restless out there. What Howard Jarvis did in California, some national leader might yet do for Washington. It's a heady thought, and it won't go away. ●

RESOLUTION REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for the decision of 21 American scientists not to attend the recent physics symposium in the Soviet Union. The resolution also calls upon the administration to take an active role in condemning the Soviet Union's disregard of basic human rights, and requests that all U.S. Government agencies make a careful evaluation of their sponsorship of international conferences involving the Soviet Union.

Nineteen American scientists, comprising the American delegation to a symposium held in Moscow from May 22 to May 26, unanimously decided to cancel their trip. In addition, Robert Marshak, president of City College of New York, and Nicholas Bloembergen, a Harvard professor, canceled scheduled trips to the U.S.S.R. This represented a reversal on the part of Mr. Marshak, who in the past has been vocal in his support of the exchanges.

The decision of these American scientists not to journey to the Soviet Union was taken in response to the harassment and abuse Soviet dissidents have received at the hands of the authorities.

Yuri Orlov, a prominent Soviet scientist, was recently tried on the charge of selling "slandering material to the West," convicted and sentenced to 7 years in prison, and 5 years of internal exile.

This harsh penalty was imposed upon an individual whose only "crime" has been to insist that the principles set forth in the Helsinki Agreement be adhered to by the Soviet Union.

Orlov's trial was conducted arbitrarily and without any regard for the defendant's rights. He was refused the right to call witnesses on his behalf. Through-

out his imprisonment and trial, his family has been continuously harassed. Mr. Marshak commented:

The closed trial and inhuman punishment imposed on our high-energy physics colleague, Yuri Orlov, make it impossible for me to attend the seminar in Moscow next week.

I fully support his position, and that taken by the other American scientists.

The Soviet Union has shown a continuing disregard for the human rights of their citizens. Their treatment of dissidents is abhorrent. The trial of Orlov is but the latest example in a continuing record of Soviet abuses in this area.

Ethnic minorities suffer heavily in the U.S.S.R. Jewish scientists in the Soviet Union who request permission to emigrate and are denied become known as "refuseniks," often cut off from the scientific community, refused any opportunity to support themselves and their families.

In the near future, Anatoly Scharansky and Alexander Ginzburg are scheduled to go on trial for crimes similar to those allegedly committed by Orlov. If they are treated similarly, the message to the rest of the world will be clear: There is no justice in the Soviet Union.

For relations between our two countries to improve, the Soviet Union must first improve humanitarian conditions in their own country. I urge my colleagues to join with me in making this statement of congressional support for the courageous action taken by our scientists, and in urging the administration to pursue with renewed vigor the enforcement of basic human rights throughout the world.

A similar resolution has been previously introduced in the Senate.

I insert the full text of this resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Yuri Orlov, a prominent Soviet scientist, was convicted by the Soviet Union of selling "slandering material to the West" after a trial in which he was denied the representation of his choice and the right to call witnesses on his own behalf;

Whereas during the trial Orlov's family was harassed and abused by the Soviet authorities and Mrs. Orlov was denied the right to visit her husband;

Whereas the entire 19-member delegation of United States scientists to the Sixth Joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. Symposium on Condensed Matter Theory announced on May 20 that they were cancelling their scheduled trip to the Soviet Union to participate in the Symposium because of the conviction of Yuri Orlov;

Whereas two prominent scientists, Robert E. Marshak and Nicholas Bloembergen, also decided to forgo visits to the Soviet Union this week; and

Whereas Jewish scientists who have been refused permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union, known as "refuseniks", have lost their jobs, have been forbidden all contact with the scientific community, have been denied access to scientific literature, and have been subjected to severe penalties of imprisonment and banishment, as in the case of Anatoly Scharansky: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the United States should support the action of certain United States scientists in

refusing to visit the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in protest of the conviction of the prominent Soviet scientist Yuri Orlov;

(2) the United States should assume leadership in condemning the violation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the basic human rights of its scientists and other citizens; and

(3) the President should direct the heads of the departments and agencies of the Government to begin an intensive and careful evaluation of international conferences and exchanges of scientists with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, sponsored by the respective departments and agencies, and such an evaluation should continue until the Government of the Soviet Union expresses its willingness to comply with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords. ●

REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS INTRODUCES A BILL TO PROTECT THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC AGAINST IMPROPER GOVERNMENT SEARCHES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 the Supreme Court delivered an opinion which drastically cut away at the constitutional right of every American to be secure against Government search and seizure. In the case of *Zurcher* against *Standard Daily* the Court held that police may use an *ex parte* warrant to enter and search the premises of a party not suspected of criminal activity. The subject of the search in the case before the Court was the office of the *Stanford University* newspaper, but the Court's decision reaches far beyond the press. In the words of the *Los Angeles Times*, "It renders every home and every place of business vulnerable to a surprise search by the police."

In response to this serious threat to fourth amendment rights, I am today introducing the *Citizens Privacy Protection Act of 1978*. This bill is designed to protect individuals as well as the press against unannounced invasions by anyone acting under color of law. Where law enforcement authorities need to secure evidence of a crime, the bill provides that they do so only by means of a subpoena issued pursuant to an adversary court proceeding.

Writing for the trial court in the *Stanford Daily* case, District Court Judge Robert Peckham recognized the safeguards which this approach provides for innocent third parties:

Unlike one suspected of a crime the third party has no meaningful remedy or protection against an unlawful search, with or without a warrant, and an additional safeguard is necessary to assure that his Fourth Amendment rights are not trampled. That protection is the obligation of law enforcement to use a subpoena duces tecum unless it is shown, through sworn affidavits, that it is impractical to do so.

The bill provides two exceptions under which a search warrant may be issued. First, where there is probable cause to

believe that the person holding the evidence was involved in a crime, and second, where there is probable cause to indicate that but for the use of a warrant, the evidence might be destroyed. The bill's provisions are enforceable through civil actions and include the granting of general and punitive damages.

In response to the Supreme Court's decision there has been a great outcry from the press against the ruling. Such disparate commentators as James J. Kilpatrick and Carl Rowan have joined in their criticism of the Court's action. This concern of the press is justified because the opinion now makes it possible for police to secure a search warrant and, unannounced, search newsroom files, desks, wastebaskets, and cabinets. In doing so they may seize only items specified in the warrant, but before leaving, they may end up examining everything in the newsroom. The police raid on the *Stanford Daily*, designed to find photographs of a crime, yielded none; yet the newsroom was rummaged by police for over 8 hours.

Speaking for a majority of the Court, Justice White is sanguine about the ability of law enforcement to keep itself in check regarding such searches. However, most of us can recall only too recently cases of gross governmental abuse of power. Benjamin Bradlee of the *Washington Post* noted that under the Court's rule, the *Pentagon Papers* might never have been published, since they could have been seized by police pursuant to a warrant. Furthermore, while searching for information relative to a crime, the police will have access to reporter's information about confidential news sources. Ultimately, such risk of exposure will effectively dry up these valuable news sources.

The Supreme Court's decision also impacts the rest of us. In his well-reasoned dissent in the case, Justice Stevens wrote:

Just as the witnesses who participate in an investigation or a trial far outnumber the defendants, the persons who possess evidence that may help to identify an offender, or explain an aspect of a criminal transaction, far outnumber those who have custody of weapons or plunder. Countless law abiding citizens—doctors, lawyers, merchants, customers, bystanders—may have documents in their possession that relate to an ongoing criminal investigation.

The Court's ruling creates the potential for official mischief limited only by the imagination of the police. Justice White's trust in judges and magistrates to act as a restraining influence fails to give much comfort. Our experience with wiretap warrants under the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act tells us that judges do not exercise meaningful control over warrant applications. From 1969 through 1976, applications by police for search warrants totaled 5,563; only 15 of these applications were denied by judges or magistrates. In 1977, not one of 626 such applications was denied. These statistics demonstrate the tendency of judicial officers to rubber-stamp applications for search warrants.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the importance of Congress

acting to correct this unfortunate decision of the Supreme Court. The bill which I have introduced goes far toward correcting the problems created by the Court's decision and toward restoring the rights of privacy and personal security to all Americans. I urge the support of my colleagues for this measure. ●

PROPOSITION 13

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 21, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROPOSITION 13

In three of my Southern Indiana town meetings this past weekend, a major topic of conversation was the California vote to slash property taxes. Hoosiers seem to agree that the vote is a message to public officials everywhere that taxes are too high and government performance not good enough.

Whatever their counterparts in other states are thinking, California officeholders have received a signal that cannot be misinterpreted. By a two-to-one margin, Californians voiced their objection to the outrageously high taxes levied on their homes and business properties. Apparently, Californians also want smaller, more efficient government. It is easy to sympathize with this anguished tax protest and hard to quarrel with the view that government has grown too big and too inefficient. For some time now there has been a feeling in the land that the burden of taxation and the government it pays for must be trimmed back.

The California proposal, Proposition 13, stands as a powerful symbol of an emerging political force: the disgruntled middle-income and upper-middle-income taxpayer. As ratified, Proposition 13 cuts the property tax rate to 1 percent of the 1975 cash value of real property, restricts increases in assessed values to not more than 2 percent per year unless property changes hands, calls for a two-thirds majority in the state legislature for any new or increased state taxes, and forbids substitute local taxes unless they are approved by two-thirds of the qualified electors. Overall, the proposal lowers property tax revenues from \$11.4 billion to \$4.4 billion.

A \$7 billion revenue loss is very significant, but it is still too soon to predict what impact Proposition 13 will have. There will no doubt be legal and constitutional challenges to it that could result in delay. The real implications of the California vote and the sentiment behind it remain to be sorted out.

California will probably relieve the immediate fiscal pressure on cities and towns with assistance from the state surplus. However, an examination of the structure and priorities of local government is inevitable and a hardheaded assessment of all public services will have to be undertaken. Since Proposition 13 does not indicate how local government budgets should be cut, there will surely be a scramble to determine what is fat and what is muscle in those budgets. With possible budget reductions of up to 70% slated for some communities and school districts, the choices will be difficult. There may be protracted disputes among the various segments of local government: police, fire, education, sanitation, recreation, and so on. The elimination of some jobs is unavoidable, and the possibility of strikes, slow-

downs and other work disruptions cannot be ruled out. Some mayors have already announced far-reaching layoffs.

In the long run, one effect of Proposition 13 and measures like it may be to transfer control of some local affairs away from local governments. The property tax has been a fiscal mainstay of local treasuries in the United States. It accounts for 80% of all local revenues. Because our federal system has stressed the importance of local control, a sharp reduction in the property tax represents a fundamental change in the ordering of that system. With less local money at hand, demand for state and federal assistance will increase, particularly in cities which are already too dependent on such assistance. One cannot help but wonder whether resentment toward taxes and government has been taken out on the right tax. Looking to the state capital or to Washington may be an easy answer, but it may also be the wrong answer.

The factors that brought about the California tax revolt would be hard to duplicate exactly in other states. In Indiana, for example, per capita state and local taxes rank 43rd in the nation in percentage of personal income, while California's are fourth. Indiana's per capita state and local tax burden is only 61% of California's. In addition, Indiana's property taxes have been comparatively stable while California's have soared. But the revolt will spread even if voters in other states do not choose the California model. It seems to me that echoes of frustration are already skipping across the country. They are being heard in Ohio where voters rejected a tax increase to help the schools and in Tennessee where a limit has been placed on the growth of state spending. Moves to curb state and local government spending are afoot in about half the states, and 23 state legislatures have called for a constitutional amendment banning federal deficits. At the federal level the revolt could result in the limiting of federal spending to a fraction of the output of the national economy.

In part, Proposition 13 and measures like it are votes of "no confidence" in government. The manner in which public officials respond to such protests may very well determine whether confidence can be restored. To replace lost revenue with new taxes would countermand the will of the people. To reduce services in a careless or haphazard way would violate the public trust. It is clear that the people now expect sharp reductions in government costs at all levels. They want efficiency in essential functions and curtailment of non-essential functions. ●

NOAH AMINADAV BEN-TOVIM

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, July 2, the Southern Pacific Region of the Zionist Organization of America will hold a reception to honor Noah Aminadav Ben-Tovim on the occasion of his retirement as regional director.

We say of a few of the people of the world who have been involved in its history that they are "living legends," and Noah Ben-Tovim is, indeed, such a person. He came from the hills of Jerusalem, a Sabra, a Hebrew scholar and teacher of Zionism; a writer and soldier; an ac-

tive and tireless administrator. A member of one of the most distinguished families in Israel, his grandfather, a judge in Jerusalem, was a founding member of Hovevi Zion together with Rabbi Mohilever, a great-uncle of his wife, Grace. Noah's father took an oath under his marriage canopy to speak only Hebrew to his family.

Noah was educated at the Hebrew Seminary in Jerusalem, at the Hebrew University, and the London Law School. His teachers praised him for his talents and modesty, for his intellectual integrity and idealism. He was the first Boy Scout in Israel; founder and president of the National Student Body which gave heroic leaders to Israel in the war for Jewish liberation; served as editor of a student magazine and of a daily newspaper in Jerusalem.

In London, Noah was appointed to represent the Betar of Poland before the British Government, the House of Commons, and the House of Lords in the struggle for immigration certificates into Palestine. A volunteer in the British Army during World War II, Noah also served in the Haganah and in the war of liberation under Menachem Begin, commander in chief. He received a British medal for brave conduct and the Aleh (the Medal for the Fighters of Statehood) from the Government of Israel.

At the end of the war of liberation, the Honorable Menachem Begin founded Shelach, dedicated to the rehabilitation of his veterans. He assigned Noah Ben-Tovim and Dr. Israel Lifshitz, his loyal officers, to direct operations throughout the Americas. Ben-Tovim and Lifshitz planned and organized this herculean task and accompanied their chief on the historic journey through our country and Latin America. In New York over a million people lined his route; thousands upon thousands flocked to see and greet Begin everywhere they stopped. Presidents, parliaments, and the news media paid tribute, in an outpouring of love, to the Jewish patriots who had accomplished a miracle for their country.

Ben-Tovim was also entrusted with the first American publication of Mr. Begin's war memoirs, "The Revolt." A 1948 autographed picture of Begin is a treasured possession of Noah's. It reads:

To my Dear Friend Ben-Tovim, the Faithful of the Sons of the Fighting Family.

The long and warm friendship between the families Begin and Ben-Tovim is a source of joy to both.

When he became a resident of the United States, Noah came to Los Angeles and served the city in many capacities for 14 years. He was president of the public utilities and transportation commission; president of the traffic commission; vice chairman of the housing authority commission; human relations commissioner and on the urban renewal committee. He is presently a county commissioner on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Hospital Authority and publisher and editor of the Municipal Guardian, a monthly publication dedicated to good government; and is the co-author of "The American Testament," a study of American history.

How can we thank a man who has given of himself so greatly, who participated in events which, literally, "shook the world"? We are fortunate, indeed, to have him in our community and to be the beneficiaries of his devotion and friendship. I ask the Members to join with his wife, Grace, his son and daughter-in-law, Gilbert and Holly; grandson, Joel Todd, and his many friends and admirers in this special tribute to Noah ben-Tovim. ●

CITIES: AN ENVIRONMENTAL WILDERNESS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an important statement of policy by the Honorable Barbara Blum, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It was delivered May 6, 1978, to the Sierra Club's 86th anniversary celebration in Berkeley, Calif.

Ms. Blum eloquently states the need for environmentalists to emphasize the urban environment, and for their own sake as well as for the sake of meeting the most gaping environmental needs of the Nation. The environmental movement may well founder if it does not move to include the majority of citizens who live in our cities. As she puts it so well:

The crisis of contemporary American environmentalism will not be resolved until we can find the proper balance between our urban-industrial-chemical civilization and the natural world. We need to see the city and the wilderness as interdependent, harmonious parts of the same human and natural community.

An elite environmental movement which ignores urban needs is bound to fail. Again, Ms. Blum states so aptly:

It's time to recognize that there is no place to hide. It's time for all urban residents, inner-city and suburban, to acknowledge that they share a common destiny. And it's time for the environmental movement to forge a new urban vision and make a sustained commitment to create a healthy urban environment.

I recommend my colleagues read the full article which is set forth below:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE BARBARA BLUM

CITIES: AN ENVIRONMENTAL WILDERNESS

We are gathered here tonight to celebrate the anniversary of the Sierra Club's founding eighty-six years ago in 1892 and to honor men and women responsible for their exceptional achievements in improving our Nation's environment.

Tonight, I want not so much to pay tribute to the past of the environmental movement, I want to confront what I think is the most important domestic challenge not only for environmentalists, but for all Americans. That challenge is rescuing our urban environment.

Throughout our history, Americans have placed a special value on their environment. The first colonists risked all to create an environment of bounty and freedom in the New World. Initially, the challenge came from the

howling wilderness, but from the start there was an urban vision too of building a city on a hill which would be a beacon to all people.

In the years of discovery and colonization, America's seemingly inexhaustible natural resources—fur, timber, minerals, and land—acted like a magnet. Millions of immigrants left their homelands to settle in America because of religious, political, and ethnic persecution.

In the nineteenth century, as the American economy gathered momentum, the wilderness was viewed either as something to be overcome to make way for "progress" or as a bonanza of untapped wealth to be plundered at will. There were no institutions and few traditions to induce Americans to conserve. The way West became the path of exploitation.

By the late nineteenth century, the industrial city's unbounded appetite for natural resources was endangering the wilderness. Men like John Muir who left their beloved mountains, and women such as Grace Greenwood who wrote so eloquently in defense of wilderness preservation, came to the city, and there fought successfully to save the wilderness from destruction. In the process, the Sierra Club was formed and environmental protection began.

Thanks to the perseverance of the Sierra Club and other environmental groups, large parts of the wilderness have been saved. Although we must continue to guard the wilderness, it is the urban environment and urban people, particularly inner-city people, who are our most endangered species.

The crisis of contemporary American environmentalism will not be resolved until we can find the proper balance between our urban-industrial-chemical civilization and the natural world. We need to see the city and the wilderness as interdependent, harmonious parts of the same human and natural community.

Ours is an urban civilization. Over three-quarters of all Americans live in a city whose total environment has been sound in the past, is healthy now, and is likely to remain so in the future.

Daily our lungs breathe in messages of warning. Our eyes smart. Our ears ring and our heads ache as the decibel count mounts. We know that the environment in which the inner-city poor must live is frightening, unhealthy and destructive.

Because the environmental movement has focused so much of its attention in the past on the wilderness, it has been charged as elitist. We had better face the fact that there is more than a grain of truth to this charge.

No person is an island, and yet we all know that in our midst there are islands everywhere, vast, ugly, dilapidated, teeming islands filled with poverty, unemployment, chronic sickness, depression and sometimes despair and violence. These islands we have come to know as ghettos, urban cores, and central cities.

Ripping through these islands are the ribbons of steel and concrete that whisk suburbanites and exurbanites into and out of town. In the last thirty years the exodus to suburbia raised the nation's suburban population 200 percent while the inner-city population declined. With that migration to suburbia went the fiscal resources for city services. With it also went much of the environmental conscience as well as the economic and political power of the environmental movement.

Suburbanites have roughly triple the income of inner-city residents and consume four times as much energy. But suburbanites are exposed to less than half of the environmental health hazards inner-city residents face.

Most of the power plants and the heavily polluting industries are the next-door neigh-

bors of the urban poor who enjoy the fewest products of American technology, but are forced to consume its often lethal pollution. The poor desperately need jobs, but as my friend Vernon Jordan of the Urban League has said, "We need jobs, but we also need to be healthy enough to hold those jobs."

The inner-city poor—white, yellow, brown and black—suffer to an alarming degree from what are euphemistically known as "diseases of adaptation". These are not healthy adaptations, but diseases and chronic conditions resulting from living with bad air, polluted water, excessive noise, and continual stress. Hypertension, heart disease, chronic bronchitis, emphysema, sight and hearing impairment, cancer and congenital anomalies are all roughly fifty percent higher than the level for suburbanites. Behavioral, neurological and mental disorders are about double.

Two-thirds of the 60,000 rat bites in the United States are suffered by that one-tenth of the nation housed in the ghettos of the inner-city.

In the city, the rate for most kinds of cancer is rising twice as fast as it is in the suburbs. For the urban poor it is rising faster yet, and for non-whites it is rising twice as fast as for whites. And for cancer, there is no such thing as adaptation. There is only illness and often death.

But as sprawl continues, environmental injury and insult come with it. The flight to the suburbs is binding innercity and suburban people together in ways that the suburban escapees did not anticipate. The air, water, and noise may be most lethal downtown, but increasingly the metropolitan environment is one continuous airshed, watershed and noise basin.

It's time to recognize that there is no place to hide. It's time for all urban residents, inner-city and suburban, to acknowledge that they share a common destiny. And it's time for the environmental movement to forge a new urban vision and make a sustained commitment to create a healthy urban environment.

In my estimation, to achieve our urban environmental vision we must:

- Give top priority to the inner-city.
- Eliminate environmental health hazards.
- Clean up air and water and develop resource recovery.
- Increase citizen participation.
- Conserve energy.
- Reach out to urban people in their neighborhoods.

- Create environmentally useful jobs.
- Form a national coalition committed equally to the enhancement of the urban environment, and to urban investment and employment.

- Develop recreation.
- Promote regional solutions.

In short, the talents and energies of environmentalism must be mobilized to help cities to once again become the magnet and the stage for all that is best about being human.

On March 27 of this year, President Carter submitted to the American people and to the Congress proposals for a comprehensive national urban policy. "This policy," said the President, and I quote, "will build a New Partnership involving all levels of government, the private sector, and neighborhood and voluntary organizations in a major effort to make America's cities better places in which to live and to work."

In developing the new partnership, President Carter did not want to repeat the mistakes of the past. Instead the entire Federal Government took a year-long inventory of the Federal policies that influenced American cities and found a substantial number of programs that needed to be redirected.

EPA's wastewater treatment facilities grant program has unquestionably con-

tributed to the underwriting of suburban sprawl in some metropolitan areas. That's one past mistake that EPA will be turning around in the years ahead.

In addition to correcting yesterday's errors, there's a second facet to the Administration's urban policy that should promote its success. The new partnership has an inventive touch, which reminds me of a story about Thomas Edison.

Mr. Edison had a very beautiful summer residence in which he took great pride. One day he was showing his guests about, pointing out all the various labor-saving devices on the premises. Turning back toward the house it was necessary to pass through a turnstile which led onto the main path. The guests soon found out that it took considerable force to get through the device.

"Mr. Edison," asked one of his guests, "How is it that with all these wonderful modern things around, you still maintain a heavy turnstile?"

Said Mr. Edison, his eyes lighting up with laughter, "Well, you see, everyone who pushes the turnstile around pumps eight gallons of water into the tank on the roof."

Jimmy Carter knows that the Federal Government alone can't do the job. That's why the Administration's urban policy calls for the building of a new partnership among all levels of government, the private sector and neighborhood and voluntary organizations. I think we'll only have ourselves to blame if we don't push the turnstile that will make urban environmentalism a major contributor to the success of the new partnership.

One of the critical challenges of the new partnership is to reach not just the well-informed middle-class (who are already involved), not just the public interest groups (who are already committed) and not just the municipal-industrial complex (who either have large-scale incentives or sanction of the law to motivate them)—but the people who live in inner-cities.

As a former psychiatric social worker and administrator of a clinic for the urban poor, I know first-hand that urban people desperately need to gain control over their destiny. They have had enough of other people planning their lives for them.

Inner-city residents are the first to suffer the unintended consequences of technology. They are the first to get sick and die from environmental health effects because their physical and social surroundings are harmed and destroyed.

We need not depend upon technological tragedy to inform us when everyday, citizens are assessing their technologies with their eyes ("It's ugly"), with their ears ("It's too noisy"), with their noses ("It stinks"), and above all, with their commonsense gut feelings and intuition ("Somehow this just doesn't make sense").

A critical test of our joint ability to build this new partnership will be the success of the three-day conference which the National Urban League, The Sierra Club and the Urban Environment Conference will hold this coming January. This National Conference will be funded jointly by EPA, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Labor.

We consider it vital that this Conference further define the vision of urban environmentalism and develop the national and regional coalitions that will begin the task of translating vision into reality.

All major urban areas in the continental United States are in violation of one or more of the national ambient air quality standards. All states with these non-attainment areas must submit acceptable cleanup plans to EPA by January 1979.

This past February, EPA made a joint grant to the Sierra Club, Friends of the

Earth, the National Clean Air Coalition and the American Lung Association to aid cities in meeting the requirements of the new Clean Air Act Amendments. During 1978, 50 one-day workshops will be conducted in urban areas in all parts of the country.

Working together at these workshops will be health and environmental groups, municipal officials, blue collar workers, labor organizations and women's groups as well as other civic organizations committed to urban, environmental improvement.

With the help of environmentalists across the nation, we are convinced that all 50 states can successfully develop acceptable cleanup plans. However, if such planning fails to achieve a workable consensus, EPA, as required by law, will end up having to impose mandatory sanctions which, in turn, will seriously restrict the flow of Federal funds for wastewater treatment facilities and mass transit. This would hurt our cities' environment. It must not be allowed to happen.

If the President's urban proposal meets the Congressional approval, EPA, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, will provide air quality technical assistance and \$25 million for planning grants during the next fiscal year to help cities work out solutions to the double-edged problem of achieving both clean air and economic growth.

To achieve these ends, EPA will develop regulations that will permit localities to "bank" reductions in air pollution and to transfer these reductions so as to accommodate a margin of new growth. In effect, this "banking" policy adds flexibility to the emissions offset policy, which EPA pioneered and Congress made law.

On April 25th, EPA proposed a number of regulations to reduce sprawl by preventing the creation of unneeded excess wastewater treatment capacity. One regulation will require that population projections for all communities in a given state, when added together, not exceed the projections of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce for that state by more than five percent. This regulation will insure that those wastewater treatment facilities that are built meet only reasonable growth needs.

For the same reason, another of EPA's proposed regulations requires that, barring special circumstances, the design period for interceptor sewers be twenty years. Finally, in order to protect environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, flood plains, and prime agricultural lands, EPA will not fund collection systems which otherwise would encourage new growth on those areas.

However, EPA's success in discouraging wasteful sprawl is going to be very much conditioned by the impact of public participation. The Clean Water Act gives state water quality agencies the opportunity to expand their management role for the wastewater treatment construction grant program. As you know, most state legislatures are dominated largely by suburban interests, as that is where the bulk of the population lives. Therefore, if areawide water quality planning and the wastewater treatment facility construction grant program are effectively to discourage wasteful sprawl, it's going to be because urban environmentalism becomes an effective political force within each state.

In most cities, solid waste is the second or third largest item in urban budgets and yearly becomes an ever greater problem as sites for disposal become scarcer. Technology is now available for recovery of energy and materials from waste. President Carter has requested \$15 million from the Congress to help communities make the transition from land disposal to resource recovery.

Businesses, as well as environmental and community groups, have already demonstra-

ted the economic feasibility and energy efficiency of recycling, and a number of states have already taken the lead on beverage container legislation.

In addition to these EPA initiatives for air, water, and solid waste, the President announced government-wide employment and recreational initiatives.

Already in place are new employment training programs for youth and public service under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. There are job opportunities in waste treatment, resource recovery and pest and insect control, as well as in air and water pollution monitoring at the state level.

Environmentalists should set a target of 100,000 environmentally related jobs from this program as their goal for the next year.

In addition, EPA will play a significant part in the overall Federal effort to draw minority businesses into the mainstream of American economic life. Specifically, the Agency will set target goals for the \$4.5 billion a year wastewater treatment facilities construction program to make sure that minority-owned businesses in urban areas receive an equitable share of contracts. We mean business; we will use our funding power to insure that these goals are achieved.

In announcing the new partnership, the President said that urban communities will compete for \$150 million in funds to revive and rebuild parks and recreation facilities. One of the amendments to the Clean Water Act provides that EPA assess the recreational park and open space potential created as a result of the construction of wastewater treatment facilities. Communities can use a portion of the available facility planning money for recreational park and open space planning purposes.

Environmental groups, long used to fighting for wilderness areas, national parks, and other grand designs, such as Gateway East in New York and Gateway West here in the Bay area, need to focus their thinking about recreation on the urban reality and the wishes of inner-city residents.

Greenlining and other modest water reclamation recreation projects may be all that is possible in some cities. But small parks can accomplish miracles in muting sound, lowering air pollution, and providing new recreational opportunities.

The Sierra Club and other environmental groups, in developing projects like the one in Boston Harbor, have already demonstrated the inventiveness of urban environmentalism.

Urban environmentalism will take a giant step forward when metropolitan regions, which usually have the same boundaries as airsheds and watersheds, control simultaneously air pollution, water pollution, and resource recovery from solid waste. To realize the potential inherent in this regional approach, metropolitan areas are going to have to go through the agony of long-range regional planning.

What will make it worthwhile is that urban areas will at long last regain control over their environment and can take those steps necessary to insure that pollution is not allowed to enter the environment. The day of disaster-prevention through catch-up cleanup will be behind us.

Air, water, solid waste, public service environmental employment, recreation, and comprehensive regional planning—these are some of the areas in which environmentalists can use their expertise to make a unique contribution to the rejuvenation of our nation's cities.

I titled this talk, "Cities: An Environmental Wilderness" because I think that, up until now, we have displayed the same attitudes of bewilderment, hopelessness and destructiveness towards our cities as our ancestors did toward the wilderness.

As I was getting ready to leave my office one of my staff told me a story. In the 1960's during the Watts riots, a friend was on an airplane. As the plane approached Los Angeles, the pilot said to the passengers, "Look out the window, folks, and you can see smoke signals from the Great Society."

To me and to many other Americans, Watts, Detroit, Harlem, and Washington, D.C. were much more than smoke signals! They were cries for help!

During the flight from Washington, D.C., across the Nation to San Francisco, I couldn't help but think of all the possibilities of urban environmentalism. But, as I landed, I was aware once again that the crisis of the urban environment is now and that delay will further increase the dangers.

We must not only avert this crisis, but also seize this opportunity to create a healthy and exhilarating urban environment.

I cannot help but believe that together we will make urban environmentalism the leading force of the New Partnership. The President's urban policy provides the tools. The rest is up to us—all of us.

Thank you. ●

FATHER EDWARD FELIX WOJTYCHA
HONORED IN NEW JERSEY SENATE

HON. JOSEPH A. LE FANTE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. LE FANTE. Mr. Speaker, recently Father Edward Felix Wojtycha was honored in the New Jersey Senate with a resolution hailing his accomplishments over the last 40 years. I extend my heartfelt gratitude to Father Wojtycha for enriching the Bayonne community so greatly with his service.

I would like to insert the text of the New Jersey Senate resolution into the RECORD. This resolution outlines Father Wojtycha's many awards and endeavors, and encourages him to continue in the same manner. I too wish him continued success in his work.

Resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward Felix Wojtycha, ordained to the priesthood on June 11, 1938 for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, and a resident of the County of Hudson; and,

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha, served in the parish of Saint Vincent de Paul R.C. Church, Bayonne, New Jersey, as first assistant pastor and administrator from 1938 to 1963, a period of twenty-five years; and

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha during that time brought great acclaim to his church and community by his unselfish service to all ethnic peoples of the City of Bayonne, New Jersey; and

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha bestowed great tribute to the State of New Jersey by involvement with the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, by winning ten national championships, twenty three New Jersey State championships and other Tri-State and Provincial championships in many of the states of our great nation, by his organization qualities in the establishment of the great Big Green Band, the St. Vincent Cadets Drum and Bugle Corps of Bayonne, New Jersey. A real tribute to his untiring efforts on behalf of youth of the City of Bayonne, County of Hudson; and through the music of his Na-

tional Champions graced the inaugural of the Governors of New Jersey and Presidents of the United States of America during this time.

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha was appointed the first pastor of our Lady of Mercy in Jersey City in 1963, the city of his birth; and now the present pastor of Saint Andrew's R.C. Church in the City of Bayonne; and

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha was instrumental in helping over 16 men to ordinations as priests and was active in organizing many youth activities in the both communities of the County of Hudson; Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Sea Scouts, C.Y.O. and High School of Religion; and

Whereas, Reverend Father Edward F. Wojtycha was an integral part of the communities he served in the County on Hudson and has been awarded many awards by our great service organizations; the Red Cross, Rotary Youth Award, Bayonne Junior Chamber of Commerce "Man of the Year"; National Junior Chamber of Commerce "Man of the Year"; Bayonne Kiwanis Youth Award; V.F.W. State Citations; Disabled Veterans award-national citation; V.F.W. national citation, Bayonne Girl Scout Award; Drum Corps Hall of Fame, therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey.

That this Senate hereby congratulates Reverend Father Edward Felix Wojtycha on his fortieth anniversary of ordination to the priesthood and wish him many more years of health and happiness in the vineyard of the Lord, whom he has served so well.

Be it further resolved, that a duly authenticated copy of this resolution, signed by the President of this Senate, and attested by the clerk, be transmitted to Reverend Edward F. Wojtycha. ●

CONSISTENCY AND FACTS IMPERATIVE IN THE ABORTION DISPUTE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, Congress again finds itself in the midst of the medicated abortion funding controversy.

I am personally convinced that abortion on demand is wrong and that Federal funds should not be spent for these activities. However, there are thoughtful and serious people who, as a matter of conscience, disagree with me. Such disagreement is inevitable in a democratic society.

With the same vigor that I oppose abortion on demand, I hold the view that a genuine respect for life must span all issues—abortion, war, the arms race, economics, health care, and the environment. And, I have tried to be consistently "pro-life" in all of my legislative activities.

Whatever one's social or moral views on the abortion issue, two things strike me as imperative: Those on both sides of the question must strive for consistency in dealing with all of the important issues of the day; and, those on both sides of the question must stick to the true, basic facts on the abortion issue.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Michael Novak which appeared in the June 18, 1978, Washington Star:

THE FACTS ON ABORTION GET ABORTED

(By Michael Novak)

Recently, Newsweek put the abortion story on its front cover once again. Abortion is a big story these days. But it is always told in an aborted fashion. Nobody addresses the basic facts in dispute.

Newsweek quotes Mary Clark of the California Abortion Rights Action League, who says without challenge that abortion "is the most basic right a woman has. If a woman can't control her own body, she has no control over the rest of her life." But is it a scientific fact that the aborted is a part of a woman's body?

Biologically, genetically, emotionally, and in every other way, the aborted is a distinct, separate, living organism. The aborted individual does not have its mother's genetic code. If male, the aborted does not even have its mother's sex. The aborted is not "part of a woman's body." It is only being carried by her, and is in her trust.

One may deny—as many do—that the aborted one is a "person," and one may disagree about whether personhood begins at conception or with "quickening," or whenever. But science absolutely forbids calling the aborted one part of a woman's body. Scientifically, that is one thing the aborted is not.

Call the aborted an "unjust aggressor," if you like. But science and medicine know all too clearly that the fetus is not just tissue. It was gynecologists, after all, who in the 19th Century worked so hard to put abortion laws on the books. For science was just then unlocking the secrets of human reproduction. The embryo—they saw then, and modern sophistication recognizes in far sharper detail—is a distinctly individualized organism, with feelings and reactions of its own.

Many good citizens have vast sympathies for defenseless seals, whales, sea gulls and louseworts. They have organized to protect these from slaughter. What failure of imagination prevents them from organizing to protect their own kind?

Is it racism, since the victims are disproportionately black, very young, and on welfare? Is it money, since abortion is cheaper than welfare?

Actually, the issue of abortion is more poignant because it has become entangled with the ideal of a woman's own "reproductive freedom." In reproduction, males and females are not equal. The biological responsibilities which flow from sexual commerce weigh differently upon females.

Some see the right to abortion as the only way to regain mastery over their own life, in case of an unwanted pregnancy. Men do not share this risk in the same way. Abortion is viewed by some as "the equalizer."

But at whose expense? The right of a woman to rid herself of an unwanted pregnancy clashes with the right of the conceived individual to be born and to have a life of his or her own. A movement for "liberation" which depends on the denial of another's right to life, and indeed upon another's death, has forfeited its moral purity.

That is why Clare Booth Luce and many other ardent champions of women's rights have protested against the portion of the women's movement which grounds itself in a systematic practice of death for others.

Suppose that seals, whales, sea gulls and louseworts were subjected to the specific, exact means of death employed upon aborted humans: painful saline solutions, dismemberment, destruction. Sensitive people would find it hard to approve of such public slaughter.

One recognizes, of course, that ugly and even evil things must sometimes happen. Sometimes humans have to make choices between two evils, trying to discern and to embrace the lesser evil. One recognizes, as

well, that in any historical human society, short of utopia, abortions will sometimes occur. One recognizes, especially, that in an age of enormous preoccupation with sexual adventurism, with no social restraints upon intercourse, the numbers of those who want sexual exercise but do not wish pregnancies will be unusually high. In such a time, the market for abortions will be very large, indeed. Abortion will become big business, a source of fabulous profits.

Somehow, all these conflicting social demands must find a point of compromise. Those who are absolute about a woman's choice, and those who are absolute about a conceived child's right to life, will find compromise difficult, indeed repugnant. Such morally serious persons provide an important social witness. Both must be listened to.

But a society that chooses life, that shows reverence for birds and plants and other living things, will have to find a way to cut back the slaughter of more than a million individual human organisms every year, more than 3,000 every day. ●

LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARIES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House two solemn Lithuanian anniversaries that occur in June. June 15, 1940, marks the Soviet invasion and occupation of the independent Lithuanian Republic. This second anniversary represents a series of events that took place between June 14 and 20, 1941. This period of massive terror and deportation was an inevitable result of the first incident.

Lithuania's roots as a nation date back to well into the 13th century when Lithuania first emerged as a unified state. During the next century, Lithuania evolved into a flourishing medieval dominion and concerned itself with expansion eastward and southward. During most of her history, until the 18th century when Lithuania was partitioned between Russia and her German neighbors, she existed as a Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth. It was not until the end of World War I that Lithuania gained her independence. But this lasted only until 1940, when the Russians occupied the small country and incorporated her into the U.S.S.R. Lithuania has been held in Soviet bondage ever since.

One year after the Russian takeover the Soviets unleashed mass terror that resulted in the deportation of 35,000 Lithuanian men, women, and children to the Gulag Archipelago, and cost 5,000 lives. This was only the first in a series of mass deportations of people who were considered "politically unreliable" to Siberia. By 1952, the toll struck a staggering mark of some 400,000 people. Most of them perished when faced with disease, arctic cold, and starvation—among other inhuman conditions that were typical of the Siberian slave labor camps.

Although the Stalin-type mass deportations have been discontinued, Lithuanians who even attempt to exercise their basic human rights of free speech and thought which are guaranteed to them in the Soviet Constitution, end up in Soviet prisons. Thirty-eight years after the occupation of Lithuania, the totalitarian regime has undergone no basic changes. Thirty-eight years after the occupation, the Lithuanian people against overwhelming odds, have maintained a strong determination to regain their freedom and independence. ●

PREGNANCY DISABILITY

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and a cosponsor of H.R. 6075, the pregnancy disability bill, I would like to share with my colleagues a paper which I believe presents solid arguments in favor of this legislation.

Earlier this year, Ms. Ruth Weyland—who was the attorney involved in the General Electric against Gilbert case—presented testimony to the Michigan State Senate Judiciary Committee on the State's version of this bill. Ms. Weyland presents clear and concise information on this issue which, I believe, will provide a greater understanding of pregnancy disability.

Following is Ms. Weyland's testimony. I hope my colleagues will consider these arguments carefully.

I am co-chair of the Campaign to End Discrimination Against Pregnant Workers, which is a temporary organization of representatives from more than 200 organizations which support national legislation to amend Title VII of the federal Civil Rights Act to prohibit discrimination in employment because of pregnancy. A partial list of organizations supporting the campaign is attached hereto. The American Bar Association just last week voted its support of this federal legislation. I am also the attorney who lost the case of *General Electric Co. v. Gilbert*, 429 U.S. 125 (1976) in the Supreme Court of the United States. This is the case which held that discrimination because of pregnancy is sex discrimination because of sex. H.B. 5257 would make clear that in Michigan for all employment purposes, discrimination because of pregnancy is discrimination because of sex.

H.B. 5257, if enacted, will impose no new taxes. It will create no new administrative agency. It imposes no across-the-board additional cost on business. For employers who have no fringe benefit plans and no sick leave plans, the bill will impose no costs whatever. The bill does not require any employer to establish a fringe benefit plan or a sick leave plan if the employer does not have such a plan.

For employers who do have fringe benefit or sick leave plans, the impact of the bill will vary from employer to employer. Thus, employers who have created generous fringe benefit plans to attract and retain the highest caliber of employees will be required to be equally as generous to their female employees who are disabled by pregnancy, while smaller, less affluent, companies are required

to provide the same modest benefits for female employees as are provided for male employees.

This means that for employers who already provide paid sick leave or disability and health insurance benefits for pregnancy related disabilities on the same basis as for other non-work related disabilities, the bill will impose no additional costs. There are such employers in Michigan. The International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO-CLC, has collective bargaining agreements with some 15 such Michigan employers.

For employers such as AT&T, which is one of the largest, if not the largest, employers of women in the State of Michigan which already provides the same fringe benefits for complications of pregnancy, hospital and medical insurance as for any other disability as well as disability benefits for 6 weeks for absences due to normal pregnancies, there would be no substantial additional cost—only benefits for women disabled more than 6 weeks by a normal pregnancy, which rarely occurs—almost by definition disability of more than 6 weeks connotes a complication and AT&T pays full benefits, sickness and accident as well as hospital medical for all complications.

For the auto companies, GM, Chrysler and Ford which already provide 6 weeks of disability benefits, as well as full hospital and medical coverage, the only additional cost would arise from disability benefits for absences due to complications or for individuals disabled more than 6 weeks by a normal pregnancy, which is unusual unless the women is engaged in particularly strenuous heavy work. The medical profession fix complications as usually occurring in less than 5% of all pregnancies.

To a large extent, the effect of the bill will be gradual because the employers with disability and health plans have been primarily in industries which historically have employed very few women. These companies are now beginning to employ women. The effect of H.R. 5257 will largely be felt only as these companies expand their work force.

Nor is the bill one which imposes costs without countervailing benefits to employers. Companies which have placed disabilities from pregnancy on the same basis as other disabilities, including payment of disability benefits, have found that the return rate of women after childbirth improved markedly. Prentice Hall, in a survey of 1,000 companies, got reports of some employers experiencing a 100% return rate. Xerox, which pays full salary for up to 5 months, with a smaller percentage of salary for periods after the first 5 months, after placing pregnancy disability benefits on the same basis as other disabilities for all employees reported return rates increasing from 46% in 1973, to 59% in 1974, to 69% in 1975, to 73% in 1976. Two other companies following the same policies are IBM, with a return rate of 74% and Polaroid with a return rate of 80%. All of these figures were supplied by the companies involved and placed in the record of the hearings in the United States Senate (Hearings on S. 995, 95th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 531, 536, 545 or in the Hearing on H.R. 6075, 95th Cong., 1st Sess., Pt. 1, pp. 195-197; Pt. 2, p. 165).

Training new employees always involves some expense, and is sometimes quite expensive. I remember an airline wage arbitration where TWA claimed it cost \$850 to train each new stewardess. With inflation, the figure today would be much higher.

COSTS LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF A CENT FOR DOLLAR OF WAGES

The United States Departments of Labor and Commerce prepared cost studies for the United States Senate and House hearings which show conclusively that the increase costs are but a fraction of a cent of each

dollar of labor cost. Their cost study states that "temporary disability insurance contributions represent only 1.4% of the wage package for covered workers in private industry and H.R. 6075 will increase that package only to 1.5%" (Hearings, S. 995, pp. 559-560). In other words, the increase would not exceed one-tenth of a cent per dollar.

The accompanying tables prepared by the Department of Labor and Department of Commerce show that whether the average period of disability is 6 weeks, 7.5 weeks or 9 weeks, the increased cost is still less than 1/10 of a cent out of each dollar of labor costs. Thus, see the following tables (Hearings on S. 995, pp. 573-574).

TABLE 8

Additional cost of extending temporary disability insurance benefits for pregnancy. (For average periods of 6.0, 7.5 and 9.0 weeks) As a percent of estimated payroll.

Weeks of Benefits	Excluding Administrative Cost [In percent]	Including Administrative Cost [In percent]
6.0	0.027	0.033
7.5	0.044	0.072
9.0	0.060	0.072

TABLE 9

Additional costs as a percentage of total TDI Contribution Required³

Weeks of Benefits	Excluding Administrative Cost [In percent]	Including Admin. Costs [In percent]
6.0	1.9	2.2
7.5	2.9	3.5
9.0	4.0	4.7

³ The percentages reflected in this table represent the additional costs (Table 6) divided by the sum of total contributions (Table 9) plus the additional costs (Table 6).

The figures of the Labor-Commerce report as to the percentage of each dollar of wages which goes to disability insurance, 1.4%, without coverage for pregnancy, is higher than the figures by the Chamber of Commerce in their latest annual report for 1975 which showed 1.2% for payments for time not worked, paid sick leave. See attached Chamber of Commerce, Employee Benefits 1975.

When we are talking about increasing costs of disability benefits, 2, 3, or 4% and what we are increasing costs only a cent or a cent and a half, the amount of the increase is under a tenth of a cent.

Figures based on the actual experience of various companies supplied by the companies themselves during the Senate and House hearings showed the following rate of increase when they covered pregnancy disabilities on the same basis as other disabilities: Cummins Engine, Inc., Columbus, Indiana, 2.7% increase (Hearings, S. 995, p. 9). Cummins began covering pregnancy disabilities fully in 1976. Hourly workers receive a flat \$100 a week for up to 52 weeks; salaried, their full salary for the first 3 months of disability, 75% the next 3 and 60% thereafter. During 1976, its bill for maternity related disabilities was \$36,039 as compared to a total of \$1,300,000 disability benefits for hourly employees, a 2.7% increase cost due to the pregnancy coverage.

Polaroid Corporation, with 11,000 employees of whom 3,300 are women, paid out over \$5 million in short term disability benefits, of which \$130,000 was for pregnant related disabilities, a 2% increase. (Hearings, S. 995, pp. 544-545). Polaroid paid full salary for up to one year for all employees with more than a year of seniority and 65 days for those with less than a year of seniority.

Careful studies of cost presented to the Senate and House committees by the AFL-CIO placed the cost increase as even less than that computed by the Department of Labor. The AFL-CIO did not offer a figure as to the percentage increase in disability benefit costs but in terms of increase in hourly wage costs which showed the increase would be between .004¢ and .01¢ (Hearings Senate, p. 202). If this increase was distributed evenly among all workers, it would amount to \$1.50 a year per worker.

Murray W. Latimer, formerly chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board and now a practicing actuary in Washington, D.C., presented a detailed analysis of costs and came up with a figure of a 3.75% increase in the costs of disability benefits (Hearings, S. 995, p. 507).

During the hearings before the committees of the U.S. Senate and House, none of the opponents of the bill presented any computation in terms of the percentage of increase in costs, although the insurance industry offered as estimate an increase of 5.9% (Hearings, Senate, p. 431). When it is understood that we are talking about increases in an item that costs only 1.2 to 1.4 cents out of a dollar, even a 5.9% increase is less than a tenth of a cent per dollar increase.

The State of Hawaii in 1973 passed a law requiring all employers in the state to pay disability benefits of 60% of wages for up to a maximum of 26 weeks. The insurance rates in effect in 1973 have dropped drastically. For instance, Pacific Insurance dropped its rate of \$2.43 per woman in 1973 to 67¢ (Hearings, Senate, p. 380). Letters from insurance companies stating that they overestimated rates are printed in the Senate hearings (pp. 354-356).

None of the six insurance companies which write more than 80% of the insurance in Hawaii found it necessary to raise rates because of the inclusion of pregnancy (Hearings, Senate, pp. 350-357). Average weeks of disability for females with pregnancy disability have dropped and in 1975 averaged 4.4 weeks as compared with 5.1 weeks for men (Hearings, Senate p. 381).

With respect to rates charged by insurance companies, it appeared during the Senate and House Hearings that the disability insurance tabulars for coverage of pregnancy disabilities had not been revised since 1948 when the birth rate was high due to the baby boom following World War II. The House Hearings on HR. 6075, 95th Cong., 1st Session, (Pt. 1, pp. 229-249) printed excerpts from proceedings of the Society of Actuaries for 1975 commenting on this fact and pointing out that experience was running at 22% to 40% of the expected cost for disability insurance covering pregnancy while all other disability costs were running 100% of tabulars or higher. Hearings before the Senate (pp. 243, 524) and House (Pt. 1, p. 207) showed many employers in 1973-74 found it cheaper to "self insure" pregnancy disability benefits rather than buy insurance at the high rates charged by some companies. Recently, employers seem to be having no difficulty obtaining reasonable rates.

HB 5257 would require that policies which cover medical expenses, both hospital and physician, for employees be available to female employees and cover all their expenses attendant upon pregnancy, childbirth and related medical conditions on the same terms as other medical expenses and without any extra charge to the female employee. The health insurance industry has often bragged as to its coverage of delivery expenses for the majority of babies born in the United States. Charges filed with EEOC showed widespread discrimination because of pregnancy in policies, sometimes by an additional deductible, other times by limitation in schedule amounts payable. There are no credible studies as to the extent of the exclusions. We have furnished this Committee with the

survey of Hospital and Physician Cost for Pregnancy and Delivery—Present Coverage by Major Health and Insurance Plans.

The cost entailed by H.B. 5257 will be less than 3.4% of the cost of medical insurance because that would be the cost of adding maternity if it was not covered at all (Hearings, S. 995, p. 508). What portion of that 3.4% will be required by this bill is unknown because we do not know to what extent existing plans approach full coverage. The survey shows that a third of major firms meet full coverage, and a third make some approximation at full coverage.

But, a 3.4% increase in costs of medical insurance is still in the fraction of a cent area in terms of the labor dollar.●

REACTORS: USEFUL FOR DECADES, RADIOACTIVE FOR CENTURIES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been deeply concerned with the disposal of nuclear wastes from reactors. An article in last Saturday's New York Times again drew my attention to perhaps the most perplexing form of nuclear waste, the obsolete nuclear reactor.

A nuclear reactor has a useful life of 20 to 40 years, after which it is either too run down to operate or so obsolete that it is uneconomical. However, having been operated for decades, the reactor is highly radioactive, and it will remain so for thousands of years. The technology to dismantle a radioactive reactor simply does not exist. Until such technology is developed—if it ever is developed—those reactors must be guarded and structurally maintained, because they are prime targets for terrorist attacks and tremendous sources of unchecked radiation in the event of natural disaster.

This is one of the hidden costs of nuclear power. An inactive reactor, of which we will have over 100 by the year 2000, must be kept secure. It must be kept secure not just for our lifetime, or our children's, or even our grandchildren's, but for thousands of years. Inactive nuclear reactors are a legacy that might well prove catastrophic for our descendants. It is not right to leave a problem of this gravity to future generations. We have no business reaping the benefits of nuclear energy ourselves and leaving the costs for our grandchildren. We should seriously rethink our construction of nuclear powerplants until we have completely developed the technology to safely disassemble them.

I think that my colleagues would find the New York Times article of June 17 interesting, informative, and a little frightening. I urge you to find the time to read it. The text of the article follows:

A-PLANT BUILDER TURNS TO DISMANTLING
OLD ONES

(By Jonathan Kandell)

MARCOULE, FRANCE.—For the last 20 years, André Crégut has built most of the important nuclear power plants in France, including the controversial Phoenix breeder reac-

tor that rises amid the vineyards and medieval villages here on the bank of the Rhone River.

But Mr. Crégut, a robust 50-year-old engineer, has not decided to spend the rest of his active years figuring out how to dismantle the nuclear plants he has erected. This is not a case of a conscience-stricken scientist converted to environmentalism. Quite the contrary. Mr. Crégut is as convinced as ever that nuclear power plants will continue to grow as an essential source of energy for the foreseeable future.

LIFETIME IS 20 TO 40 YEARS

But nobody has yet been able to dismantle a commercial atomic reactor. With dozens of nuclear plants reaching obsolescence throughout the world, scientists and governments have begun facing up to the troubling problems of ridding the landscape of these dangerously radioactive structures, and estimates for the clean-up operations are running into the billions of dollars.

Reactors usually have a lifetime of 20 to 40 years. Like any other machine, they may wear out from use, suffer irreparable damage from accidents, undergo repeated breakdowns that become too expensive to repair, or simply be rendered obsolete by new technological breakthroughs.

Already 20 nuclear power plants have been closed in the Western industrialized world—15 in the United States and 5 in Western Europe, including 2 in France. By the year 2000, there will be more than 100 inactive atomic plants. In addition, there are hundreds of smaller nuclear installations—research accelerators, fuel enrichment and reprocessing plants, navy ship reactors, nuclear medicine facilities—that have ceased to operate.

All of them will remain radioactive, for hundreds or even thousands of years. In many cases, these closed nuclear installations pose a greater threat than when they were in use. Their security systems—the antiradiation shields, alarms, ventilation, and detection devices—have been largely removed. Even if they are guarded perpetually by security personnel, they are bound to deteriorate and eventually leak radioactivity.

"Even if we entombed these plants, there is no way to be certain that after 500 or 600 years the protective casing will be physically maintained or guarded," said Mr. Crégut, who heads the French Government's program to deal with obsolete nuclear installations. "Do we have the moral right to leave these plants in place knowing that it will take hundreds, perhaps thousands of years before they cease to be dangerously radioactive?"

This question is being asked by other governments as well. Last year, in a report to Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States criticized nuclear agencies and private industry for ignoring the "problem of protecting the public from the hazards of radiation lingering at nuclear facilities which are no longer operating."

Last month, the European Economic Community proposed a five-year research program on the problems involved in dismantling nuclear reactors. And the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna has been calling attention to the hazard at least since 1975.

In France, it was Mr. Crégut who first proposed to the Government in 1974 that it start a program to deal with obsolete atomic plants. He had just completed directing the construction of the Phoenix breeder, a type of reactor that is the focus of a controversy between West European governments and President Carter, who opposes it because it uses and produces plutonium, which can be used for weapons.

"My boss congratulated me for handling the construction of Phoenix so well," said Mr. Crégut. "I told him that I hoped he would congratulate me again when I figured out how to take it apart safely."

SHELVES OF DATA ON DISMANTLING

Mr. Crégut then set about amassing studies of the Phoenix plant during the next four years. The fruit of his labors is in a room next to his office that has aisles of shelves from floor to ceiling and that he hopes includes the data necessary to dismantle the breeder reactor.

Mr. Crégut's plan follows roughly the lines proposed by other experts—mothballing, entombment and complete dismantlement. In the United States, nuclear plant owners are given an option of any one of these methods to deal with their obsolete installations. Mr. Crégut does not believe that the hazard ends until complete dismantlement takes place.

In mothballing, the reactor is welded shut with steel and the facility is placed under permanent guard. This has been done at the Marcoule GI plant, a military reactor that produced plutonium for French nuclear weapons until it was shut down 10 years ago. But Marcoule GI has developed cracks, leaks radiation and, according to Mr. Crégut, will have to be dismantled eventually.

Entombment involves encasing the reactor in concrete. But it also requires permanent monitoring and security over centuries.

Dismantling involves the complete removal of the reactor and the rest of the plant, and the restoration of the site for other activity. No one has yet attempted it with a commercial-size nuclear reactor, and even in the few cases involving smaller installations, it has proved a difficult and expensive task.

"I think in this respect France has an advantage over the United States or West Germany," said Mr. Crégut. "Here the Government owns the nuclear plants and has clear responsibility to deal with them when they become obsolete. In the United States and West Germany, a private company can always go bankrupt, and then what happens with its obsolete reactors? How can they be monitored for future generations?"

Nuclear experts in the United States and Western Europe have suggested that new atomic plants be designed with their eventual dismantling in mind. But no one knows yet what this would mean in terms of building material and added costs.

Meanwhile, it will still take years of research on dealing with existing plants before it will be known at what point radiation levels are low enough to permit dismantling. Then the equipment needed to take the plant apart can be designed. It will take additional years to carry out pilot experiments with smaller installations to build a reservoir of experience for use on larger commercial plants.

"I feel we're at the same stage now in our knowledge of dismantlement that we were with Phoenix, say, back in 1958, when it was first conceived," said Mr. Crégut. "Phoenix appeared impossibly difficult to carry out 16 years ago, and now it seems easy. At this point, dismantlement also seems just as difficult. I'll have more confidence when the budget exists to let us do what we want to do."

"By the time I retire, I want to have a clear conscience that everything I built can be taken apart properly," Mr. Crégut said. "I don't want people to think of me like that genius who invented the plastic bottle and never figured out how to get rid of the damned thing."●

EAGLE SCOUT JAMES DAVID KLAMO

HON. ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues

the accomplishments and honors of Eagle Scout James David Klamó of my district.

James, the 15-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. John Klamó, is a lifetime resident of Gary and a student at Andrean High School in Merrillville. He has been involved in Scouting for the past 8 years and is presently a member of Troop 8 of the Calumet Council. After many years of leadership, participation, and dedication to his school and community, James is more than qualified for the award of Eagle Scout which he will receive June 27 at the Izaak Walton League in Merrillville.

I am proud to have this opportunity to recognize James Klamó for his outstanding contributions and services to our community. It is always very rewarding to recognize such talented and deserving young men. It is a pleasure for me to ask my colleagues to join with the communities of northwest Indiana to recognize the accomplishments of Eagle Scout James David Klamó, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Klamó, and to congratulate them upon James receiving scouting's highest honor.●

SOVIET MVD OFFICER GETS 10 MONTHS OF POLICE TRAINING IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, with shock and surprise I have read in the current edition of the weekly news magazine, *The Review of the News*, that the Department of State permitted a Soviet MVD officer to enter this country on a student exchange program which enabled him to receive 10 months of training in several southern California police departments. The MVD or "Soviet National Police" is responsible for operating the slave labor camps of the "Gulag Archipelago," for repressing dissident groups of Soviet citizens who are denied by the Soviet state their basic human rights, and for other aspects of counterintelligence and internal security. Admittance of an MVD officer as a "police science" exchange student is particularly offensive when qualified, highly professional police officers from Free World nations are denied permission to increase their qualifications by taking training in America.

For the information of my colleagues, the article follows:

[From the *Review of the News*, June 21, 1978]

SECURITY

Police and public-safety officers from the anti-Communist countries are no longer trained in the United States on the grounds that the skills they obtain may be used against "dissidents seeking their human rights." That is a pretty phrase often used to describe terrorists seeking to overthrow friendly governments as in Argentina, Nicaragua, Chile, Iran, and South Africa.

Now the *Review of the News* has learned that our government has no such qualms about training men from the Soviet M.V.D.,

the most repressive police apparatus in the world.

WELCOMING SOVIET AGENTS

According to John Barron, author of *KGB: the Ministry of Internal Affairs (M.V.D.) the Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents*, was a forerunner to the K.G.B. and remains a part of the Communist system of internal repression. It has responsibility, among other areas, for the investigation and harassment of dissident groups, for key aspects of counterintelligence, and for running the slave-labor camps. Some people call it the Soviet National Police.

Officers of the M.V.D. are trained and conduct training at institutions including the Sverdlovsk Institute of Law in the eastern foothills of the Ural Mountains. That is important to our story because, some ten months ago, 33-year-old Anatoly Nikolaevich Gusakov, a doctoral candidate at the Sverdlovsk Institute of Law and a captain in the M.V.D., came to the United States as an "exchange student." He was a participant in the Young Faculty Exchange program organized by the International Research and Exchange Board and promptly went to work "researching" the tactics, equipment, methods, and operations of American police departments!

Gusakov brazenly told California policemen with whom he worked that he was a Criminal Investigator in the Soviet National Police and a member of the Soviet Communist Party. Nevertheless, because he was in America under the auspices of the State Department, Gusakov was allowed to carry out his "research."

The host International Research and Exchange Board (I.R.E.X.) was formed ten years ago and operates from a spacious modern suite at 110 East 59th Street in New York City. Created by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, I.R.E.X. has as its prime function the administration of academic exchange programs between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is a small, but very selective, program that in the period 1976-1977 brought 76 Soviet "senior research scholars, graduate students and young faculty" to our shores.

When the *Review of the News* interviewed John P. C. Matthews, Deputy Director of I.R.E.X., we told him that a report recently issued by Senator Edward Kennedy had reiterated facts first made public by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence establishing that "one quarter of the Soviet exchange students coming to the United States in a ten-year period were found to be intelligence officers." Matthews flatly declared: "That is not true; it can't be true. If it had been said, I would have known."

For the information of Mr. Matthews and others, this information can be found in the Judiciary Committee Report on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1977, Page 21, Paragraph 3; and in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Final Report, Book 1, Page 163.

The funds for programs such as the one that brought M.V.D. Captain Anatoly Gusakov to California to gather information on police procedures and activities is provided by a handful of "prestigious" sources that include the U.S. Department of State, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Chase Manhattan International Foundation.

Remarkably circumspect about finances, I.R.E.X. publishes no budgetary figures in its annual reports. Considering that it has a staff of 18 to operate an exchange of approximately 55 Americans and 55 Soviet-bloc citizens, its ample offices and the amount of travel and subsidy provided the program participants, the I.R.E.X. budget must be over \$2.5 million. That so much American money is used to bring Soviet intelligence

officers to this country is odd to say the least. Especially since this prestigious organization arranges the placement of these Soviet agents and provides them with credentials to make their task easier.

According to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, citing an F.B.I. counterintelligence specialist, "Various exchange groups provide additional opportunities for Soviet intelligence gathering within the United States. . . . During the past decade, the FBI identified over 100 intelligence officers among the approximately 400 Soviet students who attended American universities during this period as part of an East-West student exchange program."

Based on the Senate figures, it can be estimated that I.R.E.X. brought some 20 Soviet spies to the United States in the 1976-1977 period. According to I.R.E.X. Deputy Director Daniel C. Matuszcwski, Gusakov openly stated on his application to do "research" in this country that his interests were in the "tactical methods" used by our police; in the collection and analysis of technical police literature; and, in our "patterns of investigation into criminal activity." Can there be much doubt that Anatoly N. Gusakov was "tasked" by the K.G.B. (with which his own organization, the M.V.D., is constantly exchanging personnel) to penetrate our West Coast law enforcement community?

To aid Comrade Gusakov, I.R.E.X. arranged for him to study at the U.C.L.A. Law School with Professor George Fletcher as his faculty advisor and mentor. Dr. Fletcher, an authority on Soviet law, told the Review of the News that Gusakov had made "a very good impression" and that he was more interested in "practical police matters" than in classroom studies. Said Fletcher: "I placed him in a course dealing with the rights of suspects, but he appeared totally uninterested in individual rights; he was really only interested in the techniques of investigations."

Gusakov's quest for information on the techniques of U.S. police investigation and practical police work was facilitated by police science professor Dick Grace of California State College at Los Angeles. Working with Dr. Fletcher, Grace made arrangements for the Comrade Captain to visit and work with the Anaheim, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, and Los Angeles police departments, as well as with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. And, as Gusakov's visit drew to a close, his California police contacts, having become acquainted with the Soviet officer, provided him with introductions to the Las Vegas, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and New York City police departments as a customary courtesy.

We spoke with Chief Tielsch of Santa Monica where Gusakov spent a considerable amount of time. Tielsch confirmed that the Soviet M.V.D. man had "been involved in all facets of the activities of his Department; he had been assigned to the investigative division, the identification bureau, and the detective bureau." The Review of the News learned from Santa Monica police officers that the Soviet M.V.D. Captain had worked with them in police operations and had actually taken part in arresting American citizens.

On May 9, 1978, in Santa Ana, the police cruiser in which Anatoly Gusakov was riding on street patrol was involved in a collision. The Soviet officer received a cut on the head which required hospital treatment, and the Santa Ana Register reported, "Russian Gets Bang Out of Visit to Orange County." When the Review of the News brought this to the attention of Gusakov's faculty advisor, Dr. Fletcher replied, "I thought that he may have been injured making an arrest."

One of the senior police officers who hosted Gusakov said, "I saw nothing very wrong

with him being in my Department; he was a guest of the United States. But he may have been following a secret agenda of which we were not aware."

Very likely. In California, Gusakov was busy asking questions of a number of police officers about U.S. political groups, particularly the Christian Defense League in Orange County and the Jewish Defense League (J.D.L.), which has been involved in political activism against Soviet diplomatic and trade offices. This is especially interesting since a person using the old J.D.L. slogan, "Never again," recently claimed responsibility for the bombing of a New York City Russian-language newspaper. Reports described it as an anti-Communist publication, giving rise to speculation that the attack was a pro-Soviet provocation.

Criminal Investigator Gusakov, or M.V.D. Captain Gusakov, or Comrade Gusakov, or Student Gusakov also asked innumerable questions about police use of computers, police-radio systems, electronic equipment, interrogation procedure, contingency measures for natural disasters or civil disorders, and communication between police departments—every possible area of American police technology and operations. The Communist M.V.D. Captain made himself particularly well-informed on liaison procedures between local, state, and federal law-enforcement agencies, and had access to F.B.I. reports.

Neither State nor I.R.E.X. nor any of the police officers involved now wish to comment on how this could have been allowed. Typically, Professor Dick Grace said: "Well, the State Department arranged for it and approved it; and I have no wish not to cooperate with them." As I.R.E.X. put it: "We never know exactly what the exchange students will do. Why to ask questions would be an infringement of their right to privacy."

Requests for an interview with Anatoly Gusakov were sharply rejected by I.R.E.X. officials who claimed not to know his present location, and then contradicted themselves saying that he was on his way back to the Soviet Union. State Department spokesmen reluctantly provided the information that a "security review" was conducted before Gusakov entered the United States. But, they said, the review showed only that A. N. Gusakov was a graduate student at the Sverdlovsk Institute. One State Department official admitted, "We don't really know if Gusakov is his real name."

Our interviews with members of the California law-enforcement community quickly established that Gusakov had admitted being an officer of the Soviet National Police (M.V.D.). But the State Department spokesman refused to admit any such knowledge declaring: "Even if he is, I don't consider it very awesome."

No State Department official would admit to sanctioning Gusakov's program of police penetration, explaining that the details were arranged by "the college of his choice." And yet Professor Grace, Chief Tielsch, Captain McCarthy, Captain Stebbings, and a dozen other officers who were interviewed all recall being told that Gusakov was their guest with State Department approval.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation declined to comment on the case of Soviet agent Anatoly Gusakov, saying that neither his visit to our country nor his course of studies had F.B.I. approval. "It was a State Department matter." Asked about national security implications, the F.B.I. spokesman readily confirmed the Senate Intelligence Committee Report on the abuse of student exchange programs by the Soviet bloc, but added: "Of course we can make no comment on any investigation in the counterintelligence area." ●

CALM ACTION, NOT COLD WAR RHETORIC, IS WAY TO DEAL WITH THE SOVIETS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, it was with relief that I read in this morning's paper Secretary Vance's moderate, low-key remarks concerning our relations with the Soviet Union. This is indeed a refreshing change from the "cold war" rhetoric of recent weeks, and, we may hope, is evidence of a more mature, balanced approach by the administration with respect to the problems of dealing with the Soviets and Soviet supported activities in Africa and other parts of the world.

Of course, it is important to let the Soviet leadership know that there are limits to the kind of arms buildup and foreign adventurism they can engage in without weakening détente and undermining the prospects of a new SALT Treaty. However, past experience in dealing with the Soviets ought to have taught us by now that they are far more likely to be impressed by our actions and our resolve, communicated by quiet diplomacy and reasonable rhetoric, than by unnecessarily provocative actions and by "hard-line" talk, to which they will simply respond in like manner.

In late May, the New York Times reported that one of the studies prepared for the recent meeting of NATO leaders in Washington concluded that the Soviet Union has accepted parity with the United States in strategic nuclear arms but is still unwilling to accept equality with NATO in conventional and nuclear tactical forces in Europe. Thus, according to the report, the Soviets will continue their military buildup in Europe despite growing economic problems resulting from their continued high level of military spending.

On the other hand, on June 13, the Akron Beacon Journal reported that the Soviet Union has made a proposal for equal ceilings on Eastern and Western troop strength in Europe and a mutual reduction of weapons located there. This is the first major move that the Soviets have made since the beginning of the European force reduction negotiations in 1973. Whether this is just a tactical ploy to blunt the recent efforts to strengthen NATO's defenses or is a serious move to reach agreement remains to be seen. Obviously, it should be seriously explored.

Perhaps the Soviet proposal will turn out to be the constructive response that President Carter said he would look for at the time he decided to delay a decision on producing the neutron warhead. In any event, the Soviet proposal is more likely a response to the administration's actions than to its recent spate of rhetoric. Indeed, we ought to be concerned that continued escalation in the "war of words" does not create a climate in which negotiation of such arms limitation agreements becomes impossible.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on this subject by Mr. Anthony Lewis appeared recently in the Akron Beacon Journal, reprinted from the New York Times. Mr. Lewis says, with respect to recent administration rhetoric:

It is unconvincing to react to Soviet behavior as if one were discovering sin for the first time.

He notes that the Soviets are not likely to be impressed by bluster, which serves to blur what have to be discriminating choices for this country. As he says:

We are right to be worried about Soviet intentions. But we have to understand that some accommodations may help us; notably SALT. In such a situation presidents and their aides must be scrupulous in their rhetoric. They must avoid legitimizing hysteria.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the Anthony Lewis column and the Akron Beacon Journal article for printing immediately following these remarks:

DETENTE RHETORIC ENDANGERS SALT TALKS
(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—"I think there will be less red scare in the coming weeks."

That remark, by an administration official, is an appropriate epitaph for one of the strangest episodes in Jimmy Carter's presidency; the experiment with what could be called the New Toughness in foreign policy.

It developed while I was abroad for a month, so it struck me with particular force when I returned at the end of May: the strident tone of the administration's voice in talking about the Soviet Union and the Communist threat. Now the stridency has abated. The President's speech at Annapolis last week was a conscious and effective effort to restore balance. What remains is for Carter—and the rest of us—to learn something from the episode.

A first point is that it is unconvincing to react to Soviet behavior as if one were discovering sin for the first time. The USSR has been a powerful adversary of ours in the world for a long time, and its standards of humanity have been nasty. To react to such realities as if they were new is to appear ignorant or silly.

The Russians "maintain a vitriolic worldwide propaganda campaign against the United States," Zbigniew Brzezinski said on NBC's Meet the Press. They are carrying out a massive buildup in conventional arms, and they are trying to "encircle and penetrate the Middle East." Yes. And what else is new?

"This pattern of behavior I do not believe is compatible with what was once called the code of detente," Brzezinski said. But the pattern is what we have to expect from the Soviets, and guard against. Detente is not a happy day of brotherhood. It is restrained competition. To pretend otherwise is only to create false expectations among Americans, inevitably followed by disappointment. It is to repeat the folly of Richard Nixon in promising "a structure of peace."

The most peculiar business has been the attempt to make a great East-West point out of the rebel invasion of Zaire's Shaba Province. The Cubans in Angola may or may not have tried to stop the invasion, as they claim. But everyone knows that tribal rivalries in the area are the fundamental issue. Is it our view that the Cubans have the duty to suppress them? And if so, what of our own record?

In the Kissinger era the United States tried to keep the Portuguese in Angola, then covertly sent arms to the losing side in the

struggle for local power. That inept move brought the Cubans in. Since then we have kept Zaire afloat while it supported a continuing guerrilla war against Angola. We have foolishly refused to come to terms with an Angolan government that works easily enough with the Gulf Oil Corp. Who is destabilizing whom?

Of course the United States has to worry about any sudden jump in Communist ambitions in Africa. But the Russians have had ample trouble of their own in Africa, as in the Middle East. Carter's policy has wisely been directed at trying to deal with the underlying African problems, notably white supremacy in Southern Africa. Why suddenly encourage the American people to think it is all a Communist plot?

An even more puzzling question is why the administration should have tried to link Zaire, even by implication, with the strategic arms limitation talks. No serious issue in the world can possibly depend on developments in that post-colonial disaster area. And nothing could be more serious than SALT.

What is so odd is that Jimmy Carter really cares about arms limitation—perhaps more than any other president. He understands that a SALT agreement is urgently important to this country. In recent days he has gone so far as to reject political advice that he should stall over the summer even if the Russians are near agreement, because a treaty could not be taken up by the Senate until after election and would be a political problem in the meantime. Carter has given orders to go ahead if a treaty is in sight.

It was also inconsistent with Carter's instincts that many in Washington see some political motive for the toughness episode—a hope of going up in the polls. I suspect a less-conspiratorial reason, a desire to gain some bargaining leverage with the Russians. But if so, the technique was hopelessly inept.

The Soviets are not likely to be impressed by bluster. More important, such rhetoric as "the code of detente" blurs what have to be discriminating choices for this country. We are right to be worried about Soviet intentions. But we have to understand that some accommodations may help us; notably SALT. In such a situation presidents and their aides must be scrupulous in their rhetoric. They must avoid legitimizing hysteria.

Brzezinski has had the fame and the blame for this episode. Soviet diplomats are saying that it confirms their view of him as "anti-Soviet." I think his fault is a different one. He is a man of enthusiasms, of extremes, with many good ideas but seemingly, sometimes, to lack a center of gravity.

The moral for Carter and his administration is that, in foreign policy, steadiness is all. But there is a warning here for the Russians, too. They may complain of American attempts to "link" such disparate issues as Africa and SALT. But some linkage is a fact in American opinion. If the Soviets proceed to try to imprison Anatoly Shecharansky, for example, I think no president could save a SALT treaty.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, June 13, 1978]

SOVIETS PROPOSE TROOP CUT

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union has made a proposal for placing equal ceilings on Eastern and Western military forces in Europe that Carter administration officials said Monday could be an important breakthrough in the stalled negotiations over troop reductions.

In the proposal, Moscow said for the first time that any accord cutting back on Eastern and Western air and ground units in Central Europe should set equal ceilings on the troops that remain.

Because the Warsaw Pact possesses a numerical edge in troops deployed in Central Europe, Soviet negotiators until now have sought mutual cuts that would maintain the East's advantage.

The Western powers offered a proposal in May which clung to the principle of common ceilings but offered the Soviets greater flexibility in choosing what units it would remove.

In an apparent response to this initiative, Moscow last week agreed to the Western demand that each side be limited to 700,000 ground forces in the region and furthermore suggested that a ceiling of 900,000 be placed on total ground and air manpower.

Administration officials said that in addition to accepting the common ceiling approach, Moscow has agreed to the Western proposal, in the first phase of a troop cut, to withdraw 1,000 American nuclear weapons in Europe in return for a cutback in Soviet tanks.

The Soviet proposal is described by officials as the first major move that Moscow has made in the Vienna talks since they got under way in 1973 and, as such, it is thought to reflect a desire by Moscow to reach agreement.

Meanwhile, Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance announced a complex pledge by the United States not to use nuclear weapons against countries that do not have them.

The pledge was designed to "extend a feeling of security" to countries that renounce atomic weapons and to improve the U.S. posture in the current disarmament session at the United Nations, officials said.

The pledge will have little practical effect on U.S. policy on the use of nuclear weapons, they conceded.

Nevertheless, officials hope the statement will have a positive political input on nations such as India that have not yet signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. ●

ANTITERRORIST BILL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, Judge William Webster, expressed concern over the potential danger that terrorists pose to the United States. According to the New York Times of March 30, Judge Webster remarked:

Experience tells us that when we have epidemics like this around the world, it is very likely to come to the United States.

For many terrorists, the United States is an object of their supreme hatred. It is the leader of the capitalist world, the major financial and military power of advanced industrial society. It is the source, according to several terroristic ideologies, of the ills of modern life. It is not unreasonable to believe that the United States would present a tempting target to the kamikazi terrorist squads that have been roaming the world. No crime is too outrageous for the terrorist; for he is at war with society itself. It is well to realize that we, like Italy and West Germany, could also fall victim to terrorist violence.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any danger that we will fall victim to inordinate fear or alarmist appeals. But I

do fear that we may fall victim to complacency. Judge Webster's remarks are cause for rethinking our approach to internal security.

Modern terrorism is not simply an isolated set of violent attacks, but a more sophisticated, and systematic assault on modern states. Terrorism is now an international phenomenon. Terrorist agents and organizations have received support and encouragement across national boundaries. Aden, Algeria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, and Yemen have provided lodging and training for the death squads who go about the world bombing, killing, and kidnaping various civilian and government personnel in pursuit of their own goals. According to a special report prepared by the Heritage Foundation, "Terrorism in America: The Developing Crisis," the United States is not immune from such penetration:

In addition to our own indigenous terrorists, there is evidence that other terrorists may be migrating to the United States. The presence of Arab terrorists, anti-Castro Cubans, the Mexican radical group LC-23, and perhaps some European terrorists have been reported in the United States. In November 1977, the U.S. Coast Guard began patrolling waters near international airports in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia after Lufthansa airlines received threats of rocket attacks on its planes from groups claiming to represent the Baader Meinhof Gang (Red Army Faction or RAF). In December, several Latin American countries reported that 19 members of the RAF were present in the Western Hemisphere and were planning an "international action plan."

Mr. Speaker, the recent opening of the Palestinian Information Office, being subsidized by the Palestinian Liberation Organization, occasioned my legislative interest in this matter. I realize that a number of my colleagues will object to my proposed legislation on the ground that the PLO is only disseminating information. But my bill will not prevent them from continuing to disseminate information. It will, however, strengthen security measures that the actions of the PLO most assuredly merit.

In Washington, D.C., the PLO is disseminating information. But that is not the only thing that the PLO does. Founded in 1964, the PLO has emerged as an umbrella organization of the world's most notorious terrorist groups: Palestine Liberation Army, the Egyptian-founded Al Fatah, the Syrian-sponsored Al-Saiqua, the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Iraqi-formed Arab Liberation Front.

During the past 10 years, the PLO has been engaged in a whole series of outrageous incidents. On March 11 of this year, the PLO landed a squadron on an Israeli beach and killed 37 civilians. For a decade we have witnessed killings, bombings, and hijackings. According to Mr. Arnold Forster, general counsel of B'nai B'rith:

There have been incidents on six continents in which the PLO and its affiliates killed 1,331 people, injured 2,471 and held 2,755 hostages. These terrorist actions included 308 bombings in 20 countries; 216 at-

tempted bombings in 26 countries; 180 shootings in 11 countries; 11 assassinations in 9 countries; 17 attempted murders in 11 countries and 19 hijackings in 14 countries.

A decade's reality: seven terrorist actions a month; one incident every four days, day in and day out for over the years; nine murders each month; one victim every three days; 20 people maimed each month; 22 human beings held as hostages.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said that terrorism is bred in the depths of despair, among oppressed people who have little or no hope. As a historical fact, that may be the case. But no explanation is identical with a justification. There is and can be no justification for a deliberate war against an unarmed civilian population, against women and children. Those who make war on innocent airline passengers, civilians on a bus, or on a beach, in a city square or public market, should be branded for what they are: cowards and criminals. They can never be compared to true patriots who battle for the welfare of their people. Whatever grievances the Palestinian people have, a resort to terror will not resolve them. Terror only begets more and more terror. Outrages only give birth to more and more outrages. Terror makes an unjust cause beneath contempt, and it profanes the cause of the just.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone be sure that a representative of an organization—the PLO or any other organization—that engages in terrorist activities in other lands will not resort to terrorist or illegal activities here in the United States? Can we be sure that such representatives will not use the resources of a free and open society to recruit and indoctrinate political fanatics, preparing them for supportive violent assaults against the open society itself? The answer, of course, is that we cannot. No group that is undeterred by the simplest sentiments of humanity, that is unsparing of innocents, regardless of age or sex, can be expected to abide by the legal principles of the American polity—except for purely tactical reasons.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Congress is not morally or legally required to admit alien representatives of foreign terrorist organizations, whoever they may be, into the United States. Congress is not morally nor legally required to treat the agents of a terrorist organization as if they were ordinary, conventional representatives of foreign principals, corporations, political parties, partnerships or associations. Prudence alone dictates that we ought to strengthen our security procedures. We owe it to our citizens to insure that representatives of foreign terrorist organizations are not themselves engaging in any illegal activities. It is the very least we can do.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise to seal off—once and for all—the importation of moneys from terrorist organizations or groups into this country, and punish a breach of this inflow of foreign moneys with the most severe and deterring penalties. Consider the possibility that blood money could be spent in financing propaganda for bloodletting. The thought appalls me.

Mr. Speaker, students of politics tell us that the most difficult and recurrent question of politics is the reconciliation of personal liberty and political authority, the rights of the individual and the rights of the state. In drafting this legislation, I have been extremely sensitive to this problem. I sincerely believe that my bill recognizes, reconciles, and encompasses these legitimate claims, and strikes a balance between the liberty of the individual and the constitutional powers of the United States. No American's right to express any idea, or disseminate any information, on behalf of any cause, no matter how distasteful, would be abridged by the passage of this legislation.

I have taken time to assure that the rights of conscience, speech, and expression, as guaranteed under the first amendment, are congruent with the constitutional powers of the Congress to regulate the flow of interstate and foreign commerce and the precedents established by the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Of this much I am sure, we ignore the terrorist danger at our peril. Terrorists are at war with civilization; and it is the obligation of a civilized society to take those necessary precautions that will prevent the conflict from threatening the society in which we live. The great danger to a democratic society is not in taking strong preventative measures, but in the failure to take preventative measures. I fear that if we do not act intelligently and prudently now, some terrorist outrage, sometime in the future, will drive us into a fit of hysteria. Fearing for the safety of society, we may enact truly repressive measures thus undermining the very foundations of our free society.

My legislation will do the following: It will amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and related legislation by excluding admission to the United States of any alien affiliated with a terrorist organization; it will authorize the Attorney General to investigate any person registered as a foreign agent of a terrorist organization, in order to determine whether that person is, or has, engaged in any unlawful acts in connection with that organization; and it will forbid any person registered as a foreign agent from knowingly and willfully receiving funds from any foreign group engaging in acts of terrorism. The bill reads as follows:

H.R. 13184

A bill to provide for the exclusion from the United States of aliens affiliated with terrorist organizations, to require investigations of registered agents of such organizations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)), relating to general classes of aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission, is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (32) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (32) the following new paragraph:

"(33) Any alien who is a member of or affiliated with an organization which the consular officer or the Attorney General has reason to believe is a terrorist organization."

(b) Section 212(d)(3) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(3)), relating to waiver of excursions for certain nonimmigrants, is amended by striking out "(27) and (29)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(27), (29), and (33)" each place it appears.

(c) Section 212(d)(5) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)), relating to parole authority, is amended by inserting "(other than an alien described in subsection (a)(33))" after "any alien".

(d) Section 212(d)(8) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(8)), relating to admission for transit of foreign officials, is amended by striking out "and (29)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(29), and (33)".

Sec. 2. Section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1251(a)), relating to general classes of deportable aliens, is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (17);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (18) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

"(19) is a member of or affiliated with a terrorist organization."

Sec. 3. Section 102 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1102), relating to applicability of title II to certain nonimmigrants, is amended—

(1) by striking out "paragraph (27)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (27) and (33)";

(2) by striking out "paragraph (27)" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (27) and (33)"; and

(3) by striking out "and (29)" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "(29), and (33)".

Sec. 4. Section 243(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253(h)), relating to withholding of deportation, is amended by inserting "(other than an alien described in section 241(a)(19))" after "The Attorney General is authorized to withhold deportation of any alien".

Sec. 5. Section 244(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254(e)), relating to voluntary departure of aliens under deportation proceedings, is amended by striking out "or (18)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(18), or (19)".

Sec. 6. Section 277 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1327), relating to aiding or assisting any subversive alien entering the United States, is amended by striking out "or (29)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(29), or (33)".

Sec. 7. Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(42) The term 'terrorist organization' means any organization or group that has carried out, states that it has carried out, or attempts or threatens to carry out any of the following: killing, causing serious bodily harm, kidnaping, or violent destruction of property, with the intent to coerce or intimidate the civilian population, any segment thereof, or a government or international organization."

Sec. 8. (a) The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et. seq.), is amended by redesignating sections 9 through 14 as sections 10 through 15, respectively, and by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"SEC. 9. INVESTIGATIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall investigate the activities of any person registered under this Act as an agent of a terrorist organization in order to determine whether such person has engaged in illegal acts in connection with such organization. In the case of a partnership, such investigation shall be conducted with respect to all the members thereof, and in the case of a person other than an individual or a partnership, such investigation shall be conducted with respect to all the officers and directors thereof or persons performing the functions of such officers and directors."

(b) Section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(r) The term 'terrorist organization' means any organization or group that has carried out, states that it has carried out, or attempts or threatens to carry out any of the following: killing, causing serious bodily harm, kidnaping, or violent destruction of property, with the intent to coerce or intimidate the civilian population, any segment thereof, or a government or international organization."

Sec. 9. (a) Any person who is required to register as an agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and who knowingly and willfully receives funds, directly or indirectly, from any foreign group which such person, at the time of such receipt, had reason to know was a terrorist organization, shall be fined \$25,000 or imprisoned for a minimum of ten years, or both.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "terrorist organization" means any organization or group that has carried out, states that it has carried out, or attempts or threatens to carry out any of the following: killing, causing serious bodily harm, kidnaping, or violent destruction of property, with the intent to coerce or intimidate the civilian population, any segment thereof, or a government or international organization.●

ROBIN HOOD PROPOSITION

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD excerpts from a most stimulating and important article, "A Neo Capitalist Manifesto: Free Enterprise Can Finance Our Energy Future," written by Amory B. Lovins and first appearing in the April 14, 1978 issue of *Politicks*. As many Members know, Mr. Lovins shook the energy establishment with his "Energy Strategy: The Road Not Taken" in October of 1976. In that prescient masterpiece, he showed that—theoretically—this Nation could meet its energy demand through energy conservation, renewable technologies and transitional uses of fossil fuels. In the article that I am placing in the RECORD today, he indicates a practical means of bringing that theory to fruition: a capital transfer scheme to allow consumers to utilize solar energy.

Mr. Lovins advocates allowing—even requiring—electric utilities to invest their equity capital in conservation improvements and renewable energy technologies as an alternative to investing in new central-station, thermal generating facilities. Such investment would be effected through low-interest, long-term loans.

The major barriers to widespread commercialization of renewable energy technologies are not technological, or even economic; they are institutional. Our energy institutions are structured in such a way as to preclude rational consideration of nontraditional energy sources and to prevent the implementation of alternative sources even when they are found to be more attractive. Mr. Lovins' thesis directly addresses these problems.

If this Nation is going to get serious about our energy problems, we must seek out the innovative solutions that address the structural nature of those problems. I strongly recommend to my colleagues Amory Lovins' article as such an innovative proposal.

The article follows:

ROBIN HOOD PROPOSITION—A NEO-CAPITALIST MANIFESTO: FREE ENTERPRISE CAN FINANCE OUR ENERGY FUTURE

(By Amory B. Lovins)

The energy future will not be like the energy past. It entails a difficult transition away from reliance on oil and gas. But the nature of the transition depends on how we define the problem we're trying to solve. If we try simply to expand domestic supplies to meet projected total demands we will continue our "hard" energy path—a policy of Strength Through Exhaustion that converts ever scarcer fossil and nuclear fuels to premium forms (fluids and electricity) in ever larger, more complex, more centralized plants.

But the costs of the hard path are intolerably high—in money, risk, even freedom—for it is inevitably centrist, autarchic, vulnerable, technocratic. It produces a word not of free enterprise and pluralistic choice but of subsidies, \$100 billion bail-outs, oligopolies, regulation, nationalization, corporate statism—and perhaps Bertram Gross's "friendly fascism."

Suppose, instead, that we start by asking what tasks we want the energy for, and how we can do each task by supplying a minimum of energy (and other resources) in the way that is most effective for that task. We then find that we need new supplies of heat (58 percent of present United States needs for delivered energy) and liquid fuels (34 percent), not electricity (only 8 percent—far less than our current generating capacity). More power stations of any kind are not a rational response to this problem. They take too long to build, are far too costly, and provide a higher-quality form of energy than we can use economically.

SMOOTH TRANSITION

We can construct a smooth transition, over 50 years, to a virtually complete reliance on renewable energy sources by doing three things, starting now: using far more efficiently the energy we have; relying increasingly on "soft technologies"—diverse renewable sources (such as solar space and process heat, conversion of farm and forestry wastes, wind, and microhydroelectricity) that supply energy at the scale and of the

quality we need—and meanwhile using fossil fuels briefly, cleanly, and sparingly in special "transitional technologies."

Such a "soft energy path" has its own political problems, but they are far more tractable than those of the hard path, and the soft path is also cheaper, quicker, surer, and safer—virtually anywhere in the world—assuming only presently available soft technologies and present life styles and social organization.

INEQUITABLE ACCESS

One important way of financing the transition to soft energy technologies will be outlined here in the broader context of energy prices and equity.

Many people who otherwise could and would use efficiently-improving devices and soft technologies lack the money to do so. At the same time, attempts to build centralized, hard-technology energy-supply systems are driving electric and gas utilities toward bankruptcy because those investments require too much capital and repay it too slowly. A logical approach to both problems is to transfer capital by loans from the second group to the first. This could make energy efficiency and soft technologies equitably available to all while making utilities financially healthy, thus directly benefiting both consumers and utilities. Capital transfers would simultaneously help to increase employment, clean up the environment, decrease inflation and interest rates, rapidly replace oil and gas, strengthen the dollar, and diminish nuclear proliferation.

Some utilities already loan money to consumers for insulating their homes (see *Business Week*, July 18, 1977) because insulation is a cheaper heat source than new power stations or new gas fields. Several states, such as Oregon (H.B. 2157, 1977), are mandating such loans. I too would have utilities—competing with heating-oil distributors, banks, insurance companies, the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, farm loan organizations, and other institutions—loan money to householders (and to others ranked according to how difficult it is for them to get cheap capital now) for fuel-saving investments.

EQUAL ACCESS

But two conditions should be added. First, the utilities should loan the money at the same rate of interest at which they would otherwise loan themselves money to build, say, a new power station. Second, borrowers should repay the loan (through their utility bills) at or below the rate at which the fuel-saving investment is expected to save them money. (The saving could be computed against the energy price the consumer would have paid if the utility had met his or her needs by building a new plant instead.) The first condition is meant to ensure that hard and soft technologies enjoy equal access to capital; the second, that loan repayments do not increase consumers' utility bills.

The utility would only loan the money. It should neither execute nor control the project, either directly or indirectly (for instance by setting equipment standards). The loan would not be added into the utility's rate base (its total investment on which it earns a regulated return): People who choose not to take part in capital transfers should not have to pay for those who do. The utility's profit, at the normally regulated rate, would be from interest on the principal loaned and would equal the return that the utility would otherwise have earned from a new plant. The utility's normal operations would continue—as would needed efforts at utility rate and structure reform.

The loan would have the same legal status and remedies for default as any other. It

could be taken over by a new owner or tenant just like a utility hookup or a mortgage, and could be repaid prematurely without penalty and for an interest credit. Preferably the loan should be unsecured, since many who need it most have no collateral. Disconnection after due notice and hearing might be a last resort in case of brazen default.

CONSUMER BENEFITS

Capital transfers under this system would benefit both consumers and utilities. Consumers could heat their houses more cheaply than if they had not installed heat-saving or solar devices, yet without having to pay extra for the improvement. Second, insulation and solar heat would largely protect consumers from future rate hikes. Third, the fuel-saving investment would make the utility's cash flow more attractive (see below), would make the very costly new plants unnecessary, and would save the utility money and fuels by using present capacity more efficiently; these things all help to avoid the rate hikes in the first place. (Solar heating in an energy-efficient building should have enough storage to need no backup and hence should not make the utility's peak-load problem worse.)

Further, the lower capital requirements of soft versus hard technologies would mean lower interest rates and slower inflation. If utilities had to heat houses by building power plants and synthetic-gas plants to replace oil and gas, they would need so much capital that they would starve other sectors of the economy—leading to a net loss, directly and indirectly, of about 4,000 jobs per thousand-megawatt power station built. In contrast, conservation and soft technologies make more jobs per dollar invested, and leave more dollars available to create jobs elsewhere in the economy.

Utilities, while continuing to supply present lighting and appliance needs and perhaps eventually evolving into a distribution system similar to the telephone company (based largely on dispersed renewable sources), would avoid astronomical new investments to electrify space and water heating. Adding a completely solar heating system to a heat-conserving house requires about half as much capital as building a nuclear and heat-pump system to heat the same house, and one-fourth as much capital as building a nuclear system with resistance heaters (the kind now commonly used). Building solar heating for a whole neighborhood rather than for a single house would roughly double the capital saving. Heat conservation requires approximately one-sixth to one-thirtieth as much investment as a nuclear-powered heat-pump system: in new buildings, it can even reduce total construction costs.

While a power station often takes 10 years to build and then 30 years more to repay its cost, conservation and solar investments take days or weeks to build and pay for themselves in about one to 10 years. If utilities invested in the latter systems rather than in the former, they could turn over their money faster and improve their effective rate of return, which they are sentimental about. Thus the transitional process, which they once saw as a threat, would become an opportunity—a better business to be in than building power stations—and a former enemy of soft technologies co-opted as a merchant banker for them. (Already, utilities in New Jersey and California that fought industrial cogeneration for years are scrambling to finance it because they can find neither money nor sites for conventional power stations that would be worse investments anyway.)

A healthier cash flow would improve utilities bond ratings, reduce the rate of return they need to maintain those ratings, make their equity worth more, avoid dilution of existing stockholders' equity by new issues,

and eliminate the rate hikes now commonly needed to make both debt and equity more attractive. Those rate hikes—a desperate measure by many utilities now at or near their legal limits on interest coverage, and borrowing in short-term paper just to pay dividends—might even be reversed.

Indeed, continuing to tie up huge blocks of capital for long construction periods would make utility cash flows fundamentally unstable. It takes so long to build a plant that by the time it is finished, the interim rate hikes needed to finance its construction (both directly and by keeping debt and equity marketable) may keep people from buying as much electricity as they were expected to buy. Revenues would then be too small to pay the fixed charges on the plant, requiring still higher prices, further reducing demand, and so on into the "spiral of impossibility" familiar from United States railroad finance. Diverting new investment into another business with short lead times and fast pay back—solar and conservation—would remove this instability.

KEEP UTILITIES SOLVENT

Thus capital transfers, which look like a Robin Hood act to consumers, don't hurt utilities. On the contrary, they keep utilities solvent without a bailout, and thus help to keep taxes down. The roughly two-thirds of typical rate hikes now needed to finance new plants would become superfluous. Rates would no longer zoom out of control and could even come down. And poor people would be as able as anyone else to afford insulation and solar heat.

Gus Speth, now a member of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, once proposed a refinement that could in practice help to substitute for pricing fuels at the cost of replacing them in the long run. He suggested that utilities should not get their Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience to build a plant until they prove that they have exhausted the potential for energy efficiency improvements, peak-load management, and soft technologies that (1) would do the same jobs for consumers as the proposed plant, (2) compete with it economically, and (3) could have been financed by transfers of the capital allocated to build the plant. Only if these conditions were met would the plant economically and efficiently meet its customers' energy needs. Further, to encourage realistic cost estimates and careful cost control, the amount the utility could add to its rate base, if it did build the plant, could be limited to the real plant cost it assumed in making the above comparison. This would keep utilities from simply passing on their uncontrolled cost overruns to consumers. It is a simple control mechanism that could make investments more socially responsible without requiring a stifling bureaucracy.

LARGER PATTERN

Capital transfers, whether or not linked with the utility certification test, are part of a larger pattern of efforts to meet people's energy needs fairly and at a reasonable cost. Yet economically efficient ways of allocating energy—or food or water or shelter—are always inequitable because some people start off rich and some poor, and rich people can always buy things that poor people cannot afford. A society worth living in will ensure that even its poorest members can afford the energy (and other things) needed for a decent life. But should we do this by fighting poverty or by subsidizing the innumerable things poor people need but cannot afford?

The latter approach means making energy (for example) artificially cheap—several times cheaper than what it costs us to replace it. But while this puts some energy in reach of the poor, it always means giving cheap energy to rich people. And if we want

to use energy prices as an instrument of distributional equity, why not do the same for food, housing, education, travel, and everything else?

An alternative approach is to price energy (and other things) at levels reflecting actual costs and simultaneously to make poor people less poor by other means. Redistributing wealth or income, though it requires more political nerve, is a more direct, honest, and effective way to achieve social justice than tampering with prices in a futile attempt to make everything seem cheap enough to be afforded by people whom we haven't the compassion—or political will—to help directly.

Energy that looks cheap may actually be very expensive everywhere else in the economy—especially for poor people. Sooner or later, too, the high cost of replacing historically cheap fuels will come home to roost. In fact, we are already paying these costs: newly ordered nuclear electricity will cost, in heat equivalent, about seven times today's OPEC oil price.

Renewable sources now available are much cheaper than nuclear or synthetic-fuel systems for the same jobs—though many cost somewhat more than today's oil and gas.

Thus whether we use soft technologies or not, energy prices will rise because the fuels on which we have long relied are becoming scarcer and harder to get. The question is not whether prices will rise, but how fast, predictably, how controllably, and who will get the money.

TWO INDUCEMENTS

There seem to be only two noncoercive ways to induce investors to save money by building soft technologies in time to replace the oil and gas but before the artificially cheapened average energy prices would make them profitable. The first way is to subsidize soft technologies so they can immediately "compete" with those average prices. But this subsidy to supply perpetuates an illusion of cheap energy (with all the indirect costs that implies) and merely transfers costs from our energy bills to our already swollen taxes.

The second method—which is much better economics—is to charge ourselves realistic prices, reflecting true replacement costs, for those no-longer-cheap fuels we are rapidly burning up. But how can we get our prices right? An across-the-board energy tax would be unfair and ineffective: We want only to raise the price of depletable fuels toward that of their long-term sustainable substitutes, the soft technologies. Further, an abruptly imposed fuel tax could be as disruptive as the sudden 1973-74 rise in OPEC oil price. Any tax should be introduced gradually, perhaps over a decade or more: It need only outpace rises in real wages and interest rates. But people must be able to anticipate future energy prices in today's investment decisions, so the tax should be phased in on an anticipatory schedule, avoiding the unpredictability and possible abruptness of deregulation. Such taxation does not raise prices simply to satisfy some masochistic prejudice that high prices are desirable. Rather, it anticipates and softens the inevitable, encouraging us to substitute soft technologies for oil in good time to minimize long-term energy prices—and ensuring that the money will be used in ways that remain under political control.

SEVERANCE ROYALTY

Many kinds of taxes on depletable fuels might serve this purpose. We now tend to use excise taxes on final fuels, such as gasoline; these require rebates for equity, so they have high administrative costs and lead to a swamp of intricate rules and exceptions. A much simpler approach would be a severance royalty—a uniform Federal tax on all depletable fuels, charged according to their energy content, and levied as they come out

of the ground or into the country. This tax would automatically become embodied in all goods and services according to their total direct and indirect energy content. Administration would be relatively easy because the machinery is already in place—the severance royalty is like a depletion allowance backwards—and because the royalty is simple and universal.

End-use excises hit the poor hardest, because poor people spend the largest fraction of income on direct energy purchases. But a tax imposed on primary fuels would not be significantly redistributive, because the fraction of income that Americans spend directly and indirectly on energy does not vary significantly with income (with a minor exception in the highest income bracket): Higher-income people simply spend a large fraction of their energy budget on indirect energy embodied in goods and services, and the royalty would affect direct and indirect energy purchases equally. Further, revenues from a severance royalty could be rebated promptly to poor people or to especially hard-hit regions or groups, or used to finance efficiency improvements or soft technologies for those who need them most.

Nor would a severance royalty lead to the unbalancing side effects of more selective, special-case fuel taxes, because it applies as much to uranium as to oil, gas, coal, oil shale, etc.: All are depletable fuels. It would not disturb the present cost disadvantage of nuclear power. Rather, it would highlight the economic advantages of soft over hard technologies. Depletable fuel prices need not be made higher than soft-technology energy prices—at which virtually all hard technologies would still be very uncompetitive (to say nothing of their nasty side effects). We would then have achieved indefinitely stable energy prices lower than if we had done nothing. And while we might want some subsidies meanwhile to help conservation and soft technologies compete with the more heavily subsidized hard technologies, it is better economics not to subsidize any energy investments. Conservation and soft technologies can look after themselves on their inherent economic merits; only hard technologies cannot survive true competition.

Capital transfers are not a subsidy; they correct an imperfection in capital markets. But wider tax reform would also be helpful. For example, we should reform the policy that lets businessmen write off fuel as a business expense but forbids them from similarly deducting the capital costs of renewable systems; or reconsider the outmoded practice of taxing labor and subsidizing capital; or encourage durability by making excise taxes on consumer ephemerals (such as cars) inversely proportional to the length of the warranty. And while there is no natural monopoly on solar energy, abuses of market power are just as possible there as in agriculture, minerals, and industry generally, so vigorous antitrust enforcement and control of antisocial gigantism are important parts of a sound energy policy.

HELL WILL FREEZE OVER

Much though we need innumerable social reforms, oil depletion will not wait for them. If we make the resolution of our ideological disputes—capitalism versus socialism, price versus regulation, the future of the oil companies and indeed of our whole society—a prerequisite to addressing the energy problem, hell will freeze over first.

But a soft energy path can cut across these increasingly sterile arguments. If, for example, you are an economic traditionalist, you can build a solar collector because it is cheaper than competing sources; if you are a worker, you can build a solar collector because it gives more and better jobs than power plants; if a conservationist, because it is benign; if a social transformationalist, because it is autonomous. Yet it is still the

same collector, and you need not agree, in advance or afterwards, about why you built it.

If we can use all the kinds of energy husbandry and renewable sources that people agree about, these will be enough. We can then dispense with the hard technologies that people don't agree about, because those will be superfluous.

Our tendency at times to focus the energy debate more and more on less and less reminds me of a woman who, while living in India, once called in a carpenter to fix a window frame. He followed her sketch too literally and botched the job. When she asked why he had not simply used his common sense, he drew himself up and replied with great dignity, "But common sense, Madam, is a gift of God. I have technical knowledge only."

"Technical knowledge only": perhaps a good epitaph for a civilization. But I think a tolerant common sense is alive, and living with the people, and will not be denied. ●

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES OF THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1978, I was privileged to be in attendance at the commencement exercises of the University of Toledo in my district, and to hear the excellent commencement address given by the distinguished Secretary of Energy James R. Schlesinger. My good friend and colleague in the arduous enterprise of forging a comprehensive national energy plan took this most significant occasion to eloquently warn all of us of the problems and the challenges posed by ever-dwindling energy reserves and our increasing dependence on foreign oil. Of particular interest in this stimulating and informative address was the Secretary's stark answer to those who refuse to recognize and act upon the certain drastic consequences in years hence, if we do not immediately get about the business of providing for the future. Dr. Schlesinger's refutation of these "energy optimists" should be required reading for all those concerned with the national energy plan, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to insert the text of his address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY JAMES R. SCHLESINGER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

I am honored to have been invited to be your Commencement speaker. On this occasion, for you both festive and sobering, the first expression should be one of congratulations to all those who today receive their degrees—a reward for past efforts and a symbol of future challenge. Also, heartiest congratulations to the parents of degree recipients, whose financial obligations may or may not be at an end.

On a personal note, I should take the occasion to pay respect to your Congressman and my friend, Lud Ashley, whose persuasiveness was added to the University's in bringing me here today. Congressman Ashley is in the great tradition of Ohio legislators which includes such names as John Sherman and Robert Taft. Lud and I have been together in a foxhole in Washington's energy

war. And together we look forward to victory—sometime before Judgment Day.

As one of Ohio's most faithful sons-in-law, who has spent considerable time in Ohio over the past quarter century, I am delighted to return to Toledo on this special occasion. I must take note of the remarkable growth of the University of Toledo in recent years—which reflects, I believe, the vitality of the City of Toledo as a whole.

Toledo has grown from its early days primarily as an industrial community—a city created and shaped by America's first great economic transformation during the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century.

Within the last decade, however, a cloud has appeared on the horizon which, if unattended, could interfere with industrial development and economic expansion. I refer to the developing energy problems of this nation. Toledo and the rest of Ohio have experienced some of the initial shocks of this budding crisis, which is introducing another period of profound economic change that will determine the future well-being of the country. In the past two years, this state has been sharply buffeted by severe energy shortages—first a natural gas shortage, then a coal strike. Ohio has thus paid a price for the failure of this nation to adopt a comprehensive energy policy. Thus, unutilized gas can be available in Texas, yet, however sorely needed, it cannot be used in Ohio. With such curtailments of gas supply, Ohio industries must shift to oil, adding to the nation's severe balance of payments drain. The rising demand for oil in Ohio is symptomatic of the burgeoning world demand for oil, leading to the serious situation which faces the United States and the world.

The problem is really quite simple: growth in world oil supply—a finite resource—cannot keep pace indefinitely with world oil demand. The world oil production level, currently above 60 million barrels a day, is not likely to increase beyond 75 million barrels a day. In the course of the next decade, we shall reach a practical limit on the world's productive capacity for oil. Sometime in the 1990's conventional production of oil will peak, and begin a steady decline. All governmental and virtually all private forecasts reach essentially these same conclusions. The vast reservoirs of oil created over hundreds of millions of years will have been largely dissipated in little more than a century—roughly in the period from the introduction of the motor car and the conversion of the British Fleet from coal to oil.

In the face of these stark and compelling realities, there are still some "optimists" on energy matters who suggest the energy crisis is not real and will solve itself without vigorous action by the Government and other sectors of society. These observers argue that a temporary oversupply of petroleum in today's world market is a precursor of ample supplies of oil in the long term, that consumption of energy will not increase as fast as the rate of economic growth in the future, that the rate of world economic growth will (happily) remain low and thus restrain the growth of demand for oil, and that the world's supply and production capacity are greater than conventional estimates. The overall impression is thereby left that the energy picture is much improved today over what it was last April when the President presented his National Energy Plan.

But the opposite is regrettably true. In major respects the energy outlook today is even worse than it was a year ago.

The hope that substantial reductions in demand will rescue the world from an energy crisis belies recent history and common sense. The fact that the ratio between energy demand and economic growth has dropped since the 1973-1974 embargo—as industry and other consumers have adjusted to the five-fold increase in prices—is no revelation. These reductions in estimated future growth in demand have been incorporated in de-

mand estimates made by DOE as well as in other forecasts. To expect even lower levels of demand to occur naturally, without further large price increases, is another matter.

The argument of the "energy optimists" proceeds from the assumption that the industrialized countries are helpless in determining long-run economic growth and must accept slower economic growth dictated by relative shortages and higher prices. In effect, the solution to the energy problem would depend on worldwide economic stagnation. I would agree that restraining economic activity and accepting surging energy prices would inevitably bring supply and demand in balance, but at an incalculable cost to the aspirations and well-being of vast numbers of people. Indeed, that concern lies at the heart of the argument for vigorous national policy that can ensure a smooth transition from an era of abundant conventional energy supplies to one of prospective scarcity. It is this goal of a smooth, long-term transition that the President's policy proposals are intended to achieve.

Energy optimists also take a sanguine view of supply prospects. They suggest that OPEC capacity is much larger than actual production and that large finds, on the scale of the Alaska North Slope and the North Sea are realistic possibilities in the near term. In fact, the slight and transitory excess of productive capacity—caused in large part by increased production from the Alaskan North Slope and the North Sea, and by the aftermath of a worldwide recession—will quickly be overtaken by continued increases in world demand. To meet such increases in world demand would require a new Alaskan North Slope every six months or a new North Sea every year and a half. It is highly unlikely that finds of that magnitude will occur—and virtually impossible for such finds to be converted into actual production by the mid-1980's.

Outside the OPEC countries, oil discoveries in recent years have hardly been encouraging. The last substantial United States Oil Discovery was at Prudhoe Bay in 1968. Since 1970, discoveries of new reserves and additions to supply have been considerably less than half of the country's total production of oil. In the lower 48 states, proved reserves of oil are now only 7.5 times greater than annual production. With the exception of large new oil discoveries in Mexico, no other major discoveries have occurred worldwide since the substantial OPEC price increases in 1973-1974. The evidence of the past four years has not been reassuring—small returns and dry holes off the Coast of Florida, in the Gulf of Alaska, and most recently, off the Atlantic Coast.

The question then comes down to the ability—and willingness—of OPEC to continue to meet rising world oil demand. Since there is little additional capacity to expand production outside of Saudi Arabia, the technical capacity and willingness of the Saudis to increase production is of critical significance to the economic well-being of the entire world. Saudi Arabia has come to be regarded as an energy cornucopia. Estimates of future Saudi production, which are pure speculation, have in recent years gone as high as 20 million barrels a day. That is sheer speculation, if not fantasy. We cannot realistically expect Saudi Arabia to be the world's oil panacea. At this juncture it appears that Saudi production level of 12 million barrels a day by 1985 is realistic, that would result in a total OPEC production level of 37-39 million barrels a day by 1985, compared to estimates of around 45 million barrels a day just a year ago.

Even with efforts to conserve by major importing countries other than the United States, there will likely be a gap between worldwide demand and worldwide supply by 1985—A gap that would bridge rapid price increases and reduced output and employment

worldwide. The imbalance would be considerably exacerbated if the Soviet Union and the East European nations become net importers of oil, instead of continuing to export one million barrels of oil a day, as they do today.

Although the world's energy future is extremely serious, it is not the only reason for the United States to take actions to reduce dependence on imported oil. The national security implications of excessive dependence and the balance of payments impacts, coupled with the deterioration of the dollar and the fragility of the world monetary system, provide powerful reasons for a vigorous national energy effort. Many of the "optimists" do not even discuss these adverse effects—or the increased burden of inflation and recession which it is taken for granted the American people will have to bear.

While novel and optimistic estimates of energy supply and demand do add spice to the energy debate, the ultimate question comes down to whether the United States should base its policies—and our national future—on the hope that the prevailing projections might be wrong. With nothing less than the survival of our economic system at stake, the United States cannot drift along, waiting to see whether—or when—the day of reckoning finally comes.

There is nothing inevitable about drastic energy supply/demand imbalances. Serious national peril—can be avoided—if we do what we must do: take advantage of the time available to make adjustments before the day of reckoning.

Once the American people—all of us—fully recognize our potential perils, we have the ability and the resolve to take the actions necessary to avert that future crisis. Indeed, with the energy legislation now pending in Congress as the necessary first step, we shall be well on our way towards accomplishing this goal. For the near term, we can make the necessary adjustments. For the longer term—as the generation represented here today by this graduating class comes to maturity—we shall, through our technical skills, develop permanent, long-term answers to the energy problems. We shall bring forth new and inexhaustible sources of energy supply that will ultimately remove our dependence on fossil fuels.

These are sobering thoughts, but they are hopeful thoughts. They represent your challenge. With dedication and skill, I am confident that you—and your fellow Americans—will surmount this challenge.

Finally, it is incumbent on commencement speakers to offer to the departing graduates some comprehensive philosophy, some eternal verities—to guide them on their way. However, the Duke of Wellington offers the best advice to a speaker on occasions such as this: "Don't quote Latin, say what you have to say, and sit down." It is excellent advice—even, despite this academic setting, this stricture on avoiding Latin. Let me, therefore, simply offer once again my heartfelt congratulations to the degree recipients—for what you have already achieved and for the challenges that you will face in the future.

Good luck and God speed. ●

PROTEST SOVIET ARREST OF H. JAY CRAWFORD

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago on a Moscow street Soviet police suddenly dragged F. Jay Crawford, an

American citizen and Moscow service representative for the International Harvester Co., from his car placing him under arrest and he apparently will be charged with currency violations under article 88 of the Russian Republic Criminal Code.

The arrest and detention of Mr. Crawford, who is a legal resident of Mobile, Ala., should be of concern to all Americans and especially to U.S. businessmen who are doing business with the Soviet Union.

It is incumbent upon those of us in the Congress to join in protesting this storm-trooper-like action by Soviet policemen. Other American businesses attempting to trade with Russia can only wonder whether their representatives will be subjected to such harassment in the future.

According to press reports, Mr. Crawford may be a pawn in the current diplomatic maneuvering between the United States and the Soviet governments. He is, in fact, a hostage in reprisal for the recent arrest in this country of two Soviets who were members of the United Nations secretariat staff on espionage charges.

However, our courts have formally arraigned the espionage suspects, established bail, and set trial dates. The Soviet police are continuing their pretrial investigation of Mr. Crawford and he has not yet been formally charged.

There is little question that we may be entering into a new and dangerous era in our relationship with the Soviet Union. The arrest of Jay Crawford and the manner in which he was taken into custody can only result in a further deterioration of the spirit of détente and the relations between Russia and the United States.

It is important that we speak out and assure the safety of American citizens whether they are tourists or attempting to do business with the Soviet Union. I have today sent a letter of protest to Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington requesting immediate clarification of the intentions of the Russian Government in regard to Jay Crawford. I urge my colleagues in the House to join in this protest.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my letter to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States:

JUNE 21, 1978.

HON. ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I wish to express my deep concern and register a strong protest over the arrest in Moscow of Mr. F. Jay Crawford, an American citizen and official of the International Harvester Company, on June 12, 1978. I respectfully request that this protest be transmitted by you to the leadership of your Government in Moscow.

The arrest of Mr. Crawford and the circumstances surrounding his sudden apprehension can only result in a further deterioration of the spirit of détente and the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

It is inconceivable to me that an American citizen would be dragged from his car by Soviet police on questionable charges of currency violations under Article 88 of the Rus-

sian Republic Criminal Code. Surely your government does not condone storm trooper tactics on foreign nationals.

The treatment of Mr. Crawford and his continued detention without formal charges being lodged will undoubtedly deter other American businessmen in attempts to trade with the Soviet Union. They can only wonder whether they might someday experience similar treatment.

International Harvester, which maintains a large facility in the 4th District of Indiana, long has been a friendly trading partner with the Soviet Union. I am, to say the least, puzzled that an International Harvester employee would be the subject of this strange arrest.

In my opinion, Mr. Crawford is being held as "hostage" in reprisal for the recent arrest in this country of two Soviets who were members of the United Nations Secretariat staff on espionage charges. However, in this instance, the U.S. Courts have formally arraigned the suspects, established bail, and set trial dates.

Mr. Ambassador, I urge that immediate clarification be given of the circumstances regarding Mr. Crawford's arrest. In the interest of the continued goodwill and friendly relations of our two great Nations, I ask that if Soviet criminal code has been violated, he be granted speedy and fair justice. If, on the other hand, he is only a pawn in current diplomatic maneuvering between our governments, I demand that he be promptly freed.

Sincerely,

DAN QUAYLE,
Member of Congress. ●

THE HUMAN COST OF WORLDWIDE COMMUNISM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a curious sort of historical amnesia that afflicts many influential media and political opinion-makers in the United States. Asked to comment on the number of political prisoners in Chile they immediately respond with computer-like accuracy. Asked about the record of worldwide communism in its long and still vigorous war against human rights, these same articulate, informed men and women mumble generalities about "cold war rhetoric" and walk away. Mr. Todd Culbertson of the Richmond News Leader has taken the trouble to set the record straight concerning the record of communism. I hope this detailed and persuasive article will help jog the memories of those whose selective amnesia makes them incapable of remembering or commenting upon Communist atrocities.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "The Human Cost of Worldwide Communism" by Todd Culbertson, from the Richmond News Leader, June 9, 1978:

THE HUMAN COST OF WORLDWIDE COMMUNISM

(By Todd Culbertson)

The recent telecast of "Holocaust" awakened many viewers to the reality of Adolf Hitler's "final solution" for Europe's Jews. Yet while the Free World is committed to preventing a recurrence of Nazi barbarism, it remains relatively unaware of the extent

of the genocide that is practiced whenever Communism gains power.

Here is how Alexander Solzhenitsyn describes one of the reasons for the West's silence in the face of Communist barbarities: "There seems to be little doubt, as many now realize, that what is going on in the USSR [and other Communist countries] is not simply something happening in one country, but is a foreboding of the future of man, and therefore deserving the fullest attention of the Western observers. No, it is not any difficulties of perception that the West is suffering, but a desire not to know, an emotional preference for the pleasant over the unpleasant. Such an attitude is governed by the spirit of Munich. . . ."

Available evidence indicates that perhaps 100 million persons have been destroyed by the Communists; the imperviousness of the Iron and Bamboo curtains prevents a more definitive figure. The Communist system of forced starvation, concentration camps, and slave labor is remarkably similar to that of the Nazis, whose policies claimed approximately 6 million Jewish victims.

Herewith, a partial catalogue of Communism's record of inhumanity:

SOVIET UNION

From its beginnings the Soviet Union has fed on organized terror. Lenin himself spoke glowingly of the "real, nationwide terror, which reinvigorates the country." He added that the "energy and mass nature of the terror must be encouraged."

Historian Robert Conquest calculates that it has cost between 21.5 million and 32.2 million lives to "reinvigorate" the USSR. (The late Senator Thomas Dodd estimated the cost at between 35 million and 45 million lives.) Specific examples of this terror include (1) the trials and executions of children, (2) the government-inspired famine of 1932 that killed 5 million persons, and (3) Stalin's labor camps, which sent 12 million Russians to their deaths.

The goal of Communist terror is to destroy all potential opposition. According to a Ukrainian party official in the mid-1930s, the famine "was a test of our strength and [the peasants'] endurance. It took a famine to show them who is master here. It has cost millions of lives but the collective farm system is here to stay. We have won the war."

The Soviet execution rate may have been reduced since Stalin's Great Terror, but the Gulag continues at full force. The essential nature of Soviet Communism remains unchanged.

EASTERN EUROPE

Communist terrorism in Eastern Europe began with the 1939 Soviet invasion of Poland (at that time the Communists were allied with the Nazis). At Katyn Forest, Soviet troops machinegunned more than 5,000 unarmed Polish prisoners of war.

In 1944 the Communists refused to aid the Warsaw Uprising, which was timed to coincide with the arrival of Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky's First Belorussian Front. But instead of liberating Warsaw he halted his troops and watched as the Germans forced a surrender. Approximately 15,000 Poles died; those who escaped to Rokossovsky's lines were arrested and sent to Siberia.

The Red Army's suppression of the Hungarian Revolt of 1956 caused 15,000 casualties in Budapest alone. Communist troops fired on—among others—nurses, Red Cross workers, and children. More than 200,000 refugees fled to the West.

In "The Bridge at Andau," the definitive history of the Hungarian Revolt, James Michener wrote, "At dawn, on November 4, 1956, Russian Communism showed its true character to the world. With a ferocity and barbarism unmatched in recent history, it moved its brutal tanks against a defenseless population seeking escape from the terrors of Communism, and destroyed it."

In Czechoslovakia the Communists purged Jews, Slovak nationalists, the Catholic clergy, and the middle class. In one six-week period more than 10,000 Czechs were "enrolled" in concentration camps. "Operation Class Warfare" in 1949 caused the burning of many of the country's libraries. Three years after the Communists seized power, 152,000 persons had been executed or sent to slave-labor camps.

Writing about the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, New York Times correspondent Dana Adams Schmidt has noted, "I often felt I had been through this before. It was in Nazi Germany where I was a correspondent for two years. . . . The chief objects of the police persecution carried on by the Nazis, with their race theories, were the Jews. Under the Communists, with their class warfare, the pariah group is the bourgeoisie, who are the chief—although by no means only—objects of police terror."

Other Eastern European countries have suffered similar consequences of Communist domination. In Bulgaria more than 16,000 persons were liquidated in the first months of Communist rule. The Communist takeover in Rumania was accompanied by mass arrests and executions. In Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito ruthlessly eliminated opposition to his Communist dictatorship and suppressed the Serbian and Croatian nationalists.

BALTIC STATES

The decades-long Soviet occupation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania has been telling and grotesque. As many as 1.2 million Lithuanians were liquidated or deported to slave labor camps during the first 15 years of Communist rule. In 1962 the population of Lithuania was less than it was in 1939.

In his autobiography, ballet dancer Valery Panov, who defected from the Soviet Union in 1974, describes how as a child he watched the mass deportations of the Lithuanian middle class: "The convoy returned toward twilight. It made for the railroad station with a cargo of families crushed into each cart and truck. Guarded by soldiers with Tommy guns, the adults already wore a convict look, made even more haggard by their inability to explain their uprooting to their bewildered children. . . .

"All evening packed wagons passed by, people moaning inside them. Even children my own age were weeping. Pregnant women had fainted. I ran home, where my father ordered me to be worthy of myself as a Soviet lad, since 'those people are the bourgeois enemy.'"

RED CHINA

According to Richard Walker, director of the Institute for International Studies at the University of South Carolina, Communism-connected casualties on mainland China may exceed 64 million persons. In just the Political Liquidation Campaigns (1949-1958), 30 million Chinese may have been killed.

Walker notes, "It is worth remembering that at the very moment in June, 1971, when [Western] reporters were commenting on Mao Tse-tung's creation of the new Chinese man (see for example Seymour Topping's dispatches in *The New York Times*), troops of the People's Liberation Army were machinegunning scores of their fellow Chinese who were attempting to escape to Hong Kong from Mao's new paradise.

"Many of the youths drowned in the attempt, and others—the few—who made it told stories which were reported in the Hong Kong press, but were omitted in the euphoria that surrounded the first American direct access to Communist China for journalists and a few specialists in more than two decades."

Walker continues:

"The time is at hand to break away from the kind of double entry moral bookkeeping which has characterized the approach of all too many Western intellectuals to the facts

of rule in mainland China under Mao Tse-tung. The cost in human terms . . . stands as a formidable indictment of a half-century of Communist experience in China.

"There can be no rationalization for the attack upon those qualities that have made the Chinese among the world's most civilized humans. Their civilization has a long memory, and this is a period which will be remembered as a blot on their approach to the human condition."

CAMBODIA

Cambodia is today's most visible example of Communist enormities. According to estimates made a year ago, approximately 1.2 million Cambodians were murdered during the first two years of Communist rule. New estimates indicate that perhaps 2.5 million have died since the Communist takeover in 1975. (If Cambodia's execution rate were applied to the U.S., more than 57 million Americans would have to be killed.)

Life for Cambodians who thus far have avoided execution is little better than death itself. City dwellers have been force-marched to the countryside for slave labor. All persons aged 15 or older must work 16 hours a day; those under 15 work 12 hours. Children who try to rest during work hours are killed. Love is outlawed; marriages are ordered by the government for reproductive purposes only. Thousands of anguished and despairing Cambodians have committed suicide.

The Communist regime is so brutal that one former official who escaped to the West because he could take no more claims that Cambodian authorities have deliberately instigated border battles with Vietnam and Thailand to reduce the number of refugees.

VIETNAM

Under the leadership of the late Ho Chi Minh, North Vietnam was one of the Communist bloc's most ruthless dictatorships. The so-called "Land Reforms" of 1953-1956 sent 500,000 persons to their deaths. The 1956-1959 "People's Tribunals" ordered the execution of another 200,000.

Since the end of the Vietnam War in 1975, the Communists have been exporting their brand of terror to the South. Some 30,000 Vietnamese who worked with Americans were rounded up in one drive; 1 million South Vietnamese have been forcibly shipped to the North; yet another 500,000 languish in concentration camps, which are euphemistically called "Re-education Camps."

Nguyen Cong Hoan, a former member of the Communist government, says that 100,000 persons have been slaughtered and that 1 million more have been forced out of the cities and into the "New Economic Zones"—i.e., into agricultural collectives. Because the conditions are so primitive in the collective, few are expected to live.

LAOS

Laos is so cut off from the West by its overlords that little is known about the extent of Communist terror there. Yet 200,000 Laotians, in a country with fewer than 4 million, have fled.

CUBA

Cuba ranks among the world's most vicious and pervasive police states. Castro's prisons hold more than 20,000 political prisoners. As a percentage of total population, that is the highest concentration of political prisoners to total population of any country anywhere. Moreover, the Cubans are busy exporting Communist oppression to Africa and Latin America.

ANGOLA

During the past several months, Cuban stormtroopers supporting the Communist regime in Angola have murdered more than 70,000 women and children. Cuba also has entered the slave trade: Angolan children between the ages of 10 and 17 are taken from their parents and shipped to Cuba to work in the cane fields.

Felliciana Talanga, a refugee, describes Angola under the Communists: "The troops came in and set fire to our homes, driving us into the forest. Then a helicopter began shooting, killing, and wounding. We have lost everything. . . ." In the words of another refugee: "I was one of a handful of people to survive out of a community of 700. I have five children. They were taken away and killed, and my husband has disappeared."

Thus an incomplete accounting of Communist genocide. Since the Russian Revolution 61 years ago Communism has been responsible for the death of 100 million innocent persons—not including the terrorism inspired by Communists in free countries. The total cost in human suffering and grief is beyond comprehension.

Many who watched "Holocaust" comforted themselves in the belief that Nazi-inspired genocide was a one-time occurrence, something that "won't happen again." That is a delusion. State terror did not end in 1945. It is continuing today in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America—wherever Communism wields power.

It is popular to compare countries in terms of human rights. Indeed, President Carter has asserted that Cambodia is the world's worst violator of them. Yet such pronouncements miss a fundamental point: Communism itself violates every moral precept that has contributed to mankind's progress. Cambodia merely is the latest example of Communism's inherent barbarism. The Free World's abiding failure to depict Communism's true face is willful blindness surely equaling the West's blindness to the Holocaust four decades ago.

The Lithuanian Jewish leader Julius Margolin, who survived seven years in a Communist concentration camp, has provided eloquent testimony to Communist brutality:

"Until the fall of 1939, I had assumed a position of benevolent neutrality toward the USSR. . . . The last seven years have made me a convinced and ardent foe of the Soviet system with all the strength of my heart and all the power of my mind. Everything I have seen there has filled me with horror and disgust which will last until the end of my days.

"I feel that the struggle against this system of slavery, terrorism, and cruelty which prevails there constitutes the primary obligation of every man in this world. Tolerance or support of such an international shame is not permissible for people who are on this side of the Soviet border and who live under normal conditions. . . .

"Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have executed more victims than all the other camps—Hitler's included—together. . . .

"And those who in reply only shrug their shoulders and try to dismiss the issue with vague and meaningless generalities, I consider moral abstainers and accomplices in banditry."●

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH TALKS ABOUT OUR ECONOMY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, John Kenneth Galbraith recently addressed our colleagues at a dinner sponsored by the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future, and he warned that tax cuts and other measures designed to stimulate the economy are only temporary solutions. The text of his presentation follows:

The best way to look at the future is to look at the historical process. For the next ten years, we will see that the central problem is how democratic societies come to grips with the realization of the democratic personality—of people realizing that they can take control of their lives. Other industrial countries are making substantial progress in this area. It is time for us to catch up.

Economics is a way we have of looking at what is happening in our society, but you need to remember that when you are dealing with economics you are dealing in dynamics. In inspection into the nature of economics reveals that it has a rapid rate of change. Economists think they possess static and eternal truths, yet when they were asked what to do about the depression, they didn't have much to say and were of little help.

A golden age of economics were the post-war years . . . the 50's and 60's. Prices were stable, we had high employment, we expanded the economy by reducing interest rates, and public expenditures expanded. It was always pleasant. During the 60's there was a vigorous discussion between Walter Heller and myself. Heller thought that you should reduce taxes to expand the economy and I argued that you should expand expenditures. Both of us knew that President Kennedy would like to hear what both of us had to say. It was a good time to be an economist.

The next period has brought us into a realization of the democratic ethos. More people want to have control over their lives and that means they want to have control over their income. There has come to be a desire to escape from impersonally determined income and prices. Large corporations have control over prices and the individuals in it have control over their income. The upward pressure of income and prices is a new force in the economy. And the inward pressure of income gains strength as time passes. This is the dilemma we are contending with and will be contending with for some years to come.

Today, economists have again gotten out of phase with the times. They think that in a modern economy there can be no shortage of purchasing power and that something will occur to restore equilibrium. But we see an adjustment which is the spiral of unemployment. The older economic ideas offered inappropriate policies for solution . . . such as interest rate hikes, increased taxes, or cuts in the public expenditure. Only after substantial unemployment is there a restraint put on prices. This is the reason the Administration is struggling with voluntary restraints, trying to encourage labor unions to adopt voluntary restraints. They recognize this problem.

How should Congress react to the subject of economics? You must remember that we tend to learn economics not from professors, but from situations.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. I have a growing feeling that a major economic problem of the future will be capital formation. Capital is formed on a much more limited basis than before and by large corporations. This used to be done by entrepreneurs. Do you agree and what reasons do you give for this development?

A. I couldn't agree with you more. This is an extension of the historical process I sketched. The first reason for it is that in the last ten years, with inflation, the easiest way to deal with capital formation has been to turn to the Federal Reserve and increase interest rates. But this is the source of money for small business people. Relying on monetary policy is relying on a system of restraints that hurts the small business. If restraint is

needed in the future, I would prefer a change in fiscal policy rather than monetary policy. Fiscal policy changes cut consumption while monetary policy takes it all out of capital formation.

The second reason is that we have larger military expenditures. The Germans and Japanese are industrial successes because of their loss in WWII which limited their military expenditures. Our defense spending is a constant drain on our capital resources.

Q. Would you comment on the Puritan work ethic. As we have increasing world population, industrialization and cybernation, we are destined not to be able to have full employment.

A. I don't think that's right. I think we have a surplus in some areas of the U.S.—like the urban areas. I would argue against your proposition that a modern industrial economy runs short of work. I would attribute it to something else—liquidation of rural poverty. I see this as a temporary surplus. The day will come when we will run out of workers to do the labor of our society. Then we will look abroad. A characteristic of the modern economy is the way we have to look abroad for assembly-line labor. Yet we don't talk about it. The Swiss work force is made up of 25% non-Swiss. Germans no longer make automobiles. Can you imagine what food prices would be in this country if Americans picked it?

Q. I have two questions. (1) We are lectured by foreign countries about our economic balance and trade deficit and our energy problems. It's very difficult to communicate these problems to the people in our district. Would you comment on how we might improve that situation? (2) How far do we go in extending free trade when there is no reciprocal arrangement?

A. I will address the last question first. I have never been totally in favor of free trade. The notion of an interrelated trading community is a good one. But it doesn't require suffering of particular groups or political suicide. American agriculture is enormously dependent on foreign markets—so it serves as a barrier to protectionism. Multinational corporation are also barriers to protectionism.

On your first question, we need to get our oil imports under control, put a ceiling on them and adjust domestic policy so that we can live with what we can afford. I think your constituents could understand that if we could begin taking action.

Q. The phenomenon of people wanting authority over their income interests me. You mentioned wage/price restraints. Do you recommend that government impose such restraints? How do you reconcile this with the need for control over income?

A. You cite the basic conflict here: we are defining the problems. This is the heart of the economic/political problem which I don't want to minimize. But we can't accept unemployment as a way to control the economy, nor can we accept inflation. Both are unevenly distributed. The impact is always on the weak. The challenge is to evolve a consensual arrangement with trade unions and mandatory sanctions for non-complying employers. This is not needed for small business where the economic system still works. But we must allow for cost of living increases.

The Germans and Austrians have a social market policy where the prices will not go out of line with wages. The British have a formalized system. The French also have such a system. We are the only industrial country which is coming to this development last. Other industrial countries have resolved this to some degree.

Q. If we assume we are not going to solve the energy problem and if government doesn't move any faster, what will be the scenario that you see? What effect will our doing nothing have on the total economic activity?

FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN U.S. RISKY

A. I am not sure how it would affect internal economic activity. I am worried about the imbalance which produces a lot of money which among other things leads to massive investment in this country. I don't think this is a prudent risk to run.

Q. In the 60's, 3% was a bad rate of inflation. What level would you settle for if we did limit incomes?

A. I'm not sure. We should not expect that any system will wipe out inflation. But you've put your finger on the tendency to accommodate inflation with unemployment. We should not expect any system of restraints to set flat prices; 3-4-5% would be better than rigidity.

Q. I come from a state in which the governor recognizes that "small is beautiful."

Do you share that view and what kind of economy fits into that view?

A. I was reminiscing with Jerry Brown about Fritz Schumacher a few weeks ago. You know Fritz was my assistant during WWII. He was one of the finest men I have ever known. The concepts of limits to growth and small is beautiful are very important. But Fritz saw much more flexibility in economics than in fact there is. But there is an intermediate stage that might be appropriate to lesser stages of development. The notion of limits was very valuable when Fritz brought it up. People with fresh points of view are important—those who think the "impossible" is possible.

Q. People who have control over income aren't hurt by inflation. But some people are hurt by it, so some are talking about indexing. What would happen then?

A. That is an important question. I have been reluctant to endorse mass indexing. It's complex and difficult. How do you index personal savings, for example? If we accepted indexing, it probably wouldn't help much. But I accept indexing for cost of living adjustments in wage/price adjustments. This is part of the bargain. You can have selected indexing.

INFLATION AND CONSTITUENTS

Q. Inflation is on the mind of our constituents. How do we respond to them when they say that temporary wage/price restraints cause problems when removed, and permanent ones affect the nature of our economy?

A. Every incentive worked into the tax system has the possibility of becoming a loophole. I do not think that this changes the structure of our economy. Our economy changed when large corporations began to produce so much. Changing from private to public restraints does not change the nature of the economy. I would not like to say that restraints should be permanent, but in a world of large corporations, it is necessary.

NO TAX CUT

Q. What do we do now in Congress? Pass a tax cut or none or a medium-sized one?

A. None. The economy needs stimulation. If we need fiscal stimulation, do it in central cities. That is the least inflationary part of our economy. I'm encouraged by your resistance to a tax reduction and urge you to continue to persevere.

Q. We Members of Congress wonder if we are merely tinkering with our society—doing a little with pieces here and there. Does this change the way decisions are made in the private sector? What other tools

should we use? How could we be more bold in the next 2-5 years?

A. The system lends itself to infinity of patching. I would like to see an emphasis on the problem of public management. We don't press for a measure of public performance as we did in the past. More attention needs to be paid to managerial skills. But that's not what I would stress. I would stress welfare reform; get some incentive into that system. It would also lift a load off the big cities.

We must recognize that where there is a basic fiscal defect in our system—urbanization, population growth, high standard of living—the public costs go overwhelmingly to the big cities. But revenues accrue to the federal government. The problems go one place and the remedies go to another. Welfare reform would redistribute this. In the past we corrected the problem in the area of agriculture. I would like to see the welfare burden removed from the cities.

Q. Are you concerned about the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few?

A. Power associated with ownership of assets hasn't concerned me. Capitalists (owners) lose power and it goes into the bureaucracy. That's why rich people go into politics. There is no power in private ownership. But I think a good society spreads wealth as much as possible, so from that perspective such concentration disturbs me. Income redistribution needs to be more equitable in America. ●

GASOHOL DEMONSTRATION

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable amount of interest both here in Congress and across the Nation in the potential of alcohol fuels. The possibility of decreasing our dependence on foreign energy sources while providing a new market for agricultural surpluses increases the attractiveness of implementing alcohol fuels into our society.

Witness the statewide trend across the Nation of subsidizing State gasoline tax exemptions on each gallon of gasohol sold. Iowa, Illinois, Colorado, and Nebraska each participate in this. California is nearing a similar program, while New York is close to approving a test fleet of gasohol-fueled cars. Nebraska has also aided in organizing approximately 20 States into the National Gasohol Commission.

Witness the gasohol demonstration sponsored thus far by 15 Congressmen, Senators, and the American Automobile Association, to be held June 28-30. To demonstrate the applicability of gasohol, a tankful of blended 10 percent alcohol/90 percent gasoline will be offered to Members of Congress, the executive, interested organizations, and the media. For details see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD June 19, page 18243.

Finally, witness the administration's national energy plan. While the Senate's tax version of the plan provides for a Federal excise tax exemption on fuels at least 10 percent alcohol, the House version does not.

CXXIV—1157—Part 14

Today, I am introducing a bill to encourage the commercialization of methanol/ethanol-producing plants for the production of alcohol fuels. The bill has two provisions: The first is designed to make construction of a methanol/ethanol plant more attractive for private enterprise by providing for a rapid amortization period of 5 years, the second would provide for a Federal excise tax exemption on fuels at least 10 percent alcohol.

The rapid amortization period should be an attraction for industries interested in energy development. An exemption from the Federal excise tax for alcohol/gasoline blends will provide an incentive for consumers to try this new fuel. An average car with a 15-gallon tank could save 60 cents per fill-up by buying alcohol/gasoline-blended fuel. People would also have the satisfaction of knowing that they are contributing to development and utilization of alternative fuels which are renewable and cause less pollution. ●

PRODUCTIVITY: THE FIGURES TELL THE STORY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the lagging productivity of the American economy is a subject which has long concerned me. When American-made products are no longer competitive in the world markets, it is too easy to look outside for causes and excuses, when one large part of the problem can be found within industry itself. Sluggish growth in productivity is the responsibility of both the American worker and the industry for which he works, and protectionist remedies are only temporary solutions to a problem that ultimately will demand the attention and efforts of us all.

One June 14, 1978, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released figures on productivity growth in several U.S. industries, and these figures are telling. Not only does the United States compare poorly with the rest of the industrial world, but our productivity growth has slipped substantially behind the rates of just a year or two ago. In some instances there has even been a decline in the rate of productivity from 1976 to 1977. We cannot sit idly by and allow this state of affairs to continue. Government, labor, and management must join forces to improve both productivity and the quality of working life in American industry.

A summary of the BLS report follows:
BLS REPORTS ON INDUSTRY PRODUCTIVITY FOR 1977

Productivity, as measured by output per employee hour, increased in 1977 in more than half of the industries regularly covered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. In 1976, productivity increased in almost every industry measured.

In about three-quarters of the industries, productivity growth was less in 1977 than 1976. This slowdown is consistent with the situation in the nonfarm business sector of the economy where productivity grew 2.2 percent in 1977 as compared with 4.1 percent in 1976.

Among the key industries covered, motor vehicle manufacturing recorded an above-average gain of 7.0 percent, reflecting a large increase in output of 14.5 percent, as demand was up for all types of motor vehicles, and a gain of 7.0 percent in employee-hours. This productivity advance was slightly lower than the 8.7 percent increase in 1976, which also was based on a very large gain in output. On the other hand, the steel industry posted a below-average increase in productivity of 1.5 percent, based on a gain in output of 2.4 percent and an increase in employee-hours of 0.9 percent. This small productivity gain contrasts sharply with the 7.3 percent advance in 1976.

Productivity increases were recorded by a number of other manufacturing industries. The largest gainers included the sugar industry, which posted an advance of 16.4 percent; synthetic fibers, which grew 14.0 percent; metal cans, with 7.6 percent; major household appliances, with 7.3 percent; gray iron foundries, with 6.1 percent; and hydraulic cement, with 5.9 percent. In contrast, significant productivity declines were recorded by a number of manufacturing industries in 1977. These included clay refractories (-7.4 percent), flour and other grain mill products (-7.1 percent), footwear (-4.3 percent), and hosiery (-3.7 percent).

All of the mining industries covered registered declines in productivity in 1977. The most noteworthy was coal mining, which posted its ninth consecutive decline in productivity, dropping 1.2 percent. A slight output increase of 1.2 percent combined with a production-worker hours increase of 2.4 percent to produce the productivity decline. In iron mining (usable ore), productivity fell by 6.4 percent, while copper mining (recoverable metal) and non-metallic minerals both dropped 1.5 percent.

Among the transportation industries, petroleum pipelines recorded a large gain of 8.1 percent, as output posted a large advance due in part to the opening of the Alaska pipeline. Intercity trucking was up by 5.9 percent, with output growing 8.9 percent. Air transportation gained 4.7 percent, as output grew 7.4 percent, while railroads (revenue traffic) grew 2.4 percent, as output posted an above average gain of 3.7 percent.

In other nonmanufacturing industries, gasoline service stations had a significant increase of 7.6 percent, laundry and cleaning services grew 4.6 percent, telephone communications was up 4.4 percent, and franchised new car dealers gained by 4.3 percent. Small increases were posted by gas and electric utilities (1.6 percent), hotels and motels (1.0 percent), and retail food stores (0.8 percent), while eating and drinking places dropped by 1.0 percent.

The attached table presents indexes of output per employee-hour for the selected industries for the last 7 years. Additional data for these measures, such as average rates of change for all the components of the measures, are available from the BLS upon request. The forthcoming bulletin, "Productivity Indexes for Selected Industries, 1978 Edition," will include data back to 1947 for many industries. Data on output per hour of all persons and related cost measures for the private business sector as well as nonfarm business, manufacturing, and nonfinancial corporations are reported in the quarterly BLS press release, "Productivity and Costs."

INDEXES OF OUTPUT PER EMPLOYEE-HOUR IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES, 1971-77, AND PERCENT CHANGES, 1976-77
 [1967=100]

SIC Code	Industry	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	Percent change, 1976-77
MINING²									
1011	Iron mining, crude ore	117.1	124.4	126.7	118.1	117.0	119.3	112.8	-5.5
1011	Iron mining, usable ore	112.4	118.8	119.9	108.7	107.0	106.7	99.9	-6.4
1021	Copper mining, crude ore	121.2	118.1	117.7	117.6	128.9	143.2	136.3	-4.8
1021	Copper mining, recoverable metal	104.9	102.5	97.0	89.0	96.4	112.8	111.1	-1.5
111, 121	Coal mining	19.0	84.2	83.9	82.6	74.9	73.4	72.5	-1.2
121	Bituminous coal and lignite mining	91.5	83.9	83.4	82.1	74.7	72.9	72.5	-5
14	Nonmetallic minerals	117.2	121.7	127.5	124.8	122.5	125.3	123.4	-1.5
142	Crushed and broken stone	121.9	128.2	139.5	136.9	137.6	133.6	128.3	-4.0
MANUFACTURING									
203	Canning and preserving	112.6	114.8	125.6	122.6	124.8	132.4	(¹)	(¹)
204	Grain mill products	114.1	116.9	115.8	123.9	124.9	131.7	(¹)	(¹)
2041	Flour and other grain mill products	110.0	114.3	111.9	116.2	116.8	119.6	111.1	-7.1
2043	Cereal breakfast foods	106.7	112.8	111.0	105.3	107.7	112.8	(¹)	(¹)
2044	Rice milling	102.2	115.3	100.3	115.2	111.7	109.7	(¹)	(¹)
2045	Blended and prepared flour	112.1	103.6	103.5	116.4	104.7	108.2	(¹)	(¹)
2046	Wet corn milling	106.9	138.9	123.3	150.6	152.7	168.7	(¹)	(¹)
2047, 48	Prepared feeds for animals and fowls	119.9	115.9	118.5	127.1	129.5	138.3	(¹)	(¹)
205	Bakery products	108.1	113.7	113.1	112.9	112.7	112.8	115.9	2.7
2061, 62, 63	Sugar	110.1	117.4	114.0	110.0	108.1	111.4	129.7	16.4
2065	Candy and confectionery products	114.6	128.7	137.3	149.0	136.0	126.9	(¹)	(¹)
2082	Malt beverages	125.1	139.3	153.2	157.2	175.3	192.9	188.5	-2.3
2086	Bottled and canned soft drinks	111.2	114.2	119.5	120.9	129.5	142.6	147.4	3.3
2111, 21, 31	Tobacco products—total	109.7	110.0	108.1	111.9	114.2	119.3	118.9	-3
2111, 31	Cigarettes, chewing and smoking tobacco	105.6	106.1	104.9	106.5	110.3	114.1	113.7	-3
2121	Cigars	120.1	120.1	116.8	128.6	126.5	137.1	137.0	-1
2251, 52	Hostery	120.9	139.2	147.7	168.5	191.6	219.5	211.4	-3.7
2421	Sawmills and planing mills, general	110.0	120.6	112.9	108.2	112.7	118.2	116.6	-1.4
2611, 21, 31, 61	Paper, paperboard and pulp mills	119.9	130.0	135.4	135.2	128.0	139.5	138.6	-5
2653	Corrugated and solid fiber boxes	118.5	121.6	130.2	137.7	142.2	148.0	146.5	-1.0
2823, 24	Synthetic fibers	140.7	162.2	176.8	173.1	187.2	198.4	226.3	14.0
2834	Pharmaceutical preparations	125.7	134.9	132.1	141.3	145.4	152.2	158.8	4.3
2851	Paints and allied products	114.4	119.1	111.8	123.3	128.7	131.9	(¹)	(¹)
2911	Petroleum refining	109.5	120.5	132.4	121.4	123.7	128.3	132.7	3.4
3011	Tires and inner tubes	114.0	118.2	116.7	116.3	115.7	127.6	128.6	.8
314	Footwear	105.9	103.1	102.0	100.3	104.8	105.5	100.9	-4.3
3221	Glass containers	107.8	107.7	112.9	121.6	120.9	121.2	118.6	-2.2
3241	Hydraulic cement	121.5	123.7	129.7	119.0	110.6	120.7	127.7	5.9
325	Structural clay	122.8	127.3	131.7	134.6	132.0	138.1	132.7	-3.9
3251, 53, 59	Clay construction products	126.7	130.4	133.0	130.7	132.2	140.1	136.0	-2.9
3255	Clay refractories	109.3	116.4	125.6	143.9	127.6	130.3	120.7	-7.4
3271, 72	Concrete products	111.7	113.7	115.9	116.3	116.3	116.3	(¹)	(¹)
3273	Ready-mixed concrete	102.5	104.8	109.0	105.7	102.7	104.0	(¹)	(¹)
331	Steel	104.8	111.1	123.9	123.5	108.6	116.5	118.2	1.5
3321	Gray iron foundries	113.0	118.9	124.2	128.0	126.7	125.6	133.3	6.1
3324, 25	Steel foundries	100.4	106.0	107.6	118.5	113.6	111.5	111.4	-2
3331, 32, 33	Primary copper, lead, and zinc	121.4	135.2	140.6	127.6	125.6	141.7	144.9	2.3
3334	Primary aluminum	113.8	112.2	111.1	122.8	105.8	110.8	112.5	1.5
3351	Copper rolling and drawing	109.6	112.2	117.7	106.3	94.7	105.4	108.5	3.0
3353, 54, 55	Aluminum rolling and drawing	119.9	140.5	154.7	157.9	142.5	166.0	166.0	(¹)
3411	Metal cans	105.1	108.0	109.2	113.3	116.0	122.3	131.6	7.6
3631, 32, 33, 39	Major household appliances	121.4	133.0	135.1	134.9	140.7	145.3	155.9	7.3
3651	Radio and television receiving sets	111.6	132.2	128.5	124.4	125.0	135.3	(¹)	(¹)
371	Motor vehicles and equipment	119.0	123.7	126.7	121.1	129.4	140.6	150.4	7.0
OTHER									
401 Class 1	Railroads, revenue traffic	111.9	121.7	133.2	129.6	124.0	127.7	130.8	2.4
401 Class 1	Railroads, car-miles	108.2	115.5	119.2	116.2	115.5	117.1	117.1	-5
4213 PT	Intercity trucking ⁴	113.6	120.9	123.4	120.5	121.2	134.7	142.6	5.9
4213 PT	Intercity trucking (general freight) ⁴	108.0	114.7	122.1	118.9	109.8	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
4511	Air transportation ⁴	116.8	128.7	131.3	133.0	134.6	146.7	153.6	4.7
4612, 13	Petroleum pipelines	124.1	127.7	136.4	156.5	154.5	153.2	165.6	8.1
4811	Telephone communications	118.7	123.2	129.9	139.3	152.6	168.1	175.5	4.4
491, 92, 93	Gas and electric utilities	123.3	128.6	131.2	128.8	132.3	135.8	137.9	1.6
54	Retail food stores ⁵	114.9	113.2	107.1	103.5	106.1	105.0	105.9	.8
5511	Franchised new car dealers	113.3	116.9	119.5	116.2	122.4	130.6	136.3	4.3
5541	Gasoline service stations ⁵	124.6	127.2	136.1	142.6	136.8	149.4	160.7	7.6
58	Eating and drinking places ⁵	103.1	104.4	105.4	103.5	105.4	106.3	105.2	-1.0
7011	Hotels and motels ⁵	92.0	109.4	109.9	102.9	101.2	105.4	106.5	1.0
721	Laundry and cleaning services ⁶	102.9	107.0	109.6	107.3	104.1	105.5	110.4	4.6

¹ Preliminary.² Mining data refer to output per production worker hour.³ Not available.⁴ Output per employee.⁵ Output per hour of all persons.⁶ Less than 0.05 percent. ●

THE BIRDIE AND THE BEAR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, James Reston of the New York Times recently pointed out that there soon may be an 18-hole golf course in the Soviet Union. At present there are no golf courses in that country, a fact which may or may not be a provocative act under international law.

Reston's column warns the Soviets of the terrible risks of allowing golf to flourish in the workers' paradise:

It diverts an inordinate amount of time from work, separates families, encourages excessive drinking and leads inevitably to self-doubt and long agonies of psychological depression.

I think that is a rather gloomy assessment of the game. Golf can be a very good way of learning the truth about one's self and one's fellow man. I have had the pleasure of playing golf with the distinguished Speaker of the House and I can say without fear of contradiction that the way he plays golf very ac-

curately reflects the quality of his political insights. I will let you think about that one for a while, Mr. Speaker, while I insert into the RECORD at this point, "Moscow's Fatal Mistake" by James Reston of the New York Times:

MOSCOW'S FATAL MISTAKE

(By James Reston)

The first hot-weather or silly-season news of the year comes from Moscow. It was announced there the other day that Armand Hammer of Texas, Russia's favorite capitalist, had offered to build the first 18-hole championship golf course in the Soviet Union, and that the offer had been accepted personally by President Leonid Brezhnev. No

doubt they will call it the Hammer & Sickle Country Club.

This may be Moscow's biggest mistake since the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. Everything about golf goes against the Soviet view of life. Golf is not a collective but a highly individualistic enterprise. It takes land out of agricultural production. It diverts an inordinate amount of time from work, separates families, encourages excessive drinking, and leads inevitably to self-doubt and long agonies of psychological depression. This is not exactly what the Soviet Union needs, considering all its other problems.

No doubt Mr. Hammer made his offer in the spirit of détente and the reduction of international tensions, but golf is an addiction, like vodka, and produces more physical and mental tensions than any other form of human activity, with the possible exception of sex.

Be very careful with this deal, Mr. Brezhnev. If you're worried about the invasion of ideas and habits from the West, golf may be the most subversive of them all. It is a game of traps, pitfalls, bushes, and ambushes, defying all biological facts. Put it to the Soviet Academy of Sciences and they will tell you that it goes against all the laws of physics to swing the human body around in curves, and still hit a small ball straight onto narrow little rivulets of green grass surrounded by Saharas of sand. The history of this devilish conspiracy should be sufficient warning to any prudent Communist. As is well known, golf was invented by the Church of Scotland as a punishment for the sinful nature of man. After the border wars, it was Scotland's revenge for the arrogance of England, and there are historians of sound mind who hold it directly responsible for the decline of the British Empire.

Even today, wherever you find bitter strife in the world, you will usually find golf: Ireland, South Africa, Rhodesia, Israel, India, and Pakistan. The first thing your bearded buddy, Fidel Castro, did when he seized power in Cuba was to close down the Havana Country Club and plow up every other golf course on that island. By this act alone he liberated over 40,000 Cubans for the conquest of Africa.

Mr. Brezhnev has clearly not considered the basic conflict between golf, an expensive, elitist sport, and the Constitution of the Soviet Union. To each according to his needs, etc., as the Soviet Constitution says, would require that all Soviet citizens have a golf handicap of at least forty, and that the Hammer Memorial Country Club course, would be available to everybody. At tee-off time, this could be quite a problem in Moscow.

Even so, introducing golf into the Soviet Union has its points. It would demonstrate to the world during the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow that the Soviet Union has finally accepted the three great Scottish inventions: golf, whiskey and McDonald's hamburgers, and that it also has the authority to amend the golfing rules of the royal and ancient golf club at St. Andrews in Scotland.

What the game of golf needs, as any dub can tell you, is a whole new set of rules and golf course architects. We need the authority of the state to rescue all golfers from adversity. We need fairways as wide as the Soviet Union.

Anybody can tell you, that all golfers want the elimination of bunkers. We also want computerized clubs that won't slice or hook, magnetic golf balls that sink into larger magnetic holes, even if we're off line, and, above everything, the elimination of the four-foot, downhill, side-hill putt.

If you could do all this on Mr. Hammer's new Moscow golf course, Comrade Brezhnev, maybe it would be all right, but you'd better

be careful. Let him build it, with the widest possible fairways, no traps, no high rough, no glass-fast greens, and no publicity.

You may be able to deal with the Chinese, you have produced 900 million people partly because they stayed home and didn't play golf, and you may be able to handle the Japanese, who are nutty about golf, but you can't conquer the world and conquer golf at the same time. You will have to choose between Hammer and his golfing anvil. The guess here is that you can either conquer the world or learn to play golf, but that you can't do both. ●

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 22, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 23

- 9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Improvements in Judiciary Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2857, proposed Customs Courts Act.
4232 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on an Office of Technology Assessment report on the uses of solar energy.
3110 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
- Foreign Relations
Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the reserve role of the dollar and its implications for the U.S. economy.
4221 Dirksen Building
- *Government Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the GSA investigation of government contract fraud.
3302 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.

- Conferees
On S. 1633, to extend certain Federal benefits, services, and assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona.
S-207, Capitol

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

10:00 a.m.

- Energy and Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3163, proposed Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

- Governmental Affairs
Energy and Nuclear Proliferation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on postal reorganization legislation.
3302 Dirksen Building

- Judiciary
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee
To hold hearings on oil company ownership of common carrier pipelines.
2228 Dirksen Building

- Joint Economic
Priorities and Economy in Government Subcommittee
To meet in closed session to receive testimony from CIA Director Turner on a review of the economy of the U.S.S.R.
5302 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

- Conferees
On H.R. 11504, to improve Federal credit assistance programs for farmers, ranchers, and rural communities and businesses.
S-207, Capitol

JUNE 27

- 8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Production and Supply Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3189, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to encourage Federal coal leases and to encourage recovery of certain coal deposits.
3110 Dirksen Building

- 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 markup of S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

- Energy and Natural Resources
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 3163, proposed Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

- Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3209, proposed State Community Conservation and Development Act.
6202 Dirksen Building

- Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on efforts to reduce the Federal paperwork burden.
3302 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Conferees

On S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Energy's administration of the crude oil entitlements program and its impact on the domestic refining industry.

3110 Dirksen Building

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 markup of S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To mark up proposed legislation designating certain Alaska lands as national parkland.

3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 3209, proposed State Community Conservation and Development Act.

6202 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1927, to promote competition in the energy industry.

2228 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

1202 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

To receive testimony from Senators on S. Res. 405, making the Select Committee on Indian Affairs a permanent committee of the Senate; and to consider other legislative and administrative business.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Conferees

On S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 29

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.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Omi Gail Walden, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy and Nuclear Proliferation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on postal reorganization legislation.

4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Bureau of Prisons, with emphasis on west coast prison facilities.

2228 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs

To consider S. 2460, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act amendments; S. 2712, the Indian Program Evaluation and Needs Assessment Act; S. 3069, to provide that the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe shall have a preference right to purchase certain North and South Dakota lands held in trust by the U.S. for tribal members; and S. 3153, the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act.

5110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To receive testimony from Federal Reserve Board Chairman Miller on U.S. monetary policy.

6226 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Conferees

On S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

3110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Compensation and Pensions Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 379 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; S. 2828, the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act; and S. 1929, to establish, for purposes of paying dependency and indemnity compensation, a presumption of death from service-connected disability in the case of certain blinded veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 6503, to provide for a just and reasonable rate of return or profit for common carriers by water in intercoastal commerce.

235 Russell Building

JULY 11

10:00 a.m.

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

6226 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

10:00 a.m.

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

5110 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

10:00 a.m.

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

2168 Rayburn Building

JULY 18

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

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

2168 Rayburn Building

JULY 19

10:00 a.m.

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

2168 Rayburn Building

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 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

JULY 25

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.

6202 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.
2220 Rayburn Building
JULY 26

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up H.R. 10899, proposed International Banking Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building
JULY 27

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue markup of H.R. 10899, proposed International Banking Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building
AUGUST 2

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.
3302 Dirksen Building
AUGUST 3

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.
3302 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS
JUNE 22
10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2873, proposed Ocean Shipping Act.
235 Russell Building

JUNE 23
10:00 a.m.
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 29
9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on auto odometer requirements.
235 Russell Building

SENATE—Thursday, June 22, 1978

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 17, 1978)

The Senate met at 1:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado.

PRAYER

Rabbi Israel Goldstein, rabbi emeritus, Congregation B'Nai Jeshurun, New York, on the 60th anniversary of his ministry, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the universe, Thy blessing we invoke upon all who seek Thee in truth.

Do Thou enlighten the counsels of this legislative body. Bless our Nation that it may go from strength to strength in enlarging the boundaries of brotherhood and peace among men and nations.

The technical sciences have reduced the barriers of distance between men and nations. Grant, O Lord, that man's spiritual outreach may reduce the gaps of ignorance and prejudice which divide men and nations.

Grant that our Nation may match its strength with its greatness, its wisdom with its vision.

In the words of the psalmist we pray, "The Lord bless you out of Zion and behold the good of Jerusalem." Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1978.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable FLOYD K. HASKELL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, to perform the duties of the Chair.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HASKELL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF LEADERSHIP

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have a nomination in my hand which has been cleared all around. This nomination was reported earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for not to exceed 1 minute to consider the nomination, which I now send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Warren Demian Manshel, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the nomination? Hearing none, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominee was confirmed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL ORDER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CRANSTON. Will the Senator yield very briefly?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. First, let me ask the Chair, is the Chair recognizing me as the first of the three special 10-minute orders?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized under that order.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair. I yield to my good friend, the majority whip.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS: THE ADMINISTRATION'S VIEW

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, in testimony before the House International Relations Committee on Monday, June 19, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, speaking on behalf of President Carter, made a comprehensive and specific statement on the present state of United States-Soviet relations.

The statement is particularly welcome because it removed any ambiguity which may have remained after the President's speech at Annapolis in which he referred to choices between "cooperation" and