

H.R. 12433

By Mr. RUSSO:

—Page 42, after line 18, insert the following:

COUNSELING

SEC. 324. (a) Section 106(a)(2) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "may" and all that follows in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "shall, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, provide such services to any other owner of a single-family dwelling unit insured under

title II of the National Housing Act if such other owner was not a homeowner at any time prior to purchasing such dwelling unit."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1978.

H.R. 12931

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

—On page 23, after line 19 insert the following new section:

SEC. 510. The President shall direct the United States Governor of the International

Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United States Governor of the International Finance Corporation, the United States Governor of the International Development Association, the United States Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, the United States Governor of the Asian Development Bank, and the United States Governor of the African Development Fund, to propose and seek adoption of an amendment to the Articles of Agreement for their respective institutions to establish human rights standards to be considered in connection with each application for assistance.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHERE WE STAND ON
DISARMAMENT

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be named by the leadership of the House and by the President to serve as one of the delegates to the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament.

One of the most impressive talks at this session has been made by Ambassador T. T. B. Koh of the Republic of Singapore.

I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point and hope my colleagues in both the House and the Senate will take the time to read it.

It is a good summary of where we stand.

STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SINGAPORE DELEGATION, MR. T. T. B. KOH

The representatives of the 96 States who have spoken before me have been unanimous in condemning the arms race. If all of us are against the arms race, then the question is who are responsible for the arms race? Each of the two super powers seeks to put the blame on the other. The member States of the Warsaw Pact seek to put the blame on NATO members and vice versa. The representatives of developing countries seek to put the blame on the two super powers and on the other industrialized countries.

The first point I want to make is that the arms race is a universal phenomenon. It is not confined to the United States and the Soviet Union. It is not confined to NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The truth is that with very few exceptions, all of us are part of the arms race and are therefore responsible, to varying degrees, for its continuity.

By now we are familiar with the fact that the world is spending approximately \$400 billion annually on military expenditures. Of this amount, approximately half is accounted for by the United States and the Soviet Union. The two superpowers, together with the other industrialized countries, account for approximately 77% of the world's total military expenditures. The Third World's share of global military expenditures has been on the increase. It has grown from 15% to 23% during the last decade. Over half of the developing countries devote more than 10% of their public spending on military expenditures. A quarter of the developing countries devote more than 25% of their public spending on military expenditures. Despite severe food shortages, developing countries use five times as

much foreign exchange for the import of arms as for agricultural machinery.

I have therefore come to the following conclusions. First, the arms race is a universal phenomenon although half the world's total military expenditures is accounted for by the United States and the Soviet Union alone. Second, we are all responsible, though of course to different degrees, for the arms race. Third, if we are to reduce the arms race, we must all examine our own conduct critically, and not merely seek to put the blame and the responsibility on others.

Mr. President, we must ask ourselves why nations arm themselves. We must try to understand the reasons which promote and perpetuate the arms race. Nations arm themselves principally because they fear that other nations would attack them by force of arms. Are nations justified in harbouring such fears? If we examine the record since the end of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, we are driven to conclude that such fears are justified.

In the period since 1945, 133 wars have been fought, involving 80 countries and killing 24 million people. Have the two superpowers deployed their armed forces in combat outside their territory since 1945? Yes, they have. Have the other three permanent members of the Security Council deployed their armed forces in combat since 1945? Yes. Have the countries of the Third World taken up arms against one another? Yes. As the Prime Minister of Canada said to us, the other day, "violence within and between States is a regrettable fact of life".

As long as violence within and between States remains a fact of life, how can we possibly expect nations not to acquire arms in pursuit of their right of individual and collective self-defence?

The United Nations was established primarily for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. This is clearly set out in the preamble of the Charter, in Articles 1 and 2, which lay down the principles and purposes of our organization, and in the provisions defining the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council and of the General Assembly.

The system for maintaining international peace and security, envisaged by the United Nations Charter, comprises several elements. First, the member States are obliged, morally and legally, to respect certain principles. These include the principle that member States are to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force, the principle that member States are to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, and the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States. Secondly, the Charter sets forth a number of ways for dealing with specific threats to international peace and security. The Charter confers on the Security Council the primary

responsibility in this area. Thirdly, the Charter lays down a number of procedures for the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

A perusal of the United Nations' record during the past 32 years shows that all three elements of the UN system for maintaining international peace and security have failed to work effectively. Concerning the first element, I wish only to observe that numerous member States have broken their obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force. They have failed to live up to their obligation to settle their disputes by peaceful means. They have interfered in the domestic affairs of other States.

As for the second element, I have come to the regrettable conclusion that the Security Council has seldom been able to discharge its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and to deal with threats thereto. What has gone wrong with the Security Council? First, the Security Council can only work when there is a congruence of national interests among the five permanent members of the Security Council. In our divided world, it is very rare for the five major powers to have such a congruence of interests. Secondly, the Security Council is sometimes unable to impose sanctions against those who violate the principles of the Charter and threaten international peace because the offenders are the permanent members of the Security Council or their allies or friends. Thirdly, the 15 members of the Security Council are not the impartial guardians of international peace and security. They are the representatives of the Governments of States and they are motivated largely by their short-term national self-interests rather than by the interests of the international community.

As for the third element, it is sufficient for me to say that of the 149 member States of the United Nations, only 45 have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. At the present the Court has not a single case before it. The reluctance of U.N. members to refer their disputes to the Court stands in sharp contrast to their readiness to resort to force to settle their disputes.

Mr. President, I have sought to establish that we live in a violent world in which States have resorted and continue to resort, to force in their international relations. Second, I have sought to establish that the system, envisaged by the United Nations charter, for maintaining international peace and security has failed. This then brings me to the question what can we realistically expect to achieve in the field of arms control and disarmament? In 1961, the United Nations embraced the goal of general and complete disarmament. Is this a realistic goal? The ideal of general and complete disarmament can only be realised under two circumstances. First, when men lose their proclivity for violence. Second, when we have a world government and nation States are

disarmed. The only arms allowed will then be in the possession of the world government. Neither event is likely to come to pass in the foreseeable future. Therefore, although I will continue to dream of a world without arms, I will strive for a less lofty goal. My goal is to reduce the arms race and to make the world a safer place for all of us.

I turn first to the nuclear arms race. The nuclear arms race has five participants, China, France, United States, Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. There is, however, a race within the race. The inner race is run by only two participants, the U.S. and the Soviet Union who are running neck to neck. Between them, they possess 14,000 nuclear warheads, sufficient to destroy every city in the world seven times over. And yet, they are augmenting their nuclear arsenals by three bombs a day. Because a nuclear war would threaten the whole of mankind, every one of us therefore has a right to speak out against the nuclear arms race. We have a right to demand that the two superpowers should speedily conclude their second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. We have a right to demand that they should proceed thereafter to negotiate and conclude the third Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty which should actually reduce their existing arsenals of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In the meantime, the two superpowers should agree to limit and to reduce progressively their military spending on new strategic nuclear weapon systems and should agree to stop the flight-testing of all new strategic delivery vehicles. We hope that the current negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom will produce a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and we hope that all the nuclear-weapon States will respect such a treaty.

Turning to other weapons of mass destruction, we support the proposals for a treaty to ban radiological weapons, a treaty to ban chemical weapons and a treaty to ban napalm and other incendiary weapons.

Mr. President, I said earlier that we must all examine our own conduct critically. We must ask ourselves what we can do for arms control and disarmament. What can the Third World do for arms control and for disarmament? There are a number of specific actions which we the countries of the Third World can take. First, I observe that no member of the Third World has acquired or acknowledged that it has acquired nuclear weapons. As we are all agreed that nuclear weapons are evil and threaten the very survival of mankind, the Third World should maintain a moral consensus against any of its members acquiring such weapons. A country which acquires nuclear weapons should be condemned and not be rewarded. Second, the countries of Asia and Africa should emulate their colleagues of Latin America who have created the first nuclear-weapon-free zone through the Treaty of Tlatelco. The developing countries of Asia and Africa should consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones either on a regional basis or, where appropriate, on a sub-regional basis.

Third, the developing countries should take positive and constructive steps to reduce the conventional arms race taking place amongst them. In this regard, the example of eight Latin American countries is worthy of study.

In December 1974, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela adopted the Declaration of Ayacucho. In the Declaration, they expressed their desire to create "conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of arms and put an end to their acquisition for purposes of war". President Perez of Venezuela has recently invited the eight signatories of the Declaration of Ayacucho to meet

informally in New York during this Special Session in order to find out whether all the countries of Latin America are prepared to enter into a commitment in respect of conventional weapons. I hope that this Latin American initiative to check the conventional arms race will yield results. I hope that developing countries in Asia and Africa will examine the possibility of negotiating regional or subregional agreements to check the conventional arms race.

Finally, the countries of the Third World should take heed of what was said by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia the other day. Minister Mochtar Kusumaatmadja said, "questions of regional stability and security . . . depend, first and foremost, on the States in the region concerned. If they can exert concerted efforts to generate a climate of cooperation and devise institutions for the peaceful resolution of disputes, the stability and security of the region will be strengthened." Minister Mochtar went on to speak about the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) which has been engaged for the past 11 years in regional cooperation in the economic and in other non-military fields. He said that "ASEAN has been able to attain a degree of cohesion among its members by simultaneously pursuing the goals of preventing interference by external powers and of containing intra-regional differences."

The Third World's contribution to the cause of arms control and disarmament should not be confined to delivering moral sermons to the two super powers and to the other nuclear-weapon States. The Third World should take resolute action to keep itself free of nuclear weapons. The Third World should exert strong moral pressure against any of its members who may be attempted, or are preparing, to acquire nuclear weapons.

The Third World should also promote regional or sub-regional agreements to halt or to reduce the conventional arms race. The pre-conditions for such agreements are mutual trust and confidence. Unfortunately, conditions of mutual trust and confidence do not exist in many parts of the Third World. The Third World today is riven by conflicts and disputes, based upon conflicting territorial claims, racial, tribal, religious, linguistic and ideological differences. We, the countries of the Third World, must learn to settle our disputes by peaceful means. We must try to live peacefully and amicably with our neighbours. We must build regional and sub-regional institutions for economic cooperation and for the pacific settlement of disputes.

Mr. President, we must not allow this Special Session on Disarmament to become yet another UN exercise in propaganda and collective hypocrisy. Representatives of States are in the habit of saying one thing at the UN and doing the opposite at home. The general debate on Disarmament has been marred by this duplicity and by a tendency to put the blame on others. We must be realistic in our approach but we should not accept the present reality as immutable. We must neither give way to cynicism nor be swept away by romantic fantasies. We must face the reality that we live in an imperfect world in which violence is a fact of life. We must face the fact that the UN has failed to provide Nation States with a degree of security which would allow them to dispense with arms. The road to disarmament must pass through world-wide detente. We need detente between the United States and the Soviet Union. We need detente between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. We also need detente among the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America for the unfortunate fact is that all the actual armed conflicts taking place in the world today occur in the Third World. ●

FEDERAL REGULATIONS AND THE ONONDAGA COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, there have been many sincere attempts by the Congress and by the regulatory agencies of this Nation to better inform and protect the citizens in this country. Many of them have been badly needed and have helped to safeguard the citizens from disease, injury, and other calamities.

Unfortunately, in our eagerness to protect and to have an informed populace, we pass some pretty ridiculous laws that merely impede our efforts to achieve important goals.

These laws are then passed on to the regulating agencies who in their eagerness to make these laws as stringent and as meaningful as possible, draft regulations that frequently go far beyond the intent of the original legislation.

A case in point is Public Law 93-523, which requires public notification when the turbidity maximum contaminant level for a supply of drinking water is over five turbidity units for a monthly average or a 2 consecutive day average.

This can occur in lakes used for drinking supplies when an exceptionally heavy runoff occurs, generally in the spring in my area, and comes about as a result of heavy rains and melting and thawing snow.

When this occurs, the water company is required in addition to the notice to newspapers, radio, and television stations made at the time, to notify the customers in the first set of water bills issued after such failure.

As an example of how ridiculous the procedure is, I cite the case of the Onondaga County Water Authority (OCWA) when such a condition occurred in its source of supply March 22-25 and March 28-29, 1978, when the average slightly exceeded the levels for these brief periods. The water was not contaminated; merely slightly more cloudy and chlorination was increased as a safeguard.

OCWA was required to send out in its bills, 12,000 notices to its customers to meet the requirements of the law, even though the occurrence had been thoroughly explained and discussed in all of the local news media.

The total reaction to the news and to the 12,000 notices was 2 letters received by OCWA complaining of the condition weeks after the condition occurred, and no longer existed. This was engendered only by the notices in the customers' bills.

The attached article, from Water and Sewage Works, a professional publication in this field, by a well-known consulting engineer supports my point of view that such expensive and ridiculous requirements deserve our attention and should be abolished.

The article follows:

PUBLIC LAW 93-523: PUBLIC NOTIFICATION?
(By Henry J. Graeser)

Before EPA was born, and EDS became interested, AWWA was earnestly pleading for public recognition that "cleaning the streams" for fish was a far cry from creating streams from which people could drink. With despair, we saw the scientific community, the trained professional sanitary engineers, biologists and chemical engineers, diverted to a short-sighted effort which had as its primary goal, recreation and wildlife. Worthwhile, but shortsighted.

When popular attention was focused on the drinking water problem, however, the result again was overreaction, over-legislation and over-regulation. The public notification provision of the Safe Drinking Water Act (PL 93-523) is an example of excess in all these areas. AWWA and many water utility officials have been criticized for opposing the public notification provisions of this law. It is inferred that we want to cover something up.

Let me state at once—AWWA believes in an informed public. I believe in an informed public, but I don't believe in a needlessly alarmed public. The Public Law in its zeal for sunshine, makes even minor infractions of the neede dand desirable primary drinking water standards a reason for equally alarming statements to the press, television and, via the Water Bill, the mails.

There is no provision for degrees of concern or substitution of action and correction for notification. No one, even the state or EPA, is allowed to apply judgment. A biological violation, or for that matter, a violation of a turbidity standard, doesn't mean the public health is in danger, unless it continues to happen.

Even more so, this is true of the long term health effects of minute levels of heavy hidden metals or organics. Yet, the federal bureaucracy saw an opportunity for self-enforcement, and so recommended to the Congress that the local utility must notify the public of any infraction, however minor, of the primary standards maximum contaminant level, and thus self-regulate. Little concern is shown to the damage of public relations of the utility or the creation of distrust and disharmony at the local level.

Gaining trust and maintaining it is a long term investment of time and sincere effort—once lost, it is doubly difficult to regain. Certainly the Congress, who gets the lowest vote of confidence of all the levels of government, should be sympathetic here.

I favor intelligent public notification. We have had public notification in most states since the 1930s—at the state and local regulatory bodies responsible for public health. I believe in and have worked for federal drinking water standards and authority for the federal agency responsible for drinking water safety, and authority to notify the public and declare an emergency, and exercise inconjunctive powers, where state and local officials do not exercise proper legally authorized power to protect the public health.

I opposed, and still do so, any law and regulation requiring the operator to cry "wolf" indiscriminately without the exercise of considered and professional judgment concerning the severity of the problem and its effect on the public health.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROSENTHAL

and Mr. VANDER JAGT, I am introducing today House Joint Resolution 1014, which seeks to designate the weekend of April 28-29, as the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.

The dates chosen relate to the days in 1945 when the Dachau concentration camp was liberated by U.S. Armed Forces.

It is our hope that most Members will wish to join us in cosponsoring this resolution in order that it may be taken up by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under the rules it has adopted for considering such memorial resolutions.

Human nature being what it is, there is a tendency to blot out unpleasant memories. The extermination of 6 million Jews at the hands of the Nazis during World War II is one of the most unpleasant memories any generation has ever had to bear. It is natural that people would want to let it slip into oblivion.

Yet what occurred to the Jews of Europe less than 40 years ago is something we cannot afford to forget. Our own country bears at least a part of the guilt for our failure to provide a refuge for these people before the Holocaust began. To forget these events is to set the stage of a recurrence at some future time.

The world cannot tolerate a recurrence of such atrocities against any people. We must remind ourselves, in an age of presumed enlightenment.

After all, it is not as though bigotry died with Hitler. It existed at least to some degree in our own country and elsewhere at the same time that it reached its ultimate expression in the Nazi regime. It still exists today, a sore on the body politic that must not be allowed to spread.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is altogether fitting that such an observance be made, together with Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. VANDER JAGT I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring the resolution.●

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY IN SUPPORT OF THE COL. LLOYD L. BURKE BILL

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill that recommends to the President of the United States the promotion of Col. Lloyd L. Burke to the rank of brigadier general in the U.S. Army upon his retirement on the last day of this month, June 30, 1978.

Before I proceed I should point out that I have taken this step without consulting with Colonel Burke. He was not aware of my plans until a week ago on June 13, when I first made mention of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 17517. I am certain he would have disapproved. Nor would I thrust upon him benefits or emoluments he did not earn, for he would not accept them. I cannot

emphasize too strongly that my proposal will cost the taxpayers no money, no discomfort, no burden. Nor will it set a precedent that will be costly to our Government or subject to abuse in the future.

Colonel Burke is one of our last three-war heroes. His 34 years of service, which will come to a close this month, began as a raw recruit in 1943 when he saw battle in the mountains of Italy. It extends through the bitter days of the Korean war, when as a young lieutenant, his almost superhuman achievements in battle earned him the Medal of Honor. His selfless leadership and heroics under fire were far beyond the call of duty. He was the commander of the famed Rangers in the Vietnam defensive action, and for the last 10 years he has been deputy and then chief of Army liaison for the House of Representatives.

Respected and revered by the men under his command throughout his career, his dedication, judgment, and expertise was also acknowledged by his superiors. Recently a ranking officer had this to say of Col. "Scooter" Burke:

In addition to his brilliant performance as chief of the House Liaison Division Colonel Burke has consistently and flawlessly performed in an immense variety of duties in locations throughout the world during a career spanning three and a half decades and three major armed conflicts. In the field, or in staff positions at the highest levels, his influence upon the lives and careers of those with whom he has been associated cannot be overstated . . .

Colonel Burke is one of the last of the Army's three-war soldiers. His skill and professionalism, personal conduct, diligence, initiative, and devotion to duty have been beyond reproach during his entire thirty-four years of distinguished service and have earned for him the respect and admiration of all those with whom he has come in contact. His outstanding performance reflects great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, it is because Colonel Burke is the embodiment of that rare individual to whom America owes so much that I am introducing today a resolution that will convey to this distinguished American some small part of the gratitude many of his countrymen feel for the service he has rendered to this Nation, indeed much of it above and beyond the call of duty. The legislation would confer on him—in title only—a rank he never actively sought on his own.

My bill recommends that immediately after his retirement on June 30, 1978, the President promote Colonel Burke to brigadier general of the Army, but with only those compensations and benefits which he has earned as a colonel during more than three decades of service to the American people.

I believe it is an honor which a grateful America can well afford to confer on that rare breed of man whose character and courage are the bricks and mortar that have made this Nation a bastion of freedom. It would be an honorable and civilized way for a grateful nation to say thank you.

I believe this would be an appropriate recognition for a genuine hero who has dedicated a lifetime of selfless service to a nation when his help was needed most, and a fitting reminder to our youth that

their efforts on behalf of this Nation will not go unrecognized.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Rules of the House of Representatives which do not allow cosponsors on a bill such as this, I would like to add to my remarks a list of 71 other Members of Congress who have indicated that they join with me in their desire to recommend to the President this course of action. I am certain that each Member of Congress shares the sentiments expressed in support of the recognition of a true American hero:

**SUPPORTERS OF THE COL. LLOYD L. BURKE
RESOLUTION**

1. Mathis, Dawson, Georgia.
2. Hanley, James M., New York.
3. Devine, Samuel L., Ohio.
4. Wilson, Charles H., California.
5. Bafalis, L. A., Florida.
6. Collins, James M., Texas.
7. Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.
8. Stanton, William J., Ohio.
9. Burleson, Omar, Texas.
10. Poage, W. R., Texas.
11. Wampler, William C., Virginia.
12. Hefner, W. G., North Carolina.
13. Mitchell, Donald J., New York.
14. Boland, Edward P., Massachusetts.
15. Lagomarsino, Robert J., Calif.
16. Teague, Olin E., Texas.
17. Duncan, John J., Tennessee.
18. Young, Don, Alaska.
19. Traxler, Bob, Michigan.
20. Yatron, Gus, Pennsylvania.
21. Clay, William, Missouri.
22. Myers, John T., Indiana.
23. Dickinson, William, Alabama.
24. O'Brien, George, Illinois.
25. Patten, Edward J., New Jersey.
26. Ichord, Richard H., Missouri.
27. Carter, Tim Lee, Kentucky.
28. Lehman, William, Florida.
29. Steiger, William S., Wisconsin.
30. Daniel, Dan, Virginia.
31. Risenhoover, Ted, Oklahoma.
32. Howard, James J., New Jersey.
33. Sebelius Keith G., Kansas.
34. Derrick, Butler, South Carolina.
35. Beville, Tom, Alabama.
36. Pickle, J. J., Texas.
37. Bowen, David R., Mississippi.
38. McEwen, Robert C., New York.
39. Winn, Larry, Kansas.
40. Ellberg, Joshua, Pennsylvania.
41. Downey, Thomas J., New York.
42. Nichols, Bill, Alabama.
43. Murphy, Morgan F., Illinois.
44. Flood, Daniel J., Pennsylvania.
45. Flynt, John J., Georgia.
46. Stratton, Samuel S., New York.
47. Price, Melvin, Illinois.
48. Wilson, Bob, California.
49. Emery, David, Maine.
50. Tribble, Paul S., Jr., Virginia.
51. Pepper, Claude, Florida.
52. Addabbo, Joseph, New York.
53. Rooney, Fred, Pennsylvania.
54. Beard, Robin, Tennessee.
55. de Lugo, Ron, Virgin Islands.
56. Akaka, Daniel, Hawaii.
57. Hammerschmidt, John, Arkansas.
58. Bonker, Don, Washington.
59. Spence, Floyd, South Carolina.
60. Breaux, John, Louisiana.
61. Rostenkowski, Dan, Illinois.
62. Hubbard, Carroll, Jr., Kentucky.
63. AuCoin, Les, Oregon.
64. McDonald, Larry, Georgia.
65. Brown, Clarence, Ohio.
66. Buchanan, John, Alabama.
67. McFall, John, California.
68. Won Pat, Antonio Borja, Guam.
69. Baucus, Max, Montana.
70. Fuqua, Don, Florida.
71. Fountain, L. H., North Carolina. ●

**HUMAN RIGHTS IN PARAGUAY—
PART I**

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago Sunday, a hunger strike was begun by 16 prisoners at the Emboscada jail in Paraguay. On June 14, 3 days after the strike began, the Government released 14 prisoners. Reliable sources reported that the released prisoners were informed that three more women were scheduled to be released, but were not since they participated in the hunger strike. Three men have been removed from Emboscada, and each sent to a different precinct jail; they are being held incommunicado, as punishment for allegedly being instigators in the strike. The three men are: Severo Acosta Aranda, Virgilio Bareiro, and Carlo Jose Salaberry. The release of 14 prisoners leaves approximately 50 to 60 prisoners in Emboscada, which represents substantially fewer numbers than the 600 political detainees which the Government transferred there in September 1976.

The above incidents, on one hand showing a positive trend and on the other giving cause for concern, reflects to some degree the mixed nature of recent developments in Paraguay. The General Assembly of the Organization of American States is scheduled to meet this week in Washington, D.C. Its agenda includes the situation in Paraguay.

Below is a report on Paraguay which provides some useful background on the recent history of human rights in that country. I would like to share this information with my colleagues:

THE STATE OF SIEGE

In February 1978, a Paraguayan paper reported:

"The National Government extended the state of siege in the capital city and in the Central, Itapua and Alto Parana Departments, for the period of 90 days. The disposition was adopted by decree No. 36,982.

The document also indicates that during the state of siege the guarantee of personal freedom of those accused of the acts expressed in this decree is suspended.

"The whereas of the document expresses that 'there exist international organizations whose principal objectives are the subversion of the legitimate order and the use of violent means for destroying the fundamental bases of our society . . .'

A 'state of siege' has been in effect without interruption in Paraguay since 1947, renewed every 90 days. Established in articles 79 and 181 of the 1967 Constitution, the state of siege 'may only be applied in case of international conflict or war, foreign invasion, internal commotion, or the grave threat of one of these.' The Constitution also requires parliamentary oversight of the state of siege; despite occasional protests from the opposition, Parliament has never enacted the appropriate legislation.

It is ironic for a president whose banner has been '24 years of peace and programs', to routinely announce every quarter an internal state of siege.

"When then the continued state of siege?" asked Stephansky and Helfeld after their 1977 visit to Paraguay. Their report responds:

"Habit is one possible answer, convenience another. Convenience is precisely the word

used by the Supreme Court in its 1975 decision [in which the state of siege was cited to deny habeas corpus to prisoners detained in areas not covered by its provisions]: it is convenient for executive authority to be able to take preventive measures. Unaccountability is also highly convenient. Under a state of siege men and women may be seized, with or without evidence of guilt or complicity, held incommunicado and detained indefinitely. At no time need executive or police officials explain or justify the detentions. When it becomes convenient . . . those detained may be given their liberty.

"Recently this state of siege has been lifted in the interest of the country, leaving it only in the capital, Asuncion. However, in practice it is where the prisoner is held and not where the action took place that determines whether a detainee is covered by the state of siege provisions."

THE LAW OF POLICE PREVENTION

To supplement the state of siege provisions, the police use decree-law No. 11,321 (1945), the Law of Police Prevention. With the ostensible purpose of expediting the trial process, this decree permits the police to initiate the judicial questioning of suspects; prisoners are held under the Police Prevention Law for weeks or months until their court hearings, at which time the judge decrees "the conversion of preventive detention into imprisonment."

Paraguayan lawyers charge that this is contrary to article 199 of the Constitution, which establishes that "in no case may the Congress, nor the President of the Republic, nor Ministers, nor other officials claim judicial attributes which are not expressly established in this Constitution . . . nor intervene in decisions in any way." The law does require preventive detention cases to be communicated to the judge on duty within 24 hours. Not a single case is known, however, in which this has been done when an alleged political crime is at issue.

LAW 209

In the 24 years of General Stroessner's presidency, thousands of political prisoners have been held for months or years without official charges. Since 1975, however, a total of 98 (see Appendix) have been charged under Law 209, the "Defense of the Public Peace and the Freedom of Persons," a 1970 act characterized by imprecise definitions and inconsistent penalties. First applied in 1975 against 13 people identified with the opposing Febrerista Party, it has been used since to justify the arrest and interrogation of participants in virtually every institution not directly controlled by the Colorado Party. (The government party.)

Law 209 prohibits instigation to crime (1 month to 4 years' imprisonment), justification of a crime or criminal (1 month to 3 years), "preaching hatred among Paraguayans or the destruction of social classes" (1-6 years), and "membership in an illicit association (3-6 years, 4-8 for the leaders). The penalty for calumny against government leaders is 3-6 years; for membership in a communist or subversive organization, 1-5 years; the same for providing support—even renting space—to such an organization. The maximum sanction for kidnapping is only 3 years; 5 if the victim is a public official, 12 if it is the President or a foreign diplomat, or if ransom is involved. "Provoking tumult" is punishable with 1 month to 3 years, "public intimidation" or terrorist threats, 2-4 years.

The law serves as an instrument of repression in two ways. The first is its effect on freedom of expression and association; this is particularly pronounced in a society that has had no experience with democratic institutions, in which the majority are inclined to accept vague official definitions of "illicit association" and "preaching hatred". Ex-prisoners and prisoners' families are ostracized by neighbors and friends who fear

that they too will become suspect if seen in the company of alleged subversives.

It also serves as a "fishing license" for police investigation: given the absence of clear definitions, any type of written materials may be entered into evidence, and any personal or professional relationship with a suspect may be used in the interrogation of other detainees.¹

ABUSIVE TREATMENT

Four types of cruel and unusual punishment are common in Paraguay: beatings, torture, psychological cruelty and abusive confinement.

From the moment of detention "some police are like wild beasts," says one prisoner; "they derive pleasure from the sheer physical contact of a beating." Prisoners are regularly thrown around, punched in the stomach and groin and beaten around the face and head, with fists, feet or any implement that comes to hand. A favorite club used in the Department of Investigations was referred to by jailers as "the National Constitution".

Chartrain and Corneveaux, who visited Paraguay at the height of the 1976 repression, reported that "beatings, with sticks, feet or fists are considered as maltreatment and not as torture. Sometimes they are not even considered as maltreatment."²

The following methods of torture, apart from beatings, have been documented by Amnesty International: el sargento, a cat-of-nine-tails with lead balls at the tip of each thong; submersion in a bath of water or human excrement called *la pileta*; application of electric shock to sensitive parts of the body, and burning sensitive parts of the body with cigarettes and hot iron bars.³ Said Stephansky and Alexander: "The purpose of torture does not seem to have been, in general, to acquire information, but rather to force those being submitted to it to confess... regardless of whether those confessions represented realities or fiction."⁴

The most common form of psychological cruelty involves threats of renewed torture or death, alternated with promises of freedom or privileged treatment. Parents are tortured in the presence of their children, or vice versa; friends and coworkers are called into the torture chamber to observe the interrogation of other prisoners.

A typical form of abusive confinement is the calabozo, a solitary cell just large enough for a prisoner to stay in a reclining position. Prisoners are also chained to one another or to the wall of their cell; Dr. Agustin Golburu, kidnapped from Argentina in February 1977, was reportedly seen six months later chained to the wall, apparently unbathed and unshaven since his detention.

There are occasional reports of attempts by jailers to take sexual advantage of women prisoners. One woman who refused such an advance commented that in her experience and that of friends, the attempts are rarely followed through with force. "If you insult them, they'll find another way to get back at you. I think they're afraid to push too far with political prisoners, afraid of being

denounced. With the 'common' prisoners, that's a different story."

EMBOSCADA PRISON

In response to diplomatic pressures, in September 1976 the government transferred about 600 political detainees to a prison camp near the village of Emboscada. Recent detainees were encouraged by the move, since there is no torture chamber and the facility contains a courtyard where they can take limited exercise. But it made family visits difficult.

Apart from a chronic water shortage, Emboscada represents a clear improvement over previous detention conditions.

Prisoners may, however, be returned to local police stations at any time, for punishment or re-interrogation: each new wave of arrests since 1976 has been accompanied by the transfer of Emboscada inmates for renewed questioning in Investigations headquarters. And not all prisoners are taken to Emboscada even after their interrogation; out of 20-30 people estimated by the press to have been arrested in January and February 1978, only four were reassigned to the facility and officially acknowledged as political prisoners.

A NETWORK OF INFORMERS

Several hundred full time informers are said to be employed by the Department of Investigations and other branches of government. The greatest threat to freedom of expression comes, however, from the many voluntary, part time pyragues; they may be government employees, peasants who have received or aspire to land allotments, businessmen expecting special privileges, domestic servants who need to supplement their low wages—and, of course, the neighborhood gossip.

Like the mythic figure from whom the name is derived, the pyrague influences daily activity even when he is not there. The conversation that suddenly stops at the next table in an Asuncion bar may not mean that someone has started listening to you; the government employee on your agency's board of directors may not be planning to report tomorrow the debate surrounding this evening's decisions; the waiter at dinner may be attentive just because he's hoping for a generous tip—the monetary kind. But then, it is always safer not to say what you were thinking.

Churches are a major hunting ground for informers; one section of the Department of Investigations is exclusively charged with identifying communist tendencies in the churches, Protestant and Catholic. It was the Italian caretaker of the Salesian retreat center at Ypacarai who called in police to arrest participants in a December 1977 meeting of rural and urban labor leaders. When two executives of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) arrived in 1976 to protest the arrest of several of their employees, government officials explained that they were doing the church a favor by identifying the dangerous tendencies within their program.

Another favorite hunting ground is the workplace. During the January 1978 roundup of alleged subversives, Chief of Investigations Pastor Coronel appealed through the press to commercial, industrial and banking executives to report any absences on the part of employees. Even homes are not inviolate; Coronel also asked parents of adolescents to "safeguard their children from the pressures and threats of the most radicalized elements of the subversive groups" by turning them in.⁵

Intellectuals and university students are among the principal targets of the information network. In the School of Medicine, where students recently protested the appointment of a notoriously corrupt doctor as principal despite the recommendation of

another candidate by the duly constituted faculty committee, a group of student pyragues is reported to be informing on and offering bribes to fellow students,⁶ and a similar situation exists throughout the country's universities and professional organizations.

The most defenseless victims of this network, however, are small farmers and landless peasants. In the early 1970's at the height of repression against the Christian Agrarian Leagues, one U.S. observer reported that it was common to imprison a League leader in order "to identify his companions who will surface by rallying around"; peasants were paid to destroy the leaders' property and animals; the possession of literature interpreting Catholic social doctrine was damning in and of itself. "The government in this way plays upon the fears of other campesinos with such words as 'communist' and 'subversive' and informs them to report this anti-national activity and steer clear of it for one's personal safety as one would automatically be deemed an enemy of the State."⁷

MONEY HAS A NEW MEANING TODAY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, one seldom hears the phrase "sound as a dollar" anymore. Today, some say it with a sneer or chuckle. Prof. James Green, in a recent column, explains in simple terms just what these pieces of paper that we fold carefully and put in our wallet or pocketbook do and do not mean. He also explains why this paper money, backed by nothing but faith, constitutes embezzlement by the Congress and the policy underlying the printing of ever expanding supplies of this paper fuels the fires of inflation. The article by Professor Green, of the University of Georgia, as it appeared in the Atlanta Sunday Journal and Constitution of May 14, 1978 follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, May 14, 1978]

MONEY HAS A NEW MEANING TODAY
(By James Green)

Today we work for and spend money. Right? No, wrong! Money in its traditional meaning is gone. Too many Americans don't really understand this. They don't recognize who has been fooling around with their money nor what has happened to it and to them.

The Federal Reserve creates what we now call money based on the government's promise to pay (IOU's). Commercial banks create money based on private promises to pay (IOU's). Monetized debt, then, is what we now call money.

Look carefully at any bill in your wallet. This is a Federal Reserve note.

Stated on it is "This note is legal tender." But "tender" for what? An IOU? If it is tender for nothing more than a promise to give another piece of paper just like it, is it really a legal and binding contractual obligation?

Originally the Federal Reserve note was not designated as legal tender nor was it law-

⁶ El Pueblo, weekly newspaper of the Federista Party, first week of April, 1978.

⁷ Kevin J. Healy, "Agrarian structure and peasant resistance in Paraguay," unpublished paper presented at Cornell University, 1974.

¹ A love letter written years ago by a 1977 detainee to the woman he later married, referring to their commitment to social change, was held in evidence against him although article 69 of the Constitution expressly forbids the seizure without warrant of personal correspondence. In early 1978 a psychiatrist and a gynecologist were brutally tortured because in past years they had given professional attention to a fugitive, Nidia Gonzalez Talavera.

² Francois Chartrain and Alain Corneveaux, in *Convergence* (International Movement of Catholic Students), No. 3-4, 1976, p. 9.

³ Amnesty International Briefing: Paraguay, July, 1976, p. 8.

⁴ Stephansky and Alexander, report p. 186.

⁵ ABC Color, January 18, 1978.

ful money. Why? Because it was not redeemable for anything of value. It still isn't.

Honest money was defined by Locke as "some lasting thing that men might keep without spoiling, and that by mutual consent men would take in exchange for truly useful, but perishable supports of life."

Good representative money, the gold and silver certificates which circulated widely a few years ago stated: "Will pay to the bearer on demand gold (silver) or lawful money at any Federal Reserve Bank." These certificates were substitute (representative) money and were redeemable. When the government revoked redeemability the floodgates to economic instability, persistent inflation and capital confiscation were open wide.

ROOSEVELT DEVALUED DOLLAR

President Franklin Roosevelt devalued the dollar by 40 percent Jan. 31, 1934, raising the price of gold from \$20.64 to \$35 an ounce. Suits were filed charging confiscation of property without due process of law when American citizens were no longer allowed to hold gold as a private possession. The Supreme Court, however, sustained the seizure of gold and the abrogation of gold contracts. In legal jargon, the court ruled that "the issue of money is a political question to be determined by Congress." Here lies the answer as to "who has been fooling with your money." Now let's see what has been done to it and to you.

In its wisdom Congress has changed the basic essence of money. We have been moved from hard, commodity money which had intrinsic value in itself to substitute money which was redeemable into good money to fiat paper money with neither redeemability nor intrinsic worth.

Given worthless pieces of paper called money, your savings have been confiscated. Since 1939 Americans have saved some \$4,430 billion (in 1972 dollars) in savings accounts, insurance and pension funds, trusts, bonds of all kinds and mortgages. Of this, inflation has destroyed \$2,078 billion of your saved-up purchasing power.

DISCIPLINE IS GONE

In the first 192 years of our nation's growth to 1967, we created \$350 billion of more or less good money to grease the wheels of our economic expansion. In just 10 years we have more than doubled the supply of worthless fiat money. The broad measure of money supply now stands at \$820 billion . . . up \$470 billion. This is irresponsible. Monetary discipline is gone.

In 10 years, consumer prices have doubled. Housing prices have doubled. Medical care cost has doubled. The purchasing power of your dollar has been cut in half.

Worthless paper money without intrinsic value spawns inflation, debases the nation's currency and confiscates your capital. Webster defines what the Congress is doing to us as embezzlement, theft and fraud. Webster is right. ●

SOVIET DISSIDENTS CONVICTED

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my dismay and deep concern over the conviction of two Jewish activists in the Soviet Union yesterday. In separate, closed trials, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were found guilty of "malicious hooliganism" and sentenced to internal exile—Slepak for 5 years and Nudel for 4 years. This action can only be condemned as one further example of the Soviet

Union's disregard for basic human rights, and their refusal to abide by provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights with which they agreed to conform in signing the 1975 agreements in Helsinki.

Prior to their arrest and conviction, both Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel had been attempting for more than 7 years to obtain Soviet exit visas. Slepak's lengthy struggle had attracted worldwide attention and since the arrest of such prominent dissidents as Alexander Ginsberg and Anatoli Scharansky, he has become the focal point of much Jewish activism both in Moscow and in the West. Ida Nudel is also well known for her activities in the Soviet Jewish emigration movement. I have a personal interest in the case of Ida Nudel. On January 23, 1978, I joined 48 of my colleagues in contacting Ambassador Anatoli Dobrynin to request that he intervene on Mrs. Nudel's behalf and assist her in her efforts to get permission to rejoin her husband and sister in Israel. Yesterday's tragic action was our response. ●

THE JERSEY PINE BARRENS

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, during the 95th Congress, we have seen a growing awareness of the importance of preserving large wilderness areas. The preservation of large wilderness areas is necessary if future generations are to enjoy the beauty of this great country. In my State of New Jersey we are particularly attuned to the need for preservation. We have the most densely populated State in the Nation yet two-thirds of our land is vacant.

The attempt to preserve the New Jersey pinelands represents an important step in maintaining an important resource both to the people of our State and to people throughout the Nation.

The value of these resources cannot completely be expressed, though, through the abstract debate and discussions that take place in Congress. Sometimes a letter from a constituent does more to express the importance of preservation than all the abstract theories one hears.

The following is an excerpt from a constituent letter concerning the Pine Barrens which so well conveys the image and aura of that area:

EXCERPT

Sunday I canoed in the Jersey Pine Barrens. For six delightful hours I was in another world, a natural world. There were no roads, no cars, no trucks, no buildings of any kind, no telephone lines or power lines, not even a transistor radio. There were no power boats. Power boats and fallen logs are incompatible. Canoes are different. It was fun to duck under a log only 14 inches above the water's surface or pull and lift the canoe over the logs that couldn't be ducked. While on the river I saw no one except my fellow paddlers.

We paddled quietly on the narrow, winding, coffee-brown stream. Sunlight filtered

through the branches overhead. Patches of wild blue iris appeared where there were breaks in the vegetation overflowing the banks. Blueberry bushes loaded with ripening fruit leaned out over the water. Yellow water lilies were in bloom. In mid-afternoon we found an inviting spot and stopped for a swim.

A trip in the Pine Barrens is to my life what yeast is to bread making. It transforms the quality of the whole. And it makes me aware of the importance of preserving wilderness areas not only in our own Pine Barrens but also in far away places where I have never been. For the opportunity to experience wilderness is a necessity in any life concept that sees people as more than cogs in the big economic machine.

Not everyone will choose to get away from pavement and transistor radios for a day. Not everyone will visit the great wilderness areas of Alaska or go canoeing in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area of Minnesota. But if such areas don't exist, if they are not protected from development there will be no choice. The staff of life will have lost its leaven.

Although I may never hear the cry of a loon on a Minnesota lake or the song of a wolf in Alaska, I will have a choice. And so will my children and children yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, nothing more need be said. ●

INSURANCE REDLINING IN QUEENS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are taking up the Community Development bill. Before we begin debate, I would like to point out the existence and extent of insurance redlining in Queens, N.Y., where my district is located.

A study recently released by the Department of Housing and Urban Development concludes that throughout the Nation insurance redlining is widely practiced by insurers. Redlining is the refusal of private insurance underwriters to insure buildings in certain neighborhoods, or even in entire cities. Moreover, mortgage redlining is linked to insurance redlining, in that the inability to purchase insurance in the voluntary market is used as a reason to deny loans. In combination, mortgage and insurance redlining spread urban blight. An area designated by the private sector as being in transition is discriminated against in the insurance industry. Thus, the continuation of its transition until the area becomes an urban wasteland is guaranteed.

Many decent risks, who are denied access to insurance in the voluntary market and so must seek protection under the Fair Access to Insurance Requirements—the so-called FAIR plans, are treated as second-class consumers. In New York State, FAIR plans cost from 3 to 5 times the cost of insurance in the voluntary market. As the cost of this protection is so high, many inner-city property owners buy insufficient coverage or buy no protection at all. In the event of fire, chances are slim that their buildings will be restored. Losses

under the FAIR plans of some States are adjusted on the basis of market value, rather than replacement cost. Given appraisal practices and the unavailability of mortgage loans in the inner city, the market value of inner-city property has nosedived. Thus, claims payments under the FAIR plans are often insufficient to rebuild after losses. As a result of these conditions, the odds are that a building lost to fire will be abandoned, rather than restored.

Redlining has a definite racial component. In Queens, N.Y., the FAIR plan policies are concentrated in the southern neighborhoods of the borough, which also have the largest nonwhite populations. The percentage of residential buildings in the entire borough which are insured under the New York State FAIR plan is 2 percent. St. Albans is a black middle-class neighborhood in which 6.9 percent of all residential structures fall under the FAIR plan. This area of Queens is 95 percent nonwhite, and in 1969 it had a median income of \$11,282. In contrast, Cambria Heights is a racially integrated middle-class neighborhood also in Queens. In 1969 this neighborhood had a median income of \$12,960 and was 43 percent nonwhite. The level of FAIR plan writing in Cambria Heights is less than 2 percent. Another black neighborhood in the borough of Queens is South Jamaica. This once-vibrant community is now deteriorating rapidly. The rate of FAIR plan underwriting in South Jamaica is 12 percent. In the totally white middle-class areas of Middle Village and Douglaston-Little Neck, the rate of FAIR plan coverage is negligible.

The Federal Insurance Administration conducted an underwriting survey in St. Albans, Queens, in February 1978. The method of the survey included personally visiting the neighborhood and interviewing the local civic association and various insurance agencies. The examiners reported that St. Albans, a 95-percent nonwhite area, was a better than average neighborhood, in spite of the fact that the percentage of FAIR plan coverage was over three times the average for the entire borough. I quote from the report:

The properties were well-maintained with very few vacant or unoccupied risks. The examiners drove up and down virtually every street in these areas and found only two fire damaged properties—one dwelling and one commercial.

The vacant risks which the examiners observed were scattered throughout these areas and were found to be secured (not open to trespass) and to be well-maintained.

The examiners found no underwriting basis for the insurance industry's reluctance to provide fire insurance coverage in the areas surveyed. They did not find any physical aspects of the properties viewed that would render them unacceptable from "normal prudent" underwriting standards.

In spite of the good condition of the neighborhood, face-to-face interviews with local insurance agencies revealed that the area is experiencing a withdrawal of the standard voluntary insurance market at least half of the agents disclosed that as much as 40 percent of their current writings go either to non-standard markets or to the FAIR plan.

The agents predicted that the cancer would spread. They predicted that the matter would get worse, not better, over the next few years.

If property owners in St. Albans are not able to buy insurance, they will not be eligible for loans to improve or maintain their structures. Prospective buyers will avoid the area, as they will be unable to mortgage homes. Businesses will leave the neighborhood for failure to protect their premises. If property owners are unable to buy insurance, the future for St. Albans is grim.

Since World War II the social history of the United States has been a history of the flight of the middle class from the inner city to the surrounding suburbs. The result is that, except for the commercial districts, our once great urban cores have deteriorated to the point at which they have become the back alleys of America.

Redlining is a major villain in the deterioration of urban America. Redlining is illegal because it violates the liberal, rational values upon which America stands. Those values state that each person should be judged upon his individual worth, not upon some external criterion which is irrelevant to the contribution he can give to society. Yet insurance companies redline by means of ZIP codes. As a result, risks are rejected not on the basis of objective underwriting standards, but on the highly subjective perception of risk assumed for a general geographic location.

America has a job to do in the years ahead. We must rebuild the back alleys of America, our once-great inner cities. At the same time, we must prevent the deterioration of our presently healthy urban neighborhoods. I will not let the redliners turn St. Albans into a slum. As the Department of Housing and Urban Development prepares its assault on redlining, I hope the entire Congress joins me in giving it my utmost support. Let us hope that HUD attacks this cancer in American society with a program strong enough to be effective.●

JEWISH LEDGER'S ANNIVERSARY

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 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 audi-

ence; 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 and the 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.●

NEW PROGRAM: CRIME VICTIMS SUING THEIR ATTACKERS

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the public has long believed that the victim of violence has little or no recourse against the criminal. But the Washington Legal Foundation is attempting to change this.

To aid certain victims of violence sue their attackers, this conservative-supported Washington Legal Foundation is offering the free services of lawyers. It is essential that the victim's rights, as well as the rights of the criminal, are recognized and protected. Already many suits have been filed on behalf of victims, with damages collected.

I would like to call the following two articles to the attention of my colleagues, the first from the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the second from the Salt Lake Tribune:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 2, 1978]

LAWSUITS USED TO FIGHT CRIMINALS

(By Aaron Epstein)

WASHINGTON.—The Washington Legal Foundation (WLF) is beginning to use the weapon of the noncriminal lawyer, a lawsuit for damages, to teach violent criminals that crime does not pay.

In what it believes is the first legal project of its kind in the nation, the WLF is offering lawyers' services free to help victims of violence sue their attackers.

The foundation, a tax-exempt organization supported primarily by contributions from conservatives, has been using its resources to fight government regulation.

Now it is branching out in an effort to popularize the idea of suing criminals.

"The big fallacy in public thinking about this is that violent criminals are judgment-proof, that they are too poor to collect damages from," said WLF's general counsel, Daniel Popeo.

"This is not true. He often has assets—real estate, a car, an inheritance. Even if he goes to jail, poor, when he gets out and takes a job, his wages can be attached. Most state laws allow damages to be collected for as long as 20 years.

"I'm trying to make some good precedents and publish a manual that will encourage victims of crime around the country to say, 'I'm going to sue the SOB!'"

Popeo, 27, who was a Justice Department lawyer during the Nixon and Ford administrations, said WLF would accept as clients the most frequent victims of violent crime—

elderly citizens, teachers, policemen and sexually assaulted women.

Popeo began last week by filing suits here on behalf of two victims of seemingly unprovoked attacks. One of the victims may have suffered brain damage.

"I read in a bar journal that the average mugger makes \$11,000 a year," Popeo said. "That's outrageous. Too often the victims of crimes think they have to settle for plea bargains, probation and short sentences."

Some states compensate certain victims of crime, and individual victims have collected damages from their assailants. Popeo, however, wants to instigate "a wave litigation" that will become "as popular as suing for medical malpractice or for auto accidents."

"Our board of directors thinks that civil litigation for crime victims could become one of the strongest deterrents that the American judicial system provides," he said.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, June 1, 1978]

NEW CRIME FIGHT: SUE CRIMINALS

(By Aaron Epstein)

WASHINGTON.—The Washington Legal Foundation is beginning to use the weapon of the non-criminal lawyer—a lawsuit for damages—to teach violent criminals that crime does not pay.

In what it believes is the first legal project of its kind in the nation, the foundation is offering free services of lawyers to help selected victims of violence sue their attackers—and collect.

WLF a tax-exempt organization primarily by contributions from conservatives, has been using its resources to fight government regulation.

Now it is branching out in an effort to popularize the idea of suing criminals.

"The big fallacy in public thinking about this," said WLF's general counsel, Daniel Popeo, "is that violent criminals are judgment-proof, that they are too poor to collect damages from."

"This is not true. He often has assets—real estate, a car, an inheritance. Even if he goes to jail poor when he gets out and takes a job, his wages can be attached. Most state laws allow damages to be collected for as long as 20 years."

Popeo, 27, a former Justice Department lawyer during the Nixon and Ford administrations, said WLF will accept as clients the most frequent victims of violent crime—senior citizens, teachers, policemen and sexually assaulted women.

Popeo began last week by filing two suits here on behalf of two victims of seemingly unprovoked attacks. One of the victims may have suffered brain damage.

"I read in a bar journal that the average mugger makes \$11,000 a year," Popeo said. "That's outrageous. Too often the victims of crimes think they have to settle for plea bargains, probation and short sentences." ●

A SALUTE TO CLEVELAND'S GRANDE DAME

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take time today to extend birthday wishes to Cleveland television commentator Dorothy Fuldheim.

Miss Fuldheim is the grande dame of northern Ohio.

Politicians from across the State have cringed under her stinging reproaches and basked in her equally eloquent praise.

Her battles for the little man and her

ongoing campaign against bureaucracy and waste in government have earned her the reputation of "Greater Cleveland's conscience."

Her national reputation has been enhanced by frequent appearances on the Johnny Carson Tonight Show. Johnny has described Miss Fuldheim as one of his most delightful guests.

As Miss Fuldheim marks her 85th birthday Monday, June 26, this House should thank her for making all public officials a little more responsive.

The country is better off because of her. ●

THE TEACHER'S VITAL ROLE

HON. JERRY HUCKABY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, because of the national concern over the quality of education our children are receiving today, the dedication of our school teachers is often forgotten. Therefore, I commend to my colleagues the following discussion of the teacher's vital role, written by C. B. Germany of Jonesville, La., a public school administrator:

ANOTHER ENDANGERED SPECIES

(By C. B. Germany)

It may very well be that "teachers are born—not made." Be that as it may, be they genetic or synthetic, they are indeed a unique breed.

Unlike most of the lower animals, man comes into this world knowing next to nothing and must be taught from a very early age. There is a great maxim which says "As the twig is bent, so the tree will grow." The first and by far the most influential "teachers" of all are one's parents—in particular Mothers. And the informal training we receive at our mother's knee may well be the most significant learning of our entire lives. Yet, early in life children are "committed to their formal education in the classrooms of our schools." We all expect a great deal from our schools and teachers and rightfully so. But often we are quick to criticize our teachers not really understanding their plight.

Teachers must warrant the respect of their students, their associates, their profession and their community. Competence alone is not sufficient. The sum total of innumerable lesser attributes may be equally important. Dedication, sincerity, personal concern for and interest in their students, appearance, manner, attitude, philosophy and a sound sense of values are basic to all good teachers. If teachers want their classes to be enthusiastic about learning, they must be enthusiastic about teaching. They should plan their lessons so that they are relevant to the needs of their students, are challenging yet realistically achievable and are rewarding and meaningful experiences. They should continually evaluate their work and never be fully satisfied. They must know that they could have and should have done better and should always plan with that in mind. They may never all be great teachers but in making the great effort they all can become better teachers. Teachers may rest assured that their students will hear them but they cannot be sure that they will understand them. Too often the teacher is accused of "talking over the heads" of his students. This may come about when the teacher subconsciously endeavors to impress the class with his expertise. "Egos have ravenous appetites!"

Teachers should accentuate the positive and think in terms of varying degrees of success rather than failure. Teachers teach far more than subject matter. They are setting examples for better or for worse. The teacher should be compassionate, be fair, be polite, be kind but should not be "used." Students will find the teacher's "Achilles' Heel" and take advantage of him—given the opportunity. This may be attributable in part to overt manifestations of covert apprehension, anxieties and fears, the need of the individual to prove to himself and to his peers that he is not afraid to confront authority irrespective of the consequences. (The psychologist would say this is in reality a sign of insecurity of the individual.)

The teacher cannot tolerate disrespect or insolence or be intimidated but must not react unwittingly and make a bad situation worse. A teacher should never embarrass a student in front of his peers but should take him outside of the class or talk to him after class. The student is then given the opportunity to "save face" and then there will be at least some chance of salvage, otherwise the damage may be irreversible.

The teacher to survive must be an optimist, a mother, a friend, a diplomat, a referee, an encyclopedia, a confidant, have a sense of humor, be long suffering, have an ample supply of aspirin and antacid tablets and last but not least, be a little bit eccentric. (It is expected of him.)

The real miracle that occurs daily in the classroom is that notwithstanding multitudes of adversities and diversities, learning still takes place. Scientists tell us that "seeing takes place in the mind, not the eye." Likewise, learning takes place in the mind, not the classroom, thank goodness. How often the teacher says to the student, "Think!" as if upon command certain mental processes will be stimulated and the desired results will be forthcoming, instantaneously. Would that it were so!

In most every classroom we find one or more individuals who are there for reasons other than learning. They are constantly in competition with the teacher for the attention of the learners. They are the source of many of the disciplinary problems and yet they are indulged and tolerated. All teachers face this dilemma, yet manage to meet the challenge, rise above it and maintain effectiveness in the classroom.

Too often teachers see, but do not see, hear but do not hear, for perhaps many reasons. Might it be to keep from becoming involved? Cheating takes place and the teacher rationalizes: "They are only hurting themselves." It is so common place at any and all levels that it must not even be considered immoral by most students. Debauchery and immorality are taught—by default.

There seems to be an awakening in the classrooms of America to the realization that there is a need to return to the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic. Hopefully, there will be a return to such basics as honor, virtue, decency, respect, reverence and truth.

Through the ages man's destiny has been shaped in great part by his teachers. What an awesome responsibility! Teaching, a most noble profession, is, like virtue, its own reward! ●

LET THERE BE STABLE PRICES, AND
LET IT BEGIN WITH ME

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Steven Zats, a constituent of mine from Broom-

all, Pa., has offered an excellent suggestion for beginning the Congress attack on inflation. I endorse his suggestion as a good first step.

Often, Members of Congress give long-winded speeches about the problems we face, such as worker safety, discrimination in employment, and inflation. A law is enacted and the press releases go out. Yet in the fine print, there often appears an exemption for the Congress. The inflation problem is no exception. At the same time we call for sacrifices on wage settlements, we insulate ourselves from inflation with generous pay raises and cost-of-living increments.

Mr. Speaker, I say that it is time that our colleagues set an example. Mr. Zats has done research which indicates that certain pay cuts would add up to more

than small change. Perhaps our example could snowball; millions of dollars in savings would become billions of dollars.

I would like to share an excerpt of Mr. Zats' letter and table on cost savings because I believe it merits the attention of the Congress:

Congressman ROBERT EDGAR,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDGAR: With double-digit inflation coming upon us, some drastic acts need be, and are being, taken. Somebody, I believe it was Ralph Nader, suggested that President Carter take a cut in pay to set an example for the businesses that Carter was asking to take cuts in pay. I, too, feel the same way. I have proposed a pay cut scale for members of the Federal Government which could cut the expenses of the taxpayers by more than \$13 million. Some of

the pay cuts are rather drastic so I also feel that the limit on outside earnings for House and Senate members be dropped since, in my opinion, this is an obstruction of one of the basic freedoms that our forefathers bequeathed us in the Constitution. I realize that you gave your additional earnings after the last pay raise to charity. However, this does not stop inflation, even though it was a very generous thing to do. Enclosed please find my proposal for the three branches of government. For most of the different occupations, I listed the amount of people employed under that particular occupation and calculated the amount of money to be saved. Other jobs I did not know the employment level and thus could only propose a pay cut but not a total savings. Please examine this carefully. I realize that there are many more important things going on at this time.

Yours truly,

Mr. STEVEN ZATS.

PAY CUT PROPOSAL BY STEVE ZATS

Occupation	Number employed	Present pay	Proposed pay	Total	Occupation	Number employed	Present pay	Proposed pay	Total
President.....	1	\$200,000	\$160,000	\$40,000	Comptroller General.....	1	60,000	48,000	12,000
Vice President.....	1	75,000	58,000	17,000	Hear's of other legislative agencies.....		53,000	42,000	
Cabinet members.....	12	66,000	50,000	192,000	Total legislative branch savings.....				6,791,500
Cabinet-level members.....	5	66,000	50,000	80,000					
Other top executive positions:					Chief Justice.....	1	75,000	58,000	17,000
Level I.....		66,000	50,000		Associate Justices.....	8	72,000	55,000	136,000
Level II.....		60,000	48,000		U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.....	5	57,500	45,000	62,500
Level III.....		57,000	45,000		U.S. Court of Claims.....	6	57,500	45,000	75,000
Level IV.....		53,000	42,000		U.S. Customs Court.....	9	54,500	43,000	103,500
Level V.....		49,000	40,000		U.S. Tax Court.....	15	54,500	43,000	172,500
Total executive branch savings.....				329,000	U.S. Court of Appeals.....	88	57,500	45,000	1,100,000
Speaker of the House.....	1	75,000	58,000	17,000	U.S. district courts.....	379	54,500	43,000	4,358,500
President pro tempore.....	1	65,000	50,000	15,000	U.S. territorial district courts.....	6	54,500	43,000	69,000
Majority/minority leaders.....	4	65,000	50,000	60,000	Total judicial branch savings.....				6,094,000
Members of Congress.....	535	57,500	45,000	6,687,500	Grand total.....				13,214,500

IMPRESSIONS OF U.N. SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to visit the U.N.'s Special Session on Disarmament for the second time in as many weeks. The impressions I have gained during my visit might be of interest to my colleagues; therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to share them.

All of the participants I had an opportunity to visit with share the opinion that the SSOD will provide little real immediate movement toward world disarmament. However, they all agreed that the SSOD is providing an excellent opportunity for Third World nations to experience firsthand the difficulties involved in negotiations of this type.

One of the main feelings Third World nations have expressed at the SSOD is frustration over the slow speed of the United States-U.S.S.R. SALT negotiations and the limited scope of those talks. Since it is obvious that in order for the SALT negotiations to be successful, they must remain on a bilateral basis. There is little hope that other nations will ever be invited to join in the negotiations. While the basic frustrations of the Third World nations over

the SALT negotiations will remain, they are learning through participation in the SSOD the extreme difficulty involved in any such negotiations. Hopefully, this new knowledge will lead to a new understanding of the problems facing the United States and the U.S.S.R. in reaching a SALT agreement.

There was some discussion at the SSOD that another special session should be scheduled some time in the future, perhaps 3 or 4 years from now. This second special session would serve the dual purpose of reviewing the progress made since the first session and possibly further efforts toward world disarmament. I believe such a move would be useful in order to continue the advances made at the U.N. in the last 5 weeks.

It is too early to determine the quality of any final document to be produced through the SSOD. However, I do not think it is too early to proclaim that the SSOD, while perhaps not everything every participant desired at the beginning of the session, has been a success overall. The governments of the world have been forced to focus on the problems of disarmament. Through this process new ideas and thoughts have emerged, as well as new understandings of special problems facing individual nations. New friendships have been formed by delegations to the SSOD which will assist in any future diplomatic relations between their nations.

One cannot make a thousand-mile

march until he has taken the first step. Perhaps years from now our children can look back to the U.N.'s Special Session on Disarmament as the first step in the long process of, if not total disarmament, at least a beginning of the end to the arms race. I remain optimistic that someday all nations will be able to live peacefully with their neighboring countries. If mankind is to ever know the meaning of lasting world peace, we must develop better understanding of our adversaries. To that end the SSOD has been a success.●

PROPOSITION 13 ALREADY HELPING CONSUMERS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal reports that:

Proposition 13 passage in California is beginning to have some noteworthy effects. Bank of San Pedro reduced all of its consumer loan rates by ¼ percentage point. It said the cuts will about equal future savings for the bank on its property taxes, which were reduced by the proposition.

Is it not amazing, that when Government's burden is eased off the backs of the people, the benefits to the people begin popping up in wondrous and unexpected ways?●

CURB GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT
IN FREE MARKET SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout our country there are many advocates of the free market system in agriculture who are continually working to curb unnecessary and costly Government regulations which threaten a viable agricultural sector. One such individual is Dean Kleckner, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau. I have known Dean for many years, and his dedication to promoting "what's best for agriculture" is unparalleled.

I would like to share with my colleagues a news account of a recent speech given by Dean at the Farm Bureau's mid-year conference at Des Moines. The news account follows:

[From the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman, June 10, 1978]

KLECKNER CRITICAL OF GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT
IN FREE MARKET SYSTEM

Iowa Farm Bureau Pres. Dean Kleckner was critical last week of attempts during recent months to get the government involved again in the free market system.

Kleckner told county Farm Bureau voting delegates, presidents and vice presidents at the Midyear Conference in Des Moines that Farm Bureau sympathized with the American Agriculture Movement (AAM) in that farmers needed higher prices for their products.

However, he said Farm Bureau does not agree with their belief that government should guarantee higher agricultural prices through 100 percent of parity, a formula for comparing prices of agricultural products.

"There are really only two areas we can work in to get higher prices—producing less and selling excess stocks. We don't need and we can't stand government accumulation of surpluses, which we're building back to now," he said.

Farmers, he said, generally agree that government-held stocks depress prices. But one aspect that is not generally recognized is that high price supports help build government stocks, not higher prices.

"Government guaranteed prices at profitable levels will inevitably mean production controls because we will over-produce," he stated.

Kleckner noted that the United States has the capacity to produce too much and is therefore dependent on exports to deplete surplus stocks. But he said there is another aspect to consider.

"When we support prices at a high level, what we're doing is putting an umbrella over other countries' production. They can then sell their products at a price just under ours. They've done it before and they'll do it again.

"That's why international commodity agreements never work. Other countries don't live up to the agreement."

Kleckner recalled that several years ago the soybean support price was lowered from \$2.50 to \$2.25 per bushel. The move, he said, told foreign countries that the U.S. was going to sell soybeans and that they would have to compete with soybeans at \$2.25.

"They couldn't and from that point on soybeans have been the miracle crop," he noted.

PARITY

Kleckner quoted Gene Hamilton, staff economist with the American Farm Bureau, who says "The parity formula has developed

as a statistical device for use in comparing prices and not as a formula for fixing prices.

"In effect, the computation of parity prices reflects an effort to project the price relationships of another era (1910-14) on a mechanical basis with little regard for the changes that have taken place in agriculture in the world."

Kleckner said the parity price concept does not make adjustments for changes in technology, output per farm workers and yield per acre.

The pressure exists today to move agriculture back toward fixing prices through government controls, he said. "I would hope that as Farm Bureau leaders in the county and state we will carefully review our farm policy recommendations this year," he said.

Kleckner stressed the importance of continued unrestricted access to foreign markets and government's role in providing agricultural research, market information, educational assistance and credit programs, among a few. ●

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND AMERICAN
DIPLOMACY AT STATE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1978, the House adopted H.R. 12598, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1979. Title V of this act contains legislation on science, technology, and American diplomacy originally introduced as H.R. 11548 by Chairman ZABLOCKI and several cosponsors, including myself. The intent of the legislation is to encourage the use of science and technology in our Nation's bilateral relations as well as in our policy toward international organizations. The Committee on International Relations in recommending title V did not intend that the State Department should be able to veto proposed activities of other agencies. Indeed, nothing in title V gives State the right to veto such programs. Rather the committee intended that State advise those agencies involved in international scientific or technical programs of their international implications so those programs would be consistent with overall foreign policy. If an agency did not want to accept State's advice, State could appeal to the White House, but this is no different than current practice.

A recent article by John Walsh in Science magazine provides a useful commentary on the current state of affairs in the Department concerning international, scientific, and technological cooperation. Walsh also provides several insights into title V. He properly emphasizes the committee's interest in having the State Department coordinate and oversee activities undertaken pursuant to such agreements. The committee felt that the technological sophistication of the Foreign Service needed to be improved and that the Department's external research program needed to be upgraded so as to improve long-range planning for applying science and technology to foreign policy problems. State needs to assess the opportunities and threats implicit in technological change.

But I do not believe the committee ever intended that the State Department should assume responsibility for research and development in technical areas such as energy, communications, communicable diseases, arid lands research, agriculture, and ocean matters as some have inferred. Rather, the committee report (No. 95-1160) speaks of the need for State to rely on other agencies to manage and operate programs called for under these agreements.

The article by John Walsh is a useful discussion of the current state of affairs in the Department in international, scientific, and technological cooperation and of the ways title V intends to improve that situation. I commend it to all Members' attention:

IS PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION SETTLED FOR
SCIENCE OFFICE AT STATE?

The State Department has picked an insider to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental Affairs (OES) to replace Patsy T. Mink who resigned in April. Although not yet announced by the White House, the choice is reliably reported to be Thomas R. Pickering, a career foreign service officer (FSO) who is now ambassador to Jordan.

The selection of Pickering is said to reflect a considered decision by Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance that what OES needs is a leader who knows the State Department system well and can work effectively within it. The nomination lays to rest, at least for the time being, a protracted insider-vs.-outsider debate over whether the head of the science bureau should be recruited outside to bring strong scientific credentials and reputation to the job or should be a State Department career officer with proven management skills.

Two recent occupants of the OES post, Mink a former congresswoman, and Dixy Lee Ray, who came to State from the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, resigned after relatively short, unhappy periods in office (Science, 19 May). In a 1974 reorganization, responsibility for a number of matters, including fisheries, environment, nuclear energy, and population were consolidated in the science office. The reorganization was designed to strengthen OES, but the bureau has been repeatedly bypassed by top State officials on important policy issues involving science and technology, ignored by the regional bureaus, and consistently been the loser in internal bureaucratic bouts.

It is generally assumed that Pickering would not have taken the OES job unless Vance had given firm assurances that OES would be brought into the policy mainstream and given resources to operate more effectively.

The weakness of OES has long been a worry to a constituency in government, universities, and private foundations concerned with the role of science and technology in international affairs. Among members of that constituency who were consulted or informed about the Pickering appointment, the first reaction seems to have been dismay at the choice of a career officer with no science in his cv. However, Pickering's reputation as a comer in the department and the strong impression he made when going the rounds in Washington to discuss the job appears to have won him wide approval. There now seems to be more general support than ever before of the view that the status of the OES bureau chief among his peers is an essential factor in the standing of the bureau. As one knowledgeable university-based observer put it, "When the foreign service corps looks at this [appointment], it could change the ball game."

OES prospects for a stronger position in the department could be enhanced by legislation recently reported to the House by the

Committee on International Relations. The State Department authorization bill (H.R. 12598) this year includes a section (Title V) sponsored by the committee's chairman, Representative Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), designed to require and assist the State Department to make more effective use of science and technology in its operations.

A key provision mandates that the State Department coordinate all science and technology activities overseas. The bill says the Secretary of State "shall have primary responsibility for coordination and oversight with respect to all science or science and technology agreements and activities between the United States and foreign countries, international organizations, or commissions of which the United States and one or more foreign countries are members."

The Administration has not yet taken a formal position on the proposed legislation, and the Department of Defense (DOD) and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) have expressed strong reservations that State Department coordination could adversely affect their activities affecting science and technology abroad. Negotiations with committee staff on the matter resulted in the inclusion of language in the committee report designed to deal with DOD and CIA objections, but at this point it is not clear how strong or effective the opposition will be.

The legislation is a product of a massive study conducted over a period of 7 years on the interactions of science and technology with United States Foreign policy at the behest of Zablocki. The study, carried out for the committee by the Congressional Research Service and directed by Franklin P. Huddle for CRS, culminated last year in publication of a three-volume, 2000-plus page compilation of analysis and recommendations on the subject.*

The Zablocki initiative is the most vigorous and extended expression to date of a growing concern in Congress about the importance of science and technology in international affairs and of vexation with the State Department for its relatively indifferent behavior on the subject.

The House Science and Technology Committee has been active on a number of international science issues and its chairman, Representative Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.), was consulted on the Zablocki legislation. In the Senate, the chairman of the Commerce Committee's science, technology and space subcommittee, Senator Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill.) is showing a particular interest in international economic implications of technology transfer. Most relevant for OES is the attitude of Senator Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee's subcommittee on Arms Control, Oceans and International Environment, who was author of the OES reorganization measure.

The OES post requires Senate confirmation and Pell's subcommittee would hold the confirmation hearings. Pickering touched base with Pell and apparently made a favorable impression. Pell is said to have come around to the view that an outsider in the top job at OES will inevitably run afoul of the system and that the best bet for OES is to have an insider with a mandate to build up the bureau.

Pickering, 47, seems to fill the bill very well. He has no scientific or technical background, and, except for serving in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the early 1960's in his first assignment after joining the Foreign Service, he has had no real opportunity to learn science on the job. His career, otherwise, could be a textbook

case of an FSO on the fast track of early promotion and assignments that cause State Department careers to prosper. By 1967 he was deputy chief of mission in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. He then returned to Washington to be deputy director of the Bureau of Political and Military Affairs from 1969 to 1973 and then a special assistant to the Secretary of State until 1974 when he went to Amman as ambassador. Pickering is said to be tough minded and very bright and seems to have made a positive impression on key officials he will be working with, including the President's Science Adviser Frank Press.

Hill observers say that Secretary Vance's choice of Pickering gratifies another constituency. Foreign service regulars were aggrieved at the beginning of the Carter Administration by appointments of outsiders to a number of top posts in the department. They complained bitterly to Vance that career officers were being cut off from these top jobs with a consequent serious effect on morale. These observers say that Vance more or less committed himself to appointing qualified FSO's when high-level vacancies occurred. The Pickering nomination is seen as making good on that commitment.

The Pickering appointment is a major step in the effort to bolster the position of OES, but only a step. As a long succession of analysts and advocates have agreed, what is needed is not only astute leadership and stronger resources in OES, but the diffusion of sophistication about science and technology throughout the department (*Science*, 8 April 1977). The troubles of OES have tended to restrict the focus of the discussion to the bureau.

The conversion of FSO's at large into a corps of true believers in the place of science and technology in diplomacy will not be easy, but recently there have been signs of recognition at State that such a conversion is required. State Department officials have never argued about the importance of science and technology in principle, but now embarrassing and even threatening events are forcing them to take science and technology seriously in practice.

Two major examples make the point. U.S. foreign policy on nuclear matters, particularly as related to proliferation issues in the 1970's, has been woefully inept and inadequate. The State Department appeared to recognize the issue too late to deal with it effectively. Relations with less developed countries are profoundly affected by technology-transfer and economic development issues which have a heavy science-and-technology component. U.S. tardiness in getting preparations under way for the U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development, scheduled for next summer, is a characteristic example of U.S. failure to come to grips with a set of potentially explosive issues highly important to this country's interests.

The Zablocki legislation takes the broad dimensions of the problem into account. The bill says that the government should consult with industry, the universities, and other research institutions concerned with modern technology in formulating and carrying out technological foreign policy. To do this and to assess the opportunities and threats implicit in technological change, the bill authorizes the department to make a variety of arrangements for research and consultation with individuals and other institutions, governmental and nongovernmental.

To carry out its coordinating role in science and technology activities, the bill foresees the department undertaking an ambitious program of training both internally and by providing opportunities for detached service for department personnel for graduate study in colleges and universities.

The bill would leave the details to the department by delaying implementation for

a year, and requiring the Secretary to spell out by 20 January 1979 budgetary and personnel requirements to carry out the objectives of the bill.

Prospects for the bill will be clearer when the Office of Management and Budget comes forth with the Administration's formal position. The military and intelligence agencies have not commented publicly on the proposal, but are said to fear that the "oversight" function given State might be construed as a "management" responsibility. Congressional sources insist that the committee was generally satisfied with present coordination arrangements between State and DOD and CIA; the legislative history of the bill, both hearings and report, make clear that the aim of the section is to achieve better coordination of the science and technology activities of civilian agencies such as the departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Energy.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy attitude currently is a cautious approval of the general principle of the bill but no comment on the specifics. Much the same is true at State but the department is concerned about the burden of extra work the bill requires of it, and has not yet fully assessed what the implications of carrying out the new duties would be.

On Capitol Hill, the State authorization bill is expected to be acted on in the House by early June. No equivalent of Title V is in the Senate version of the bill. Zablocki and Pell have discussed Zablocki's Title V, and backers of the measure hope that the Senate will accept it substantially intact in the House-Senate conference on the bill.

Whatever the immediate fate of the bill, proponents of science and technology at State have reason to take heart. The problem of the succession at OES seems at last to have been settled. And the signal from the Secretary's office may mean that, on the subject of science and technology, the education of the State Department is under way.●

A NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, global agricultural production walks a precarious tightrope between a little surplus on the one hand and little shortage on the other. The vagaries of man—war, trade policies—and the vagaries of nature—adverse weather and pest infestations—make predictions of future marketable grain supplies an impossible task. However, the demand for agricultural commodities is growing but is basically inelastic. As the United States is the major grain producer in the world, the unpredictability of the world market leads to economic instability and price and income uncertainty at home.

As long as the United States attempts to operate in an essentially free market economy with respect to agricultural commodities, farm incomes and food prices will ride the unstable roller coaster of unpredictable world grain production. Any major disturbance or series of disturbances in the global supply of agricultural commodities would have a direct and immediate impact on the domestic market. Whenever supplies become a little short, the world experiences a scramble for supplies which skyrockets prices;

* *Science, Technology, and American Diplomacy*, three volumes. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

whenever supplies become a little long, farm prices drop just as precipitously, causing an agricultural recession.

Since 1975, total world grain stocks have increased from 126 to 183 million metric tons. Wheat stocks have climbed from 62.5 million tons to 100 million tons. As the demand for grains is largely inelastic, the increased stocks have resulted in a decrease in price. The price of wheat has decreased from \$6 a bushel in the shortage years of the mid-1970's to the \$2 range in 1977.

The United States must develop an agricultural policy which would enable it to sustain and expand its exports, at the same time insulating itself from the shocks of a totally free market situation. A well-managed reserve stock program is the most effective way of maintaining a reasonably stable price level which would be acceptable to both the producer and consumer elements of society. Consumers would be guaranteed an adequate supply of food at a reasonable and predictable price, while farmers would be protected against precipitous declines in income.

A secondary, but no less important function of the grain stock reserve would be the maintenance of adequate supplies to meet famine or other relief requirements, as determined by the President.

Agricultural production in the Third and fourth worlds has barely kept pace with the growth in population, which is greater than 2 percent per year. As a group, these countries consume barely 400 pounds of cereals per person per year, mostly in the form of cereal, rather than of meat. A complicating factor is the fact that increasing affluence causes increasing demand for protein rich diets—thus further increasing the demand for food. However, per capita consumption has been relatively stable for the past decade. This means that improving diets for some has meant worsening diets for others.

Most of the developing nations tend to be close to self-sufficiency in agriculture, as they do not have the foreign exchange to finance heavy food imports. Thus, bad crops in these areas of the world means starvation to the millions of poor people who live on subsistence diets during years of plenty. When these countries do go into the world market to buy food, the wide swings in prices are especially destructive to their economies.

Directed toward famine conditions, emergency food relief would save lives and insure the viability of the local community. Rather than act as a disincentive to local production, the aid would give local governments the opportunity to implement policies designed to increase food production.

The United States would find it advantageous to encourage other countries to develop effective reserve stock programs. As the industrial nations can afford to specialize in agricultural production, they constitute the major exporters and importers of agricultural commodities. A well-coordinated international system of reserve programs would go a long way toward stabilization of the prices of grains and related commodities. Furthermore, if other major exporters

and importers maintained reserve programs, the cost and size of a domestic reserve stock program would be reduced.

Since 1974, it has been the policy of the United States to support a world food reserve. The U.N. World Food Conference held in Rome in 1974 recommended that a world food reserve be established to prevent recurrence of the food shortages and highly volatile price situation of the early 1970's. The United States supported this proposal. Again in 1975, at the International Wheat Conference, the United States reaffirmed its commitment to a system of world food reserves. Later, at the 1975 meeting of the Ministerial Council of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United States outlined a proposal for an international system of reserves.

The United States must develop a food and agricultural policy which would enable the country to profit from its position as the major supplier of grain to the world market, while avoiding the disadvantages of global market forces. H.R. 9573 would provide just such a policy. As the bill does not require the establishment of publicly held grain reserves, waste can be avoided through privately held, frequently rotated reserves. The bill encourages the President to enter into negotiations to establish an international network of reserves. Stable prices will encourage grain exports and, thereby, increase U.S. income.

Regarding the use of a food reserve as a means of disaster relief, we must take this opportunity to act unilaterally and provide an example for the rest of the world. The Third World will see this as an affirmation of our commitment to world peace and human rights. For the right to food is the fundamental human right, as it constitutes the right to life itself.●

TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution enacted on June 6 by the Council of the Township of Upper Darby, the largest community in my congressional district. This resolution calls upon the President and the Congress to maintain the embargo on arms to Turkey pending the outcome of good faith negotiations for settlement of the Cyprus conflict.

By lifting the embargo now, we would be giving the Turkish Government a clear signal that the Cyprus issue is not important enough to interfere with our military and other ties to Turkey. At a recent White House briefing on the Cyprus impasse, my office asked what incentives we could give the Turks to reach a just settlement of the Cyprus conflict once we lift the embargo. The administration responded that once the embargo is lifted, the United States still could withhold security assistance if progress is not made in the Cyprus talks. On fol-

low-up questioning, the administration affirmed its willingness to withhold future aid if the Cyprus impasse is not resolved. If this is the case, then the Cyprus issue is, in fact, important enough to warrant an interruption of our normal relationship with Turkey. If it is logical to claim that we should withhold aid next year from Turkey if progress is not made on Cyprus, it is logical to withhold aid this year. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the maintenance of the embargo and I commend the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Greece has been a friend and ally in combat of the United States for over sixty years, through two World Wars, an intense civil war to hold back communism in the Balkan Peninsula, the Korean Conflict, and is now an indispensable ally and the symbol of democratic government in Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, Greece is essential to the security of the United States and the Free World in the Mediterranean area and is essential for the safeguarding of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean; and

Whereas, Turkey has attacked, seized and continues to occupy forty percent of the independent island nation of Cyprus, by illegal use of American supplied military weapons in violation of the United States Foreign Military Assistance and Sales Acts, and in violation of the NATO Charter and in repeated and flagrant violation of four United Nations Resolutions; and

Whereas, The humanitarian crisis on Cyprus, involving over two hundred thousand Cypriots, now refugees in their own country, grows increasingly more desperate, as the prospects for a negotiated settlement wane and United States foreign policy waivers in the face of Turkey's truculent blackmail tactics; and

Whereas, President Carter has declared that the United States foreign policy shall be committed to the protection of human rights, and he has proceeded to withdraw United States aid from nations which have persisted in violations of human rights, such as Turkey has committed, and is continuing to commit, against the people of the sovereign nation of Cyprus;

Now, therefore, be it resolved:

That the Mayor and the Council of the Township of Upper Darby urge the President and the Congress of the United States to exert their best efforts toward a just resolution of the Cyprus conflict, to apply the principles of human rights and self-determination to the sovereign island nation of Cyprus, to bring about the removal of all foreign troops from Cyprus, to restore the over two hundred thousand displaced and suffering Cypriot refugees to their home, and to restore to the people of Cyprus the right of self-determination; and

Be it further resolved:

That the Mayor and the Council of the Township of Upper Darby urge the President and the Congress of the United States to give generous support to the Cypriot refugees, to continue to support Greece by annual aid authorizations and to continue the embargo on arms to Turkey until such time as Turkey acts affirmatively to resolve the Cyprus conflict by withdrawing its armies from occupied Cyprus and enters into good faith negotiations for a permanent peace treaty; and

Be it further resolved:

That copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.●

POLL SHOWS NEW YORKERS NOT IN FAVOR OF TAX CUT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, ever since the passage of California's Proposition 13, it has been assumed that taxpayers everywhere are in favor of lower taxes regardless of the impact these cuts would have on public services. A recent New York Daily News opinion poll shows that this is not true. New Yorkers, much to their credit, are well aware of the consequences of an irresponsible tax cut. Perhaps the most encouraging finding of the random sample of 1,200 adults is that 62 percent believe that it is more important to improve the physical condition of the city than it is to lower taxes. A mere 28 percent prefer a tax cut under these conditions. The results of the poll, reprinted in full below, reveal commonsense optimism, and willingness to sacrifice that is commendable and worth emulating.

Poll follows:

[From the Daily News, June 19, 1978]

THEY SAY: BETTER TO FIX CITY THAN CUT TAX

New Yorkers are overwhelmingly concerned about the deterioration of the city's facilities such as schools, bridges and trucks and feel it is more important to fix them up than to cut taxes or embark on major new projects.

But they generally are optimistic that the city will be able to solve its problems—with outside help—and that the quality of life here won't get any worse in the next five years.

These conclusions are based on a in-depth random telephone survey of 1,200 adults in the metropolitan area during April, May and June by the Daily News Opinion Poll. Each respondent was asked a dozen questions about the city's problems and its future.

Nearly nine out of 10 of those polled feel that the city has allowed its equipment and physical facilities to deteriorate during the fiscal crises of the last few years. This concern is felt about bridges, schools, parks, streets and heavy equipment.

And despite the tax revolt sweeping the nation, six out of 10 say it is more important to improve the physical condition of the city than to cut their taxes.

By the same six-out-of-10 majority, they feel it is more important to improve the city's physical plant than to give municipal employees the pay raises that they have not had for several years.

An even bigger majority—eight out of 10—think that the city should use its money in fixing up what it has instead of building new facilities such as a convention center. In addition, they feel it is much more important to improve mass transit than to build Westway, the West Side superhighway project.

More than half of the respondents think that New York will solve its problems, but three fourths agree that the city can't do it on its own and some sort of outside help will be required.

Somewhat surprisingly, the older persons polled—those over 50—are more optimistic than those under 35 about the city's future. The older respondents are more inclined to believe that New York will be a better place in which to live by 1984.

Blacks and Hispanics are less hopeful than whites about improving the quality of life

in the city, and are much more worried about the breakdown of facilities or equipment.

For example, 67% of the blacks and 78% of the Hispanics but only 41% of the whites said they worried about elevators not working. And 83% of the blacks and 90% of the Hispanics—compared with 61% of the whites—worry about parks not being clean and burning benches to sit on.

MOST IN THE BRONX

This concern about equipment and facilities being inadequate is much more prevalent in the Bronx than any of the city's other boroughs.

Six out of 10 respondents also said they worry about bridges being safe, a concern strongly supported in a report being drafted by the city controller's office. This report says normal maintenance has been almost nonexistent and there is a "strong possibility of structural failure" on many of the city's bridges.

Broken down by boroughs, the feeling that New York will find the answers to its problems is strongest in Manhattan and weakest on Staten Island.

Similarly, residents of Manhattan are more convinced than those in other boroughs that life in the city will get better by 1984 or at least remain the same. Staten Island residents are the ones most likely to think the city will be a worse place in which to live by then.

Manhattanites also are the most willing to put improvement of the city's facilities ahead of a tax cut, by a ratio of 71% to 19%. Strongest sentiment for fixing up facilities ahead of a city employees' pay raise is the 73% in Brooklyn.

Respondents over 50—some of whom may be paying higher taxes than younger persons—are more inclined than those under 35 to think that a tax cut is more important than repairing facilities. But a majority in each group thinks the facilities should come first.

KOCH IS FAVORED

More New Yorkers feel that the Koch administration will help to improve the city than will either President Carter or Gov. Carey. But only about half say they now think that even Koch will succeed in that undertaking.

The Daily News poll covered persons 18 or older in the five boroughs and Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, and Rockland Counties. Richard F. Link of Artronics Information Systems Inc. was the consultant and helped to analyze the results.

Following are the exact questions put to all of the 1,200 respondents and their choice of replies, broken down by percentages:

In general, do you think the city has allowed its equipment and physical facilities, such as trucks, bridges and schools, to deteriorate during the fiscal crisis of the past few years?

	Percent
Yes	86
No	6
Don't Know	8

When you are in New York City do you worry about elevators not working?

	Percent
Yes	46
No	50
Don't Know	4

Parks not being clean with benches to sit on:

	Percent
Yes	65
No	31
Don't Know	4

Bridges being safe:

	Percent
Yes	61
No	54
Don't Know	5

Being tied up in traffic because of street closings:

	Percent
Yes	61
No	33
Don't Know	6

Do you think the city should embark on new projects to improve its facilities such as a new convention center or should it use its money in fixing up what it has?

	Percent
Get new facilities	16
Fix up what it has	80
Don't Know	4

Is it more important to you to give city employees a raise which they have not had for several years, or to improve the physical conditions around the city?

	Percent
Give raise	32
Improve physical conditions	60
Don't Know	8

Is it more important to you to cut taxes in the city or to improve the physical condition of the city?

	Percent
Cut taxes	28
Improve physical conditions	62
Don't Know	10

Is it more important to you to build Westway, or to improve mass transit?

	Percent
Build Westway	21
Improve mass transit	66
Don't Know	13

Generally, do you think that New York City will solve its problems?

	Percent
Yes	53
No	34
Don't Know	13

By 1984 do you think that the city will be a better place to live, about the same, or a worse place to live?

	Percent
Better place to live	31
About the same	26
Worse place to live	30
Don't Know	13

Do you think that the city can do all that has to be done on its own or do you think that some sort of outside aid is required?

	Percent
Can do on own	17
Outside aid is required	77
Don't Know	6

Do you think the Koch administration will help improve the city?

	Percent
Yes	48
No	29
Don't Know	23

Do you think that the Carey administration will help improve the city?

	Percent
Yes	24
No	56
Don't Know	20

Do you think that the Carter administration will help improve the city?

	Percent
Yes	34
No	21
Don't Know	21

BORO BREAKDOWN

Generally do you think that New York City will solve its problems?

Manhattan: Yes, 61 percent; no, 27 percent; don't know, 12 percent.

Bronx: Yes, 55 percent; no, 29 percent; don't know, 16 percent.

Brooklyn: Yes, 53 percent; no, 37 percent; don't know, 10 percent.

Queens: Yes, 54 percent; no, 28 percent; don't know, 18 percent.
 Staten Island: Yes, 39 percent; no, 47 percent; don't know, 14 percent.●

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the Senate Banking Committee have both recently passed legislation which provides financial assistance to New York City in the form of bond guarantees. The margin of passage was considerable, and shows that both Houses of Congress are sympathetic to the ills which can befall any major city in these times of enormous inflation and an overall shaky economy.

The city of New York has made some major sacrifices to accommodate the conditions set by the Federal assistance in the past and in the current legislation, and we have made some additional giant steps toward setting our financial house in order for the day when outside assistance will no longer be required.

Robert J. Milano, formerly the deputy mayor for economic development of the city of New York, recently spoke before the New School for Social Research of the center for New York City affairs, and outlined some of the courses of action, some of which are already underway, and some which bear the seeds of new and vital programs to stabilize the city's economy.

I commend his remarks to my colleagues who would like to be better informed about the economic problems and solutions in the Nation's largest city:

REMARKS BY ROBERT J. MILANO AT DEAN'S LUNCHEON SEMINAR CENTER FOR NEW YORK CITY AFFAIRS NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

The Honorable Eugene Keogh recently asserted that a distinction exists between a former Deputy Mayor and an ex Deputy Mayor. I disagreed. Unequivocally, I can state that, just like the Gold Dust Twins, there is no difference at all. Whether a former or ex Deputy Mayor, he has doffed the trappings of office and is alive and kicking.

Upon assuming the duties of Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, I discovered that my assignment was fraught with policy questions and few, if any, answers. For a business man relegated to his own devices, however, the work cut out was clear. I would start by viewing the City of New York as an ailing but not helpless conglomerate in dire need of a strategy designed to cope with its weaknesses and reinforce its strengths. Also, I would try to bridge the lessons of the past into the schemes of the present and the future.

Without comparable balance sheets and profit and loss statements, how would one go about the business of making an estimate of the situation.

On one side of a broad brush, the city has been plagued by financial crises stemming from unbalanced budgets; a neglected plant in desperate demand for repair and maintenance; a hideous level of unemployment, especially amongst blacks and Puerto Ricans, that feeds on welfare and gnaws away at

pride; debilitating taxes; exorbitant energy and insurance costs; inadequate incentives to breed entrepreneurs for small and medium sized ventures; prohibitive prices for Government owned land crying for utilization; decayed or declining neighborhoods; obstacle courses in the way of initiating ideas and implementing projects; deficient mechanisms to identify and tap Federal grants; and a disenchantment spurred by discouragement and doubts that the City's government really cares.

On the other side, we could be consoled by mounting signs of economic revival. Whether this upswing can be ascribed to the cyclical healing qualities of an indomitable Metropolis gradually nursing itself back to mental and physical health is a matter of conjecture. Or could it be that Adam Smith's "Invisible hand" of self interest is at work despite years of misguided intervention?

The fact is that tourists are flocking to the city; hotels are full; retailers are enjoying the best sales in years; Broadway is in the midst of a record season; restaurants are thriving; commercial rentals are in demand; new construction, reconstruction and remodeling are becoming visible; and employment is stabilizing after a loss of over 600,000 jobs in less than 10 years.

Nonetheless, a businessman must understand that the city's economic base rests on the vitality of its preponderant consumer market; incomparable financial; commercial, business and communications network; significant manufacturing and construction industries; matchless inventory of management, technical and labor skills; precious educational, cultural and health care institutions; comprehensive transportation, distribution and waterfront facilities; and industrial parks and other usable areas principally in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island.

These are massive assets of immense value and scope far more than ample to sustain a thriving New York and a forceful impact throughout the world. What can be done to accelerate the thrust behind the deployment of these assets? How do we help seed more abundant crops of business and jobs?

The infusion of private capital is the backbone of our economy and the key to long term growth. Witness, as shining examples, the investments announced for the Fisher Brothers, I.B.M. and Chrysler office buildings, as well as the Palace and Commodore Hotels. But while we rejoice in these accomplishments that loom on Manhattan's skyline, the urgency to spread a sense of revival to the other four boroughs weighs even more heavily on our shoulders. Our sights can't be set on anything less than the whole city.

If, then, the application of private resources is circumscribed for whatever the reason, any other conceivable source of capital to fill the gap must be sought and brought into play. This means Federal and State funds and guarantees as well as conduits such as the Port Authority, the Urban Development Corp., the Industrial Development Agency and the TRTA Authority. The mandate is to bring together ingredients, including public-private partnerships, needed to propel profitable, job producing enterprises.

In charting courses toward economic development, what about priorities? At this point in time, the candidates—controversial or not—are mass transit; Westway; the Convention Center; South Bronx; Waste Resource Recovery; Port Authority development of industrial parks; the Battery Park housing project; reductions in business taxes and insurance costs; incentives and tax abatements; consolidation of the City's development components; cutting red tape; business crime prevention; an energy policy; assistance for small business; and the Business Marketing Corporation.

Sixteen priorities? Does this boggle the

mind? Remember that New York's ravenous appetite begs for a big bowl instead of a plate; and that the fruits to be borne may take years and even skip a generation. How do they stand?

Mass transit, the sensitive spine of economic stability, must be required and maintained, not expanded, while holding the line on its fare. There is talk in Washington of changing highway and mass transit formulas in favor of older urban areas. This could bring more than \$360 million a year to add to the improvement of our subways and buses. The announcement from Albany last week that conjured up another \$800 million of Federal, State and Port Authority money for mass transit improvements on top of a pledge to preserve the 50 cent fare until 1981 is as endearing as it is perplexing. Let's keep our fingers crossed while we take a look at this gift horse in the mouth.

Until last Wednesday, Westway was in the lap of the Gods. With the stamp of approval it has received, the overwhelming question is when Westway can be expected to pollinate the City with the jobs and potentially beneficial investments sorely needed to stimulate our economy.

The Convention Center is moving to size resolution with 34th Street as the likely site. Financing should be imminent.

South Bronx Redevelopment plans at long last were unveiled with Washington's still flimsy stakes for this gamble motivated by despair. The economic development portion was first in place. On March 10th it was ready for initial step implementation. If predictions are muted it is because South Bronx is an acid test of what the City's recovery will be all about.

Waste Resource Recovery is an exciting concept whose time has come. If the economics of commercial operations prove acceptable, garbage, instead of a disposal problem, could transform itself into a cost-saving energy and valuable by-product resource.

The Port Authority's proposal for industrial park development in New York City signifies a new, desirable path of direction. The availability of prime industrial property at competitive prices is an indispensable objective. Enabling legislation is in process.

The housing project for Battery Park City awaiting F.H.A. loan guarantee approval tests the old adage about a bird in the hand being worth two in the bush. The issue is whether the City would be willing to trade a "down the road" calculated risk for construction ready to go now. Look around. The City is loaded with birds in the bushes.

A package of business tax proposals was submitted for consideration in January. It called for reductions of \$145 million beginning fiscal 1979 and ascending to \$257 million in 1982 but ran into conflict with the City's Four Year Plan. The tax burdens imposed on business are flagrantly counterproductive and remedies should be pressed even before budgetary constraints permit. In its time, a business restrictive tax dollar seemingly lost will come back to roost many times over.

Testimony was prepared and presented in February to the State Senate Committee on Insurance urging the legislature to amend the Fair Plan in the interest of lower costs and broader coverage. Discussions are in progress with the State Superintendent of Insurance.

Comprehensive recommendations to expand and liberalize incentives and tax abatements, with insights on depressed areas, were put forward in March. The progressive performance of the ICIB and IDA provides compelling reasons for affirmative action in extending inducements without which the initiative for business formations and growth would not occur.

In February, as an initial step, directives to knit together the City's seven fragmented development activities were promulgated. Central control is necessary to insure ac-

countability and maximize results in exploiting industrial and commercial development opportunities of any size. Additionally, executive orders were recommended requesting all City Agencies to refer economic development matters to the Office of Economic Development for coordination, to appoint a liaison officer for this purpose and to treat inquiries originating from any client courteously and promptly.

The Office of Economic Development provides one stop services to anyone interested in dealing with the City. This not only saves time but also assures appropriate consideration by responsible officials. Red-tape is so ingrained in the system, however, that in early March a Business Improvement Panel was proposed to identify and correct procedures and practices of City Agencies that impede legitimate business activity. To insure a top-level input for sustained effort to effect changes, the Panel should be headed by the Deputy Mayor for Management and composed of the Comptroller, City Council President, Director of Operations, Director of OMB and Director of OED. An illustration is the New York Airways' application for a temporary permit to maintain helicopter service to and from Battery Park. Over 30 days of countless man hours involving five City agencies were consumed in frantically rushing to resolve a request that should have taken less than one-tenth the time. And all this was happening while decisions to close down permanently and reduce employment were hanging by a thread.

Business crime prevention is as essential as it is frustrating. In conjunction with the Deputy Mayor for Criminal Justice, 42nd Street West of Times Square has been chosen as a test target area for police and economic development involvement. Crime prevention grants for merchant associations also are in the works.

Because of injurious costs to business, an energy policy for New York is long overdue. A top-level Committee of City/Business/Labor representatives should be appointed and convened to start drafting it without delay.

When one realizes that of the 193,000 firms in the City 173,000 are classified as small business establishments, the importance of programmatic assistance becomes overwhelming. Aside from red-tape cutting, this OED service ranges from locating finances and structuring loans to aiding companies damaged by foreign imports. A thriving small business sector is basic to the City's economy. Every effort should be exerted to recognize its problems and fortify its ability to survive and profit.

The Business Marketing Corporation, a private, non-profit organization, performs as the marketing arm of the OED. This embryonic, national and international sales force has the responsibility for encouraging companies to remain and expand as well as for attracting new business to New York.

After a prospect that his needs have been identified, the service facilities of OED, if adequately staffed to take over, must guide the potential transaction through a maze of steps endemic to packaging a deal. A sale without the capability to deliver is the drumbeat of futility.

There is no doubt but that New York needs a better "mouse trap" to compete with its "friendly" neighbors. As this is being built, a redirected BMC, properly supported by tax levies and private funding, should be out there spreading the Gospel.

These objectives are apparent. But there is an abundance of other less visible, but pregnant, economic development opportunities that have been asking for and receiving attention.

Let's pick some at random.

Commercial shopping areas; merchant groups; critical target industries such as apparel and garment, motion picture, printing, toys, communications, plastics and plating; manpower training and prospective job-

marketing; contract procurement guidance and technical assistance for minority businesses; tourism and conventions; City owned, i.e. James J. Lyons, Spring Creek, Brooklyn Navy Yard, College Point, Staten Island, Industrial Park development; and waterfront, a largely dormant resource, revitalization.

Ongoing initiatives include: corporate retention and expansion projects such as the American Stock Exchange, Pan Am, Ebasco, Ideal Toy, Lane Bryant, Rheingold Brewing, Farberware, Gourmet Poultry, Barnes Press and Comfort Printing; Industrial Free Trade Zone expansion; Red Hook and Howland Hook container Terminals; a space bank for ready client reference to available sites; and Urban Development Action Grants for Zerega Avenue Industrial Park, Brooklyn Army Terminal, Bronx Woolworth Building, Portman Hotel and cogeneration facilities for industries that would be driven out of New York without energy cost reductions.

Others lurking in the wings: Hunts Point Trucking Terminal; offshore drilling support bases; Fordham Shopping Plaza; Pathmark Shopping Center; Coney Island Urban renewal; Astoria Motion Picture Center and SBA 502 Local Development Corporation to increase and expedite loans to small businesses.

Some imaginative ideas? Quincy (Massachusetts) Plan markets for each borough; a study to determine the manpower economics for financing a flannel shirt factory in the South Bronx; a transplanted garment manufacturing center; income for advertising in elevators of City owned buildings; 42nd Street, East River to Hudson River electric trolley; a distribution/trucking facility to ease traffic and costs and, mind you, a Tivoli Gardens.

The business community does not speak always with one voice and should close ranks. Yet, advocacy and policy formulation provide platforms in support of issues of concern or special interest. Some that have been researched: "three martini" luncheons; J-51 loft conversions; tax free banking, State constitutional amendments eliminating prohibitions against gift and loans for job development; the proposed "returnable bottles" law; preferential bidding for local firms; electricity submetering of commercial buildings especially in the garment district; the Music Hall; the National Securities Market—Rule 390; and a National Urban Policy. Economic impact statements tracing the effect of proposed governmental actions, programs or laws on the economy of depressed urban areas should become standard operating procedure.

All this may sound to some as an ambitious undertaking. Considering the City's enormous problems, I regarded it as the framework of an ongoing movement that was being pursued and taken in stride as it was being organized. There is no substitute for energy applied on a broad enough front in sufficient doses in building momentum.

What about the capabilities and resources of the Office of Economic Development to carry forward missions essentially directed toward retaining and expanding employment in the private sector, while promoting an hospitable and encouraging climate for increasing business activity?

My reckoning, for the time being at least, was that the agency staffed, by and large, by competent, conscientious public servants, principally professionals, was prepared to handle the flow of requests for a wide variety of business, financial and development services emanating from the segments of the City's economy. Interestingly enough, this demand spurred with the advent of the new administration apparently because of heightened hopes and aspirations.

As for resources, I estimated the office could effectively carry out its functions and business outreach for fiscal 1979 with an appropriation of slightly more than 1/20th of 1 percent of the City's budget. This repre-

sented an amount 1/4 less than that urged in December by the Mayor-Elect's Task Force on Economic Development. It included recommended funding for the Business Market Corporation, the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the first professionally staffed unit to be organized specifically to search for and take full advantage of accessible Federal funds.

And now, one comment about the status of Deputy Mayor for Economic Development. He should serve as advisor to the Mayor and administrator of the Office of Economic Development. Policy formulation and execution go hand in hand. One without the other would obscure the vision of both.

The policies and actions of the Federal and State governments are bound to play an overbearing role in the future of New York. It is for this and other compelling reasons that we must strive to help ourselves by mustering the means to determine at least a decent portion of our own destiny.

It would be unreasonable to attempt to evaluate the results of economic development in terms of return on investment. However, in the long run, if not short, there can be no lingering doubt but that the benefits will far outweigh the cost.

Unlike politicians, economic development should not be elected every four years. Instead, it should be conceived, structured, supported and institutionalized as an evolving and cohesive process dedicated to the well-being of all walks of the City's life. ●

EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON H.R. 13125

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the food for peace program should not be used as a vehicle of convenience to force a foreign government to comply with a properly motivated directive for a foreign official to appear before a committee of Congress. Under the Wright amendment, the \$56 million in food for peace funds programmed for Korea during fiscal year 1979 would be jeopardized unless former Korean Ambassador Kim Dong Jo appears before the Korean investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. This is the wrong means to achieve a proper goal.

On May 10 of this year during consideration of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1979 an amendment to deny Korea \$56 million in food for peace funds was rejected by a 254-to-146 margin. I voted against the amendment and I find the renewed threat within the Wright amendment equally ill-advised. On May 31, I again voted against a similar measure, House Resolution 1194.

The food for peace program is aimed not at foreign governments, but rather to people in countries where food and fiber are not sufficient. Our farmers are paid in full for crops sent abroad under title I of this program and some of the crops involved for shipment to Korea are grown by Louisiana farmers. It is with their interest in mind that agriculture exports should be continued without undue interference.

Last year I voted to authorize the Korean investigation by supporting House Resolution 252 and I voted to encourage

full disclosure by Korean officials by voting for House Resolution 868. I continue to support the Korean investigation and encourage full cooperation by the Korean Government. If it does not comply with our requests, attention should be given to cutting aid given directly to that government and not punish the people of Korea. Congress needs to find an appropriate mechanism to get full cooperation, but that goal will not be advanced by hurting people who have been our allies or our farmers who will lose these sales to another foreign supplier. ●

ARROGANCE OF CLAMSHELL ALLIANCE ORGANIZERS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1977, 1,414 demonstrators organized by the Clamshell Alliance were arrested during an illegal occupation of the site of the future Seabrook nuclear powered electrical generating plant in New Hampshire. The demonstrators, who were charged with criminal trespass, spent several uncomfortable days in five National Guard armories until being processed by the courts. This year, the New Hampshire Public Service Co. owner of the Seabrook nuclear plant, and officials of the State of New Hampshire offered to negotiate with the Clamshell Alliance activists by providing them with 18 acres of land outside the construction site area on which to have a "camp-in" and demonstration. The Clamshell Alliance gang took this as a sign of weakness on the part of the authorities and have increased their demands.

Manchester Union Leader Publisher William Loeb wrote the following editorial outlining the result of the conciliation effort on the part of the company and State officials. I highly commend Mr. Loeb's column to my colleagues who will doubtless also see an analogy between New Hampshire's efforts at conciliation with the Clamshell Alliance and negotiations in other spheres. Mr. Loeb's editorial originally appeared in the June 14 edition of the Manchester Union Leader:

THE ARROGANT CLAMS

While arrogance would seem to be a contradiction when applied to clams, considering their generally flaccid appearance, nevertheless the Clamshell Alliance apparently has found a way to make clams arrogant.

Their so-called "acceptance" of the so-called Rath proposal actually amounts to a counter-proposal couched in the most arrogant possible terms.

The Clamshell Alliance's press release starts by saying, "The proposal by the state and the Public Service Company of New Hampshire is a clear recognition of the growing strength of the anti-nuclear movement."

Here are just a few of the demands enclosed in their counter-proposal:

1. Flexibility to use land in addition to the 18 acres that is outside the construction zone;
2. Assistance and cooperation for marches and parades onto the 18 acres;
3. Parking assistance from the company and the state;

4. Toilets and other assistance mentioned in the press release;

5. Port Authority assistance for boats. In other words, what the Clamshell Alliance wants is for the state and the Public Service Company to run a demonstration for them!

Of course, this is ridiculous. As this newspaper has said from the beginning, you cannot talk sense to people who insist on saying that the activities of the Public Service Company at Seabrook are "illegal," when the record is perfectly clear that the construction at Seabrook is in accord with all federal and state regulations.

As this newspaper has said many times before, the people composing the Clamshell Alliance are fanatics. They are not interested in the rule of the majority, nor will they abide by the votes of the majority. They feel that they—and they alone—can determine what is right and what should be done and what is good for the rest of us.

In conjunction with these political facts of life and the ever-present potential for violence when mobs of fanatics assemble, be sure to read today's thoughtful commentary at the top of our back page by Columnist John Metzler.

It was a mistake for Attorney General Rath and the Public Service Company ever to make any gesture towards these people. They did it in good faith, but they obviously do not understand the nature of the people who make up the Clamshell Alliance. Good faith is something that the latter do not accept, and reason and common sense are completely alien to their thinking.

This newspaper most sincerely hopes that Attorney General Rath and the Public Service Company will now reject this proposal by the Clamshell Alliance as completely unacceptable.

It is time to get all this silliness behind us and to get back to work to complete the Seabrook facility as soon as possible, so that the electric bills of all of us can drop when the nuclear plant starts producing power.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher. ●

TRIBUTE TO BEN RUIZ

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 29, 1978, my longtime and good friend, Benjamin Ruiz, of South El Monte, Calif., will be honored at a special luncheon.

The occasion in his honor will be sponsored jointly by the Mid-Valley Manpower Consortium and the Mid-Valley Community Mental Health Council, and will be held at the Shamus O'Brien Restaurant in South El Monte.

I am proud to know Ben Ruiz, an outstanding citizen and civic leader in the 30th Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent. In elective office, Ben served with distinction on the South El Monte City Council from 1970 to 1978, including two terms each as mayor and vice mayor. Constituent concerns and community betterment were important priorities to him during this period, as they still are.

His numerous other community service activities include executive capacities in the Boys Club of San Gabriel Valley, We TIP—a program to turn in drug pushers—United States/Mexico Sister Cities Association, the Mid-Valley Com-

munity Health Council, and the Mid-Valley Manpower Consortium.

He is also an active member of the South El Monte Sister City Association. These are just a few of the many organizations to which Ben Ruiz has devoted his time, energy, and considerable talents to help bring about a better community for all citizens.

I know from my long friendship with Ben Ruiz how very much he cares about his community and country. Citizens like Ben are the backbone of our great Nation, the source from which we draw our collective strength, stability, and progress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in this tribute to Ben Ruiz, and to send him, his devoted wife, Connie, and his family our very best wishes on June 29, when he will be a most deserving honoree. ●

BORROWING AGAINST YOUR LIFE INSURANCE POLICY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, an often ignored feature of many life insurance policies is the right to borrow against the accumulated cash values. Historically, interest on these borrowings is charged at a very low rate—approximately 5 percent per annum. A recent article appearing in the New York Times (June 10, 1978) notes the advantages in such borrowing, as it is possible "to scalp 3 points or more by reinvesting the proceeds of a life insurance loan in treasury bonds at about 8.4 percent, or top investment grade Bell System bonds paying close to 9 percent."

Naturally, all good things must come to an end. The industry has put on a determined and highly successful lobbying effort to increase the cost of borrowing. New York, for example, gave insurers permission to raise the cost from 5 percent to 8 percent. Nevertheless, the borrowing rate is determined at the time the policy is issued. Ninety-five percent of all coverage presently carries the old rate, so that it will be years before the change makes a significant impact.

The article follows:

INSURERS GIRD FOR LENDING

(By Richard Phalon)

Life insurance companies are bracing for a new round of borrowing from policyholders hoping to turn a profit on interest spreads. "There definitely could be some pressure for borrowing," said a spokesman for the American Council of Life Insurance. In most states, it is still possible for most policyholders to borrow against the accumulated cash values of their insurance policies at the very low rate of 5 percent a year.

There is plenty of incentive to do so. Interest rates are at the highest level in three years. It is possible to scalp three points or more by reinvesting the proceeds of a life insurance loan in Treasury bonds at about 8.4 percent, or in top investment grade Bell System bonds paying close to 9 percent. Even so conservative an alternative as long-term savings certificates are returning more than 8 percent.

The pattern is familiar enough. In 1974, when interest rates reached a peak, loans

against the accumulated cash value of ordinary life insurance climbed to 8.7 percent of the industry's assets.

That was the highest level since the Depression year of 1935, when borrowings reached a record 15.2 percent of assets. The economy was in such desperate straits then that people were borrowing to keep bread on the table, or because doing so was the only way they could raise money to pay the premiums on their policies.

Now, as in 1974, much of the borrowing seems to be a pure interest play. Yields are still well under the 1974 peaks, but they have moved up to the point where arbitraging policy loans has once again become attractive. The prime appeal appears to be to individuals in high-income brackets, the spokesman for the insurance council said. Interest payments on the loans—as with any kind of borrowing—are tax deductible.

The effective cost of policy loans, according to Walter Cohen, head of the New York Insurance Department's Life Insurance Bureau, can be cut to 4.8 percent if the interest is paid in advance. On participating policies, which pay dividends, the effective cost is even lower. In most instances, it is possible to borrow 90 percent or more of the cash value of the policy.

At the moment, the loan ratio is hovering near 8 percent of industry assets, or a total of \$27.6 billion, about the same as at the end of last year. In general, policy loans tend to move in tandem with the interest cycle. That generalization, however, does not take into account the borrowing generated by minimum-deposit insurance, a hybrid form of coverage also designed to appeal to the high-income individual.

Unlike most ordinary life policies, where the cash buildup is comparatively slow in the early years, minimum-deposit coverage offers a quick scale-up. The cash values are systematically stripped from the policy in the form of loans that help to pay the premiums. The interest payments, of course, are tax deductible.

The industry has put a lot of sales effort into the tax-deductible loan benefits of minimum-deposit insurance, despite some limitations that have been clamped on the tax aspect by the Internal Revenue Service. Most companies until fairly recently had also made a selling point of the low-cost borrowing feature of the traditional ordinary life policy.

Borrowing on life insurance, however, seems likely to generate less consumer enthusiasm in the future than it has in the past because the industry has put on a determined and highly successful lobbying effort to make the cost of borrowing more expensive.

The New York State Legislature, for example, gave the insurers permission to raise the charge from 5 percent to 8 percent, effective last Jan. 1. Between now and next Jan. 1, according to the insurance council, at least 45 other states and the District of Columbia will have given companies in their jurisdictions the same right.

The right to raise rates, though, is permissive, not mandatory. It applies only to policies written after the effective date of the legislation. The higher rates apply only to new policyholders and not to those who bought their coverage during the palmy period of 5 percent money.

"Ninety-five percent of the coverage out there is stuff that carries the old rate," said the insurance council spokesman. "It's going to take years before the change really makes itself felt."

It is hard to tell at this point how many companies will go along with the change. In New York so far, according to the State Insurance Department, only about 75 companies have filed the new policy forms required to activate the higher rate. Most of those companies have gone to the full 8 per-

cent, but some have raised the rate to only 6 percent. "It's a competitive sort of thing," said the Insurance Department's Mr. Cohen. ●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS—VII

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have been pleading the case of Ms. Jo Ann McDaniel and Ms. Katherine Zenz, two young American girls imprisoned in Turkey. The girls are serving long sentences for their alleged possession of hashish. They have now served 5 years.

My efforts, I am happy to report, have not been without reward as I have received heartwarming correspondence from concerned individuals throughout the country. The Turkish Government has contacted me, also, and indirect negotiations are now being conducted in hopes of formulating a prisoner exchange treaty that is acceptable to both nations.

The State Department and the Library of Congress are now in the process of studying both the U.S. treaty with Mexico and Canada and the Turkish Convention with the European Council regarding prisoner exchanges. An evaluation will be made of the provisions, and differences will be determined. From this information, hopefully we will be able to establish a common ground from which to quickly secure the release, into the custody of the U.S. Government, of Katherine and Jo Ann.

A recent article in the Grand Rapids Press, which I am including in the RECORD, sums up my efforts on this matter to June 14, 1978. Please keep in mind that further progress has been made and that I will continue to inform you on this pressing concern.

The article follows:

[From the Grand Rapids Press, June 14, 1978]
SAWYER SEEKS TO PRY U.S. PAIR FROM
TURK JAIL IN EMBARGO FIGHT

(By Tom Limmer)

WASHINGTON.—Concern over the plight of two American women in a Turkish prison may prompt Congressman Harold S. Sawyer to challenge the proposed repeal of a U.S. arms embargo against that country.

Sawyer, R-Mich., said Tuesday the prohibition should be lifted only if Congress is assured that a prisoner exchange treaty between Turkey and the United States is included in the deal.

Sawyer called for the negotiation of such a treaty in a speech Tuesday on the House floor, and Thursday he will deliver that same message personally to President Carter and Defense Secretary Harold Brown at the White House.

Sawyer, said he is concerned about the fate of Americans detained in Turkey, particularly two women who are serving 24-year prison terms after being convicted of conspiring to smuggle 264 pounds of hashish into that country in late 1972.

Joann McDaniel, 33, of Coos Bay, Ore., and Katherine Zenz, 32, of Lancaster, Wis., are "experiencing deplorable conditions with no hope for review of their sentences," he said.

The two women say they are innocent of the charges. Their claims were backed up in a statement to police by Robert E. Hubbard, who was convicted with the women and in whose minibus they were riding when arrested.

The women first contacted the Grand Rapids Republican and other congressmen in November of 1977 when a House judiciary subcommittee on international law began negotiating a prisoner exchange treaty with Mexico.

A member of that subcommittee, Sawyer said he initially contacted the State Department to see whether the Carter administration could negotiate a return of the women to this country.

But, he said, State Department officials have proven to be "at least responsive of all the bureaucrats in the federal government." Nothing has been accomplished since, he said.

The debate over ending the arms embargo against Turkey, which Congress imposed three years ago in reaction to that country's invasion of Cyprus with American-supplied weapons, has given Sawyer the opportunity for which he has been looking.

"At a time when the plea of human rights has become the cornerstone of our foreign policy, I firmly believe it is imperative for the United States to receive strong assurances by the Turkish government that a prisoner exchange treaty will be negotiated and acted upon before any reconsideration of the present arms embargo," he said on the House floor Tuesday.

The embargo has become a major issue because of Turkey's involvement in the NATO alliance. Carter believes it has weakened NATO's southern line of defense.

The Carter administration favors a repeal of the embargo, but intense lobbying by Greek-Americans—angered by Turkey's invasion of Cyprus—has left members of both the House and Senate split on the issue.

Carter has scheduled a series of briefings and meeting with key members of Congress to argue the case for appeal. Sawyer will be part of a 30-member delegation invited to the White House Thursday morning.

Although the prisoner exchange treaty is not on the agenda, Sawyer said he will bring it to the president's attention for discussion.

If Carter doesn't warm up to the idea of linking the two issues, Sawyer said he will offer an amendment on the House floor to do it.

Sawyer's speech in the House came on the second day of live radio broadcasts of the House proceedings. ●

BIG TIME BUSINESS IN SMALL TOWN NEVADA

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, life in American society has been greatly affected by the tremendous growth of Government programs and their attendant bureaucracies. The effects that the burgeoning size and less than personal nature of our Government have produced are in turn becoming increasingly apparent. The following article by Jack Mabley provides a humorous commentary on the type of situation that can arise as a result of this massive and seemingly uncontrolled bureaucracy.

Jack Mabley's story in the Chicago Tribune stresses the need for greater control of Government programs and of

the bureaucracy which implements these programs. Government programs can provide great benefits for the American public. But if they are not well-supervised and conscientiously implemented, these programs are likely to simply become ever-larger money guzzlers whose benefits never reach the American public.

The article follows:

NEVADA TOWN SELLS UNITED STATES A PIG IN A POKE

(By Jack Mabley)

Waterhole Ike, of Golconda, Nev., Social Security No. XXXX has a \$19 tax rebate coming. He doesn't mind the wait. He's drunk as a pig after 10 o'clock every morning.

This is a kind of report to 1,500 stockholders around the country who have a financial stake in Waterhole Ike.

"It all started as a joke," related Mark Cowley, 49, owner of Waterhole No. 1, a saloon in Golconda.

"This is a small town . . . only 45 or 50 people. In our little bar we talk about everything that's going on. We have to create our own entertainment.

"One day eight of us were talking about unions. I told them we should start our own union. I collected \$5 from each guy to start Waterhole Loco No. 3. They made me promise not to bet it on a football game.

"Well, I bought some chickens and rabbits and pretty soon I'd built the \$40 into \$60. Then we read about how the race horse Secretariat was syndicated. I decided to syndicate a pig. I sold shares for \$1 apiece and we bought a young pig and named him Waterhole Ike.

"Word got around and I had to print up 300 stock certificates. The stock was selling so fast I called a meeting to elect officers. I nominated myself president and seconded the nomination with a proxy of a guy who was too drunk to know what I was doing.

"The money got to be too much for the cigar box we kept it in, so I opened a bank account in Waterhole Ike's name. The bank wanted a Social Security number so they could report the interest to the government.

"So we applied for a card for Waterhole Ike and HEW sent one. I have it in the vault here—XXXX

"Then another bank wrote Ike a letter offering higher interest, so we switched. Later they sent him a letter saying he was eligible to borrow up to \$25,000.

"I checked with Social Security and told them I had a friend who was an alcoholic. He really is, you know. I pour all the beer that people leave in their glasses into a big bucket. We have to breed him early in the morning because by 10:30 he's had 2 or 3 gallons of beer and is in pig heaven. The curl even goes out of his tail.

"Anyway, Social Security said my friend was entitled to help. All I had to do was sign the papers. Then I checked with welfare. I said I had a friend who was out of work and had 10 dependents. They said he was entitled to \$633 a month plus food stamps.

"But I didn't apply for either program. Ike doesn't want any government handouts. He's not that kind of pig. He can take care of himself. He's kind of a middle-class pig.

"This is the first year he's had to file a tax return. In '76 he earned \$400. But in '77 he earned about \$1,200. He actually made more than that, but he had a lot of expenses. He's got a pretty fancy red, white, and blue pen.

"He's had to sign a lot of forms lately. He signs them and I sign as a witness. We just had a notary public out here. We put a pen in Ike's foot and he makes a sort of X.

"On the forms that ask his race, I fill in black and white. That's what he is, a black and white pig.

"He didn't actually pay any taxes this year. We went to an accountant and he said Ike was eligible for a credit of \$71 in his

Social Security account and a cash rebate of \$19. He filed as self-employed and an unmarried head of a household.

"Besides the stock sales, he gets an income from stud fees. He's a pretty good stud. He had 25 sows last year. He gets \$25 or the pick of the litter.

"We're having a lot of fun with him. I don't know what will happen next. Even though people want his stock for souvenirs, it might turn out to pay better than General Motors. [Ed. note: What happens next is he'll probably hear from the Securities and Exchange Commission].

"We might come out with a Waterhole Ike T-shirt. Or, if we sell enough stock, we might start a Waterhole Ike bacon factory.

"Unfortunately, all 45 people in town are mad at me because they're afraid Ike will make Golconda so popular that property taxes will go up. My wife Mary thinks I'm crazy but she helps me out a lot."

Cowley insists he isn't trying to satirize society, but he says it with a little bit in his voice, laying on that country "Gee, I don't know what you mean . . ." ●

LEV BLITSSTEIN: A GUILTLESS PRISONER OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again bring to the attention of my colleagues the unfortunate situation of Mr. Lev Blitshtein, who has encountered repeated and unjustified barriers in his attempts to obtain a visa which would allow him to emigrate from the Soviet Union. There should be no controversy surrounding Mr. Blitshtein's application for an exit visa, yet Soviet officials continue to violate his rights by holding this man, just as they do many others like him, an unwilling resident. Not only is this a clear breach of the Helsinki Agreement in which the Soviets pledged to assist in the reunification of families, but it is also a deterrent to the United States' efforts to fulfill our end of the commitment made at Helsinki.

I have recently had the pleasure of meeting with Lev Blitshtein's son, Boris, who emigrated with his mother and sister in October 1975. He informed me of the history of his family's struggle to obtain visas from the Soviet Government, a struggle which has yet to be won.

In August of 1974, the Blitshteins applied to the OVIR for exit visas. After an unusual 6-month wait, they were notified that their application had been rejected for unspecified reasons.

Mr. Blitshtein, whose former position had been that of a chief administrator in the Ministry of Meat and Dairy, began a letter campaign to many different Russian officials in an effort to discover the reason for this refusal. The answer he received was a direct threat from the KGB to cease his letter writing before it became necessary to have him repressed.

His next effort in his endeavor to obtain permission to leave Russia was to request that his family be allowed to apply separately from him. This request was also refused by the OVIR until Mr. and Mrs. Blitshtein agreed to get a divorce.

After this forced separation, visas for the other family members were granted,

and Boris, his mother, and later his sister emigrated to New York.

OVIR officials have recently refused Lev Blitshtein's latest request for an exit visa and have warned him not to re-apply for at least another year. This is an outright violation of the U.S.S.R.'s stated policy that the OVIR will review each visa case every 6 months.

Boris Blitshtein is diligently working in the United States and abroad to expedite his family's reunion. In the interest of human rights, we must assist him in this struggle and I ask for your continued help with this cause by writing strongly worded letters to the appropriate Soviet authorities requesting that an exit visa be issued to Lev Blitshtein immediately so that he can resume his life with his family. Mr. Brezhnev should be made aware that we are cognizant of this violation of the Helsinki Agreement, and that we intend to pursue his cooperation in this particular case, as well as in others which are brought to our attention. I also urge you to write to Col. Vladimir Obidin, chief of the OVIR, to demonstrate your concern for this family and to seek his cooperation in approving Lev Blitshtein's application for an exit visa. I would be glad to provide you with more information about the Blitshtein family, and I hope you will keep me informed of your efforts in this regard.

Your cooperation in this case may well result in the Blitshtein reunification, and I know that the whole family would be deeply grateful for any support you can afford them. ●

"LID ON FEDERAL SPENDING"

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my contention that there are exceptions to be sure, but locally elected officials are usually the ones who are most careful with the taxpayers' money. In contrast, the Federal Government is without question the most wasteful and careless with the hard-earned money that has been extracted from American workers.

An Associated Press-NBC News opinion survey asked, "Are you getting your money's worth from tax dollars?" The highest percentage of "No" answers was given concerning Federal tax dollars, with the lowest percentage concerning local taxes, while the percentage concerning State tax dollars was inbetween.

It just may be necessary to clamp spending lids on local and State government to effectively send the fiscal sanity message to Washington. But citizens would most like to put a lid on Federal spending. They strongly feel that the majority in Congress is unresponsive to their wishes.

I have introduced H.R. 13026. It would put a 1-year freeze on total Federal spending, followed by 3 years in which total Federal spending could increase no more than 5 percent annually. I urge other Members to join me in cosponsoring this bill that would put a lid where

it is most needed—on Federal Government spending.

Two editorials in newspapers published in Nebraska's First Congressional District make strong cases, with excellent reasoning, for enacting spending limitations at the Federal level. Mr. Speaker, I include both editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first was written by George W. Schock, publisher and editor of the Falls City Journal.

The groundswell which has developed on governmental spending at all levels, and for which the vote favoring Proposition 13 last week in California served as a natural catalyst, appears to be taking a rapid turn toward Washington. And we agree with the turn.

If any lid is placed on spending, in our opinion it ought to start with the federal government, where a million dollars anymore is "chickenfeed." Millions here, millions there, with little or no regard for John Q. Public, who has to pay the freight. Although the federal bureaucracy operates like every day is Christmas, taxpayers can quickly tell the bureaucrats that it really isn't so.

The popular expression which handles the situation is "there is no such thing as a free lunch." And it's true.

A state government spending lid would be next in line, in our book, and local governmental subdivisions would bring up the rear—if at all.

After observing city councils, county boards and boards of education in action through the years, we have come to the conclusion that, generally speaking, they are capable watchdogs of the taxpayers' money.

And we figure there are three good reasons:

1. They are responsible citizens sincere in their efforts to provide efficient, economical services.
2. Excess spending hits them directly in the pocketbook, as it does their next-door neighbor.
3. They must meet their fellow citizens every day face to face on a downtown street, or in their place of business or wherever. And they have to answer directly to these fellow citizens for their actions.

That does make a difference. Washington is far removed from the front-line give and take. The irate taxpayer may compose a letter and fire it off to his senator or to his representative. But his chance of buttonholing the politician on his main street generally is remote. And the cutting edge tends to get pretty dull when time and distance intervene.

So let the spending lid start in the nation's capital—where the spending pot bubbleth over and where the inflationary spiral is fueled and fueled and fueled.

The second editorial was written by Don Gillen, editor and manager of the York News-Times.

It has been pointed out in this space more than once that if a spending lid is needed, it is needed at the federal and state levels rather than at the local level.

Various tries at making the federal government hold to a reasonable increase in spending have failed, despite campaign promises by a variety of presidential and other candidates.

While there is no reason to believe this space had anything to do with it (I strongly suspect the passage of Proposition 13 in California as the determining factor), First Dist. Rep. Charles Thone is asking all Congressmen to join him in cosponsoring a bill to put a lid on federal spending.

Thone's proposal would freeze total federal spending at the current level for one year and allow no more than a 5-percent annual increase for the next three years.

He said past efforts to put a ceiling on

federal spending have always fallen short of enactment but he's hopeful "that the mood of the country now will scare reluctant members of Congress into approving a cap on federal spending."

Thone called President Carter's anti-inflation program "a joke." He pointed out that it was ridiculous for the Administration to be jawboning management and labor to join in the fight against inflation when the federal government's policies are the main causes of the nation's spiraling costs.

Should Congress pass and the President sign into law Thone's bill, known as the Federal Spending Discipline Act of 1978, the American public might really be convinced that the federal government is going to fight inflation. Once the federal government takes a firm stand, the private sectors of the economy will be able to feel firm in following anti-inflationary policies themselves.

"Nothing is as powerful as an idea whose time has come," Thone said. "The time is now for a lid on federal spending."

We agree. The lid should start at the top—not at the bottom.●

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to share the results of the 16th annual public opinion poll which has been conducted over the past couple of months in the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina. In my first campaign for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962, I promised to solicit the opinion of my constituents, and I have done so on an annual basis since that first campaign. I have always found this grassroots opinion to be very helpful to me, and I hope that it will be of interest to my colleagues in the House.

This year I utilized a different format which asked nine questions and gave a brief discussion on both sides of each issue. I hoped that this would result in more interest and more informed answers to the questions. I also felt this format would help my constituents to see that there are usually no easy answers to the complex problems which are faced in the Congress. Nearly 14,000 of my constituents took the time to answer my request for their views and many of them also wrote down reasons for their answers. Others let me know of their problems with the Federal Government.

The strongest sentiment in the 10th District was expressed on the questions involving Federal financing of congressional elections and on the controversial Panama Canal treaties. I might add that the overwhelming majority of our questionnaires were returned to me before the Senate took final action on the treaties.

Eighty-six percent opposed the use of Federal dollars to finance campaign elections. Nearly 82 percent opposed the passage of the Panama Canal treaties. This was not surprising based on the content of the letters which I received and the conversations which I have had with residents of my district during the past year.

Opposition to the right of public employees to strike was also strong in my district with 79 percent of the respondents being against their right to strike and 18 percent supporting it.

I was very much interested in the replies to the question of extending the period for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Seventy-two percent opposed the idea that Congress should extend the deadline past March, 1979. North Carolina's General Assembly has turned down the ERA in the past, but it is expected to come before the legislature again early next year.

Of equal interest was the complex question of abortion. We gave the respondents several alternatives. Fifty-six percent said abortions were a personal decision. Twenty-five percent favored an amendment to the Constitution which would prohibit abortions. Nearly 5 percent said it should be left up to the States, while 10 percent picked none of the alternatives. Four percent did not answer. These responses indicate the wide difference of opinion which exists on this controversial issue.

The proposal by the Federal Trade Commission to ban certain television advertising which is aimed at children was the most closely contested with 49.8 percent supporting the ban and 46 percent opposing it.

How additional financial assistance for educational expenses should be handled also received a variety of responses. Sixty-one percent supported the tax credit while 19 percent said no further Federal action in this area is needed. Fourteen percent support the President's position which is to expand the existing Federal grant program. The highest number of "no responses" were received on this question with nearly 7 percent offering no opinion.

Nearly two-thirds—62 percent—opposed increasing the 55 miles per hour speed limit while 35 percent want it raised an undetermined number of miles per hour. A large number commented that they wanted it raised 5 miles per hour on interstate only.

The question of mandatory retirement revealed considerable difference of opinion in the district. Fifty-four percent favor eliminating mandatory retirement while 41 percent want it retained in the law.

The responses and the comments to the 9 questions which I included on this year's survey will be of great assistance to me as I continue to study the important issues before this Congress.

The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

(1) The much-debated Equal Rights constitutional amendment, which proponents say would guarantee equality of treatment between the sexes, must be ratified by three-fourths of the states by March 22, 1979. A proposal is pending before the Congress to extend the deadline for another seven years, because an insufficient number of states have ratified the amendment and some believe more time is needed to gain support for the E.R.A. Opponents argue, however, that the seven-year ratification period is sufficient. Should the ratification period be extended for another seven years—where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	25.17
No	72.18
No response	2.63

(2) A. Some have argued there is a need for a constitutional amendment to prohibit abortions to protect the rights of the unborn. B. Others argue that the abortion controversy should be decided by each state. C. Still others believe that this is a personal question which must be left up to each individual. Where do you stand?

	Percent
A	24.82
B	4.89
C	56.18
D. None of the above	10.10
No response	3.99

(3) In order to remove the influence of "special interest groups" over the electoral process, some believe that federal tax funds should be used to finance congressional elections. Others, however, argue that public financing of elections would constitute an expensive use of taxpayer dollars, that it would foster the majority viewpoint, and that it would force some taxpayers to support candidates with views opposing their own personal beliefs. Should Federal tax dollars be used to finance the campaigns of Members of Congress—where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	11.15
No	86.09
No response	2.74

(4) Some argue that because of the special nature of their employment, certain public employees such as teachers, police and firefighters, do not have the right to strike. Others believe that the right to strike should be enjoyed by all workers. Should public employees be given the right to strike—Where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	18.01
No	79.04
No response	2.93

(5) News reports increasingly highlight the fact that students from middle income families are being left out of student aid programs. Some believe that these programs only aid the poor, while the wealthy can afford to pay the tuition expenses. President Carter has recently asked for an expanded direct federal assistance program to aid middle income families with students. Others have argued that a tax credit, or tax deduction for college tuition (up to \$500 per year) would get relief for financially-pressed families in a much fairer and less bureaucratic way—Where do you stand?

	Percent
A. Tax credit for educational expenses	60.92
B. Direct Federal grants	13.81
C. No action needed	18.78
D. No response	6.76

(6) President Carter has negotiated a treaty with the government of Panama which would relinquish U.S. control over the Canal by the year 2000. The President has argued that the country of Panama can now best manage the Canal, and that such a treaty is necessary to foster better relations between the U.S. and Latin America. Many Americans feel the Canal is a U.S. territory which has been built and maintained with taxpayers' funds and that relinquishing control over the Canal would jeopardize the future national security of the U.S. Should the proposed Panama Canal Treaty be approved—Where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	14.46
No	81.77
No response	3.76

(7) In 1974, a law was enacted which established a mandatory 55 mph maximum

speed limit on all highways throughout the United States. Although this measure was intended to save energy during the fuel crisis, it was later found that the 55 mph speed limit has the added bonus of increased highway traffic safety. Some feel, though, that the 55 mph speed limit is unreasonable, that it is not being obeyed by drivers, and that it places an unfair burden on truck drivers and others who must drive for a living. Should the 55 mph speed limit be increased—where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	34.83
No	62.92
No response	2.24

(8) The House has passed a bill which exempts federal workers from mandatory retirement, and which raises the mandatory retirement age for most private sector employees to age 70. Proponents of eliminating mandatory retirement argue that mandatory retirement is arbitrary, discriminatory and does not allow individuals to be judged on their individual capabilities. Opponents of mandatory retirement argue that it would allow older workers to take jobs from younger workers, and that it might lead to the eligibility ages for social security and other retirement insurance programs being raised, thus denying those who wish to retire at 65 those benefits. Should mandatory retirement be eliminated—where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	54.40
No	41.40
No response	4.18

(9) The Staff of the Federal Trade Commission has recommended that television advertising aimed at children should be restricted, due to its great influence over younger viewers. Others argue, though, that in light of the freedom of speech and freedom of choice that Americans enjoy, it is not appropriate that the Federal government intervene in such a matter. Should the Federal Government ban TV advertising aimed at children—where do you stand?

	Percent
Yes	49.85
No	46.12
No response	4.02

WHEN A NATION'S WILL DIES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not the United States of America wishes to remain a first class power in the world is a function of our will. We have the means to do so, if we care to. It accomplishes nothing for our national leaders to make stirring speeches about the resolve of America if no tangible action follows. In the past few years, it is evident that most of the leadership in this Nation has decided that we have lost our national will. Nationwide polls contradict this and indicate that a return to basic American values with forthright and dedicated leadership would restore this situation. Needless to say, our adversary, the Soviet Union, has not ignored this trend and is exploiting it every day, principally in Africa. If this situation is not reversed, we are headed to second class power status. Mr. Thomas Sowell,

a professor of economics at UCLA, recently pointed out the dangers of this development in a thoughtful "Point of View" item in the Washington Star for May 6, 1978. The article follows:

WHEN A NATION'S WILL DIES

(By Thomas Sowell)

The barbarian armies that finally overran the Roman Empire were smaller than other barbarian armies that had been turned back and cut to pieces by the Roman legions in earlier centuries. The Barbarians weren't stronger. Rome was weaker—and it was self-weakened. Each Roman legion was smaller than before, less heavily armed and armored, and less disciplined. The Roman aristocracy no longer provided officers for the legions. Emperors no longer led them in battle, Roman youths increasingly evaded military service. Rome's enemies could destroy it only after it lost the will to resist.

America's will to resist has also been visibly declining. We have abandoned the defense of American vessels seized on the high seas—both fishing boats and U.S. Navy craft. We have let our once superior military power deteriorate to what we now hope is "parity," as more and more of the military share of the federal budget has been diverted to welfare spending. Rome did that too—it makes politicians popular in the short run. Finally, we have advertised to the world our declining will to resist by turning over the Panama Canal under threat of violence.

A flood of political rhetoric about our "generous" or even "courageous" act cannot conceal the brutal fact of surrender to threats—a fact made plain by Panamanian dictator Torrijos, who went on television immediately after the treaty vote to announce that he would have begun sabotaging the canal within 24 hours if the Senate had not given it to him. We cannot grandly soar above all this on grounds that "of course" the United States could defeat Panama militarily if we wanted to. The question is not our ability; the question is our will. Lack of will defeated Rome, and it nearly destroyed the Western democracies when Hitler began his rampage through Europe in the 1930's.

Numerous probes of the will to resist preceded the onslaught on Rome and the Nazi blitzkrieg. Some of these probes were by small powers seeking small concessions, but what was ultimately crucial were the soft spots discovered by these probes. If we think that the Soviets were looking the other way while we paid ransom to South American countries who seized American fishing boats, while Idi Amin made Carter back down and eat crow, or while we crawled to get the Pueblo crewmen back, we are just kidding ourselves. Perhaps even more revealing was the denunciation and derision that greeted President Ford's attempt to reverse this trend by using troops to rescue the crew of the Mayaguez. Our sophisticates howled down this square man and his square decision, in terms reminiscent of the Western sophisticates of the 1930's who asked, "Why die for Danzig?"

The Senate has said, in effect, that we are not about to send American boys off to die over the Panama Canal. Perhaps that is just as well, if we really don't have the determination to back them up and see it through. It may even be courageous and patriotic for a Senator to put his political life on the line by opposing public opinion, if the public itself will not be willing to pay the price of its desire to keep the canal. But if that is where we are, we need to be told that loud and clear, like a danger signal in the night.

Instead, all sorts of efforts are made to conceal it, with verbal sleight-of-hand about our generosity or anti-colonialism or other such drivel. If our leaders' diagnosis of the public's will is wrong, we need to correct it at the next

election. And if the diagnosis is right, we need to realize that far more formidable adversaries than Torrijos are likely to know it, and that the ultimate cost may be far higher than the Panama Canal.

A post-Vietnam unwillingness to get involved militarily overseas is understandable, as a short run swing of the pendulum. A similar sense of the futility of war overwhelmed a whole generation disillusioned by the carnage of World War I. Young men in the 1930's openly took the "Oxford pledge" never to fight for their country. But once they saw the bombs falling on their homes, this generation vindicated themselves in the skies over Britain and on the beaches at Normandy. But a terrible price was paid by the whole world in the meantime—and it was almost too late. The timetable of a nuclear war may not permit second thoughts.

Once we have traded away enough military technology for social programs, giving the Soviets a decisive advantage, it may no longer be possible to decide that we have gone too far and turn back. If the Soviets ever get the same overwhelming military advantage over the United States that America once had over them, they can unilaterally forbid our development of the needed technology by declaring that to be an act of war. Just as they had to back down in the Cuban missile crisis, we would have to back down or face annihilation.

Mutual nuclear overkill can be oversold as a deterrent to international blackmail. Does a policeman have "overkill" whenever he faces five criminals single-handedly, just because he has six bullets in his revolver? It is problematical whether he can fire them at all, much less fire all of them with deadly accuracy. Nuclear delivery and defense systems, and their ever-changing technology, make the question much more complicated than whether our arsenal could theoretically kill every Russian five times over. Maybe the Maginot Line could have killed every Nazi soldier if World War II had been fought differently, but such numerical calculations would have been small consolation to a defeated France.

Even where mutual over kill is maintained—and the neutron bomb decision (or vacillation) makes that questionable—there is mutual deterrence only as long as both sides have the will to resist, not when one side is repeatedly advertising its willingness to capitulate.●

THE SOVIET UNION IS THE MALICIOUS HOOLIGAN

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has once again demonstrated that it has little intention of living up to the Helsinki Accords signed in 1975 by the Soviet Union and several other countries. Yesterday, after a closed, kangaroo-type proceeding, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were sentenced to extremely harsh sentences for the "crime" of trying to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families.

According to Soviet law, their crime was malicious hooliganism. Webster's Third International Dictionary defines a hooligan as either a "ruffian" or "a person that as a representative of some special interest (as a political or racial philosophy) attempts to override the legal and human rights of other people." I think these definitions accurately de-

scribe the Soviet Government whose actions seem bent on subjecting Jews in the Soviet Union to relentless oppression. Who other than a hooligan would pour boiling water on the wife of Vladimir Slepak (who will go on "trial" in the near future) while she and her husband courageously hung a banner outside their window that said simply, "Let us out to our son in Israel." This hooligan act was committed by Soviet internal security agents.

The irony of this situation is far outweighed by the personal suffering of the Slepaks and Ida Nudel, and all the refuseniks in Russia. These people have applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union and have been refused. As a result of their actions, these people lose their jobs, often their housing, and they become social outcasts under the surveillance of Soviet KGB agents. The Soviets claim that they are attempting to discourage emigration, although Soviet policies actually motivate increased emigration by the same people whose emigration is prohibited. If the Soviet Union can approach the matter of human dignity and basic human rights in such a callous and pernicious manner, with total disregard for an international agreement, it reflects poorly on the entire spectrum of United States-Soviet relations. In order to establish the necessary international climate for a peaceful world, there must be a feeling of mutual understanding, at least at a basic level. This vicious official state act would seem to indicate that at the present time, this basic level cannot be reached.●

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Presidential Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski to Peking marks a low-water mark in United States-China relations. That visit, taking place on May 20, coincided exactly with the inauguration in Taipei of His Excellency, Chiang Ching-Kuo, as the third President of the Republic of China. There can be no mistake of the affront we have delivered to our friends and allies on Taiwan; the failure of this administration to appoint a special representative to attend the inauguration has only compounded the slight.

I fear that the Republic of China is being dealt with by the administration as a liability rather than an asset, and as a tarbaby to be discarded as quickly as possible, rather than as a bastion of progress and freedom in the Asian region. Too often, in pursuit of the near-term tactical advantage, have we ignored the specific long-term interests and the tremendous moral, political, and economic investment which the United States has developed in the Republic of China over a 30-year period. At this point I would like to introduce into the RECORD a recent news release of the Chinese Information Service, which con-

tains the text of a cable sent by the American Chamber of Commerce in the ROC to Dr. Brzezinski on the occasion of his mainland visit. It clearly outlines the stakes involved in maintaining our relationship with the Republic of China, and for this reason I strongly recommend it to the Members' attention:

BUSINESSMEN REMINDS DR. BRZEZINSKI OF U.S. INTERESTS IN TAIWAN

TAIPEI, May 12.—A group of U.S. businessmen in the Republic of China today reminded Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, not to forget the U.S. interests in Taiwan in his forthcoming visit to the Chinese mainland.

In its cable addressed to Dr. Brzezinski, the American Chamber of Commerce in the Republic of China said that normalizing relations with the Chinese Communists "should not proceed unless it is clearly advantageous to the United States, and not at the expense of the Republic of China on Taiwan."

"We believe that these objectives, including the guarantee of adequate protection of U.S. economic interests in Taiwan, can be obtained through effective negotiations," the cable said.

Members of the business organization further believe that Communist China "has more to gain from normalization than the United States, and our negotiators should not hesitate to use this to our advantage."

Full text of the chamber's cable to Dr. Brzezinski is as follows:

"In view of your upcoming visit to Peking, we would like to express the deep concern of American citizens in Taiwan on the issue of normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China. Even though it has been explicitly stated that the purpose of your visit is not for negotiating reasons, we are disturbed to learn that nevertheless this visit is part of the overall process of moving toward normalization within the framework of the Shanghai Communiqué. The only thing which gives us some comfort is that your past pragmatic position on normalization indicates that you are not in a big hurry to upgrade relations with the PRC. We feel this is something which should put you in a stronger bargaining posture, should the issue of normalization be discussed. And because we think that it will be impossible to avoid the subject of normalization, we would like you to have a fresh reminder of the view of American citizens doing business in and with Taiwan.

"First let us give you our position on the normalization issue. We believe that normalization with the PRC should not proceed unless it is clearly advantageous to the United States, and not at the expense of the Republic of China on Taiwan. We believe that these objectives, including the guarantee of adequate protection of U.S. economic interests in Taiwan, can be obtained through effective negotiations. We believe that the PRC has more to gain from normalization than the United States, and our negotiators should not hesitate to use this to our advantage. Finally, we believe that the current diplomatic situation with the two Chinas, although admittedly not too tidy, has served and protected our economic interests well, which should restrain our government from setting early deadlines and pushing to a settlement of dubious value.

"We further believe that the mutual defense treaty is of fundamental importance to our economic survival on Taiwan. In one word, the mutual defense treaty symbolizes stability, the stability we need to grow profitably in our business operations. We submit several points to support this position.

"First, if the defense treaty were to be abrogated, we would be deeply concerned

about the psychological impact on the people of Taiwan. As we withdraw their cornerstone, we would seriously hurt their confidence, possibly cause political divisions, and create a general sense of abandonment.

"Second, the abrogation of the defense treaty would set clear precedent on abrogation of at least 58 other treaties the United States has with the Republic of China. These treaties and agreements concern such areas as shoe and textile quotas, aviation landing rights, tariffs on imports and exports, guarantees of American investments of private capital, safeguards of nuclear material, and protection of American citizens. It is quite apparent that all these are directly related to our ability to do business and survive economically on Taiwan. And any unilateral expressions by the United States stating its wishes or oppositions on these lapsed agreements would not hold water with pragmatic businessmen.

"Third, there is bound to be a regional effect. Japan, with its 'Japanese solution' which recognizes the PRC diplomatically but still deals effectively with Taiwan on trade and investment matters, is strongly opposed to sharing this solution with the United States. It seems that our mutual defense treaty provides them with the stability they require to do business with Taiwan. And the South Koreans feel now no less sanguine about an American military withdrawal from Taiwan and the effect it might have on their own precarious position with the Carter Administration.

"And fourth, what about the Asian view of our national integrity? Again, we believe that Asian stability is dependent upon the American presence there. We already have eroded our credibility through the Vietnam conflict. If we now sell out a long-term ally like the Republic of China, this would be considered to be a deplorable act on the part of the United States. Moreover, other Asian countries would have good reason to doubt our national integrity in any dealings we might have with them in the future.

"Would not an 'informal' type of defense agreement take care of all our concerns? Could we not persuade the Chinese Communists to promise the United States that they will not resort to the use of force in the Taiwan Straits? We merely call your attention to a very recent statement by a high level PRC representative, Mr. Wu Hsiuchuan, who told a group of Japanese military affairs experts that the PRC prefers to take over Taiwan peacefully, but is prepared to use force if necessary. In addition, we call your attention to a recent addition to the Constitution of the PRC, which now states that, 'We are determined to liberate Taiwan.' The choice of the word liberate certainly does imply the use of force.

"One final observation. We regret that your visit to Peiping falls on the same day when Premier Chiang Ching-kuo is to be inaugurated as the new President of the Republic of China.

"We need not tell you what this signals to the people of Taiwan. We thank you for your attention to our cable and hope you will consider it in your deliberations." ●

CONCERN OVER ESCALATION OF VIOLENCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on Irish Affairs I am deeply con-

cerned over the escalation of violence in Northern Ireland.

There is much culpability in this escalation, from the IRA to the UDA to the British troops. The kidnapping of a priest by Protestant extremists was unfortunate but their releasing him unharmed was praiseworthy. However the senseless kidnap/murder of a police officer by the IRA merits the strongest possible censure. Equally as reprehensible was yesterday's killing of three suspected IRA members by British forces, who in their ambush also killed an innocent bystander.

This new wave of violence must be halted before it inundates Northern Ireland with blood. Progress toward peace must be permitted to continue, without the impediment of violence. I call upon all sides to cease all acts of violence. It is a discouraging development which I fervently hope is short lived. ●

MUST DIRTY DOZEN REPORT HONOR AS CONTRIBUTION?

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, winning national awards is not without its drawbacks and dangers.

Along with 11 other of my distinguished colleagues, I was named to the Dirty Dozen list by a—in their own words—"bunch of kooks (that) has named a total of 41 people to the Dirty Dozen and, during the campaigns, has defeated a total of 22."

In studying Environmental Action magazine, which heralded the honors, I find that the article is "a paid political advertisement of Environmental Action's Dirty Dozen Campaign Committee."

I have asked the Federal Election Commission if that is an in-kind contribution which must be reported by my campaign committee. Frankly, that campaign committee failed to officially notify me of my share of the contribution.

Is that not dirty politics? Have these "kooks" trapped innocent incumbents into such illegalities which led to defeat of 22? Those questions occurred to me. Therefore, I have written the following letter which I call to the particular attention of my fellow Dirty Dozeners:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 22, 1978.

HON. THOMAS E. HARRIS,
Chairman Federal Election Commission,

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The June issue of Environmental Action magazine carried an article described as "a paid political advertisement of Environmental Action's Dirty Dozen Campaign Committee."

I was not asked by this committee if I wanted this good publicity and, to date, my campaign committee has not been advised of the cost and/or the value of the advertisement. I have written the enclosed letter to the editors inquiring about the cost of the advertisement which, in this case, would be presumably charged off at one-twelfth to my campaign committee.

My questions are these:

- (1) Is my campaign committee required to report this in-kind contribution?
- (2) How is my share of the advertisement determined, if the editors supply me with the costs?
- (3) What if that contribution exceeds the legal limits of a multi-candidate committee? Is the violation theirs or mine, since I did not solicit the ad, regardless of how grateful I may be.

Sincerely,

TED RISENHOOVER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 22, 1978.

DEBORAH BALDWIN, DEBBIE GALANT, AND GAIL ROBINSON,
Editors, Environmental Action,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MESDAMES EDITORS: I noticed in your June 17th issue a "paid political advertisement of Environmental Action's Dirty Dozen Campaign Committee" which included valuable and helpful information about me.

As I understand the Federal Election laws, my campaign committee is required by law to report in-kind contributions. I have written the FEC directly in this matter.

Since, after publication, a renewed interest in my re-election was noted with good increases in unsolicited contributions, I need to know the cost of my share of the advertisement for the Risenhoover for Congress committee's report of July 10th.

Additionally, my campaign committee would be interested in buying extra copies of this magazine for distribution to my constituents. Would you please quote the prices in multiples of 1,000.

Sincerely,

TED RISENHOOVER,
Member of Congress. ●

SENTENCING OF SLEPAKS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my outrage at the recent sentencing by the Soviet courts of Vladimar and Mariya Slepak and Ida Nudel.

The Slepaks were among the original founders of the unofficial group of Soviet citizens monitoring Soviet compliance to the Helsinki accords. In addition they have courageously led public protests of the repressive policies of the current Soviet regime.

As a result of their activism the Slepaks have been an outstanding symbol for a just human rights policy and religious freedom—in particular Jewish self-expression.

Ida Nudel has been equally vehement and vocal in opposing the Soviet policy. She bravely refused to enter the courtroom yesterday without her friends and had to be forcibly brought into the proceedings.

All three of these individuals have applied for some time to join members of their families in Israel. The Helsinki Final Agreement clearly states that reuniting families is of prime importance:

The participating States will deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family . . .

That they have been repeatedly denied this inherent right in addition to being prosecuted for openly expressing protest is a travesty and an outrage that should not go without a vigorous statement of disapproval from our country.

I am sending the following letter to President Carter urging him to communicate U.S. opposition to yesterday's treatment of the Slepaks and Nudel to President Brezhnev.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 22, 1978.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Yesterday the Soviet courts sentenced three outspoken Jewish citizens, Vladimir and Mariya Slepak and Ida Nudel to exile in Siberia.

I know that you must share my own deep personal sense of outrage at this sentencing. These individuals, who were jailed on charges of so-called hooliganism, in reality have been important voices within the Soviet Union for religious self-expression and individual human rights.

The Slepaks were among those who originally found the unofficial Helsinki Agreement monitoring committee and have been on the forefront with Anatoly Sharansky and Alexander Ginzburg in the "refusenik" movement and openly and courageously displayed their opposition to the Soviet's unfair policies. Ida Nudel has pursued a similar course.

In your telegram to Vladimir Slepak during the Presidential campaign you stated: "I want you to know of my deep personal interest in the treatment that you and your colleagues receive."

I urge you to further voice this personal concern now by formally protesting the treatment of these activists to Chairman Brezhnev.

Sincerely,

TED WEISS,
Member of Congress. ●

SHARING THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS OF GOVERNMENT: ONE MEANING OF PROPOSITION 13

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to the equation of Government: who obtains the benefits; and who shares in the burdens. The Federal budget—the direct expenditure budget—is the principal vehicle for the first; the Federal tax expenditure budget, the tax code, as well as State and local taxes, are the major instruments of the latter.

Proposition 13 in California—the property tax reduction referendum that has sent shock-waves throughout the country—is going to perform one very important service, in addition to its disservices—namely, to raise with particular force the question of how the burdens and responsibilities of Government are being distributed, among social classes, between individuals and corporations, and across the Federal, State, and local levels of government. At the Federal level during the last few decades we have permitted privileges of all sorts to pile up, inequities in the tax system to

deepen and fester, and local burdens to grow to a point where local tax revolts became inevitable. On example drives home the point. In 1967 the tax expenditure budget amounted to \$37 billion; 10 years later it grew to \$114 billion. Today it stands at nearly \$135 billion. This is the budget that allocates the tax credits, exemptions, deductions, preferential rates—namely, the loopholes and shelters—that severely overburden certain groups to the advantage of privileged ones.

Three articles have come to my attention on what is happening in California in the aftermath of proposition 13, that illustrate how unfairly the burdens of Government have been distributed. They appeared in two recent issues of *In These Times*, a new weekly newspaper published in Chicago which is committed to the reporting and examining of news that affects the working class, the disadvantaged, and minorities, and from a perspective that reflects faithfully their needs and concerns. I highly recommend to my colleagues the three articles that follow:

CALIFORNIA IN CHAOS IN WAKE OF PASSAGE OF JARVIS-GANN (By Eve Pell)

"Stop the politicians from going to Paris and Hawaii!" "The politicians put Proposition 8 on the ballot. The People put Proposition 13 on the ballot. Who do you trust?" With slogans like these, fueled by resentment of ever-escalating property taxes, California voters, 60 percent of whom are home owners, swept Proposition 13 to victory and narrowly defeated Proposition 8, a compromise tax relief initiative belatedly devised by a liberal Republican Senator.

Jarvis-Gann will cut property taxes on all real property in California from 4 percent of assessed value to 1 percent. Value will be assessed on the basis of 1975-76 prices. Since some property has increased in value at 20 percent a year, the roll-back means a dramatic additional reduction. When property is sold, it will be reassessed at 25 percent of the actual sale price. State taxes cannot be raised without a two-thirds vote of the state legislature.

THE AFTERMATH

In the aftermath of Proposition 13 chaos reigns. No one can answer the important questions: How many jobs will be lost? Which services will close? What does the vote mean?

Day and night meetings go on up and down the state: administrators wonder how to cut their budgets; unions fight to retain jobs and wages; workers debate whether to accept salary cuts in order to hold onto jobs.

The governor and the legislature must complete a plan for allocation of the state's estimated \$5.8 billion surplus by July 1, the date Proposition 13 goes into effect. "It's complete pandemonium in Sacramento," says Cary Lowe of the California Public Policy Center. "You can't even talk to anyone up there."

It is possible that Howard Jarvis' initiative will be declared unconstitutional. Five lawsuits were filed almost immediately after the measure's two-to-one victory by teachers' unions, school districts and officials, eight counties, and two Sacramento residents.

Among the lawsuits' claims: Proposition 13 denies equal protection of the laws because homeowners who buy property after 1976 will pay more for the same services than those who bought before. Also, the suits claim the proposition is an illegal revision of the constitution, not an amendment, and that it covers more than one subject, which is against California law.

Attorney General Evelle Younger, who won the Republican gubernatorial primary, considers Proposition 13 constitutional and will defend it. The California Supreme Court is expected to act speedily, within a few months. No less than four justices must face the voters in November; their votes will be subject to careful scrutiny by the electorate.

In the meantime, layoff notices keep coming. "Each of you must appear personally to pick up and sign for your pay check on Friday. In exchange, you must sign for and pick up the official layoff notice," says the letter sent to the staff of the Santa Clara County Public Defender's office. In other offices, employees search for their names on computer-printed lists posted on bulletin boards.

Generally, affirmative action has given way to seniority. A Los Angeles survey showed that about 62 percent of some 8,300 laid-off workers there are minority members; about 28 percent women.

While the total rendered jobless by the Jarvis-Gann initiative will probably not approach the 450,000 predicted before the election by management experts at UCLA, the numbers grow daily. Assembly Speaker Leo McCarthy expects at least 75,000 local government employees to be laid off in the next few months.

Services too are shutting down; summer schools in most areas, health centers, new admissions to city hospitals. Freezes on overtime have reduced the hours some public facilities remain open, and the deputies available to staff jails.

San Francisco declared a state of fiscal emergency June 12, giving the mayor and department heads special powers to reduce expenses.

Many community groups that provide health care, legal services and counseling in poor and minority communities must also cut back severely because they depend on federally funded CETA workers hired through county-administered contracts. With the end of county funding, the groups lose their eligibility for CETA workers. Thus Centro Legal de la Raza in Oakland's Fruitvale area will lose seven people, and must reduce the number of cases it can take per month by about 100.

DID VOTERS WANT SERVICES CUT?

Was this what the voters wanted? No one can say for sure, but two differing strains of opinion emerge. According to a *Los Angeles Times* poll, 71 percent of voters for Proposition 13 did not intend to vote for a cut in county services.

"The voters thought they'd have more control over their government and that it would cut out new cars for supervisors and trips to the Bahamas for the mayor," says a nurse recently laid off from San Francisco General Hospital.

But the second view holds that voters really had it in for public employees and welfare recipients.

"The message wasn't just tax reform; they didn't like the public servants," says Emalle Ortega, a lawyer in the Santa Clara County public defender's office. "It hurts that they went to the polls with such vindictiveness. As a single parent with three kids, I'll be hit pretty hard."

Whatever the motivation of the voters, desperate workers faced with layoffs are reacting in different ways to salvage as much as possible.

Some are meeting to discuss the possibility of taking cuts in salary, job-sharing, or shorter work weeks in order to minimize the number of layoffs.

Some want their full pay and normal hours at the expense of others, like the deputies at the San Francisco jails who think social services for inmates can be dispensed with.

Others appeal to the public: 48 hours after Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley announced

that 1,000 police would be cut, the Police Protective League ran a full-page newspaper ad depicting the aftermath of a mugging and asking, "Where will the police be when you need them?"

Still others want to proceed at full staff on full salary with no cuts and run the offices until the money runs out, then simply close the doors.

It appears that non-unionized workers like public defender staffs, county counsel staffs, and county parole administrators tend more toward the voluntary salary cut and shorter work week method of keeping as many jobs as possible. Unionized workers seem less likely to go that route.

An eligibility worker in the Contra Costa County welfare office and member of Service Employees International Union (SEIU), explains her reasoning. Five years ago, she said, when a financial crunch threatened the staff with layoffs, they all agreed to accept lowered salaries. However, full funding unexpectedly came in at the last minute. "Then," she fumes, "management hired additional people, gave themselves an 8 percent raise plus a 5 percent management differential and a huge insurance policy. We remained at the 'crisis' wage. We have no reason to think that would not happen again. We don't trust them."

Workers in her office are demanding that no line staff be laid off, that rules be relaxed so those who wish leaves of absence or part-time work can be accommodated, and that if the pay is reduced, the hours be reduced proportionately. "There are a lot of ways to cut budgets without cutting people," she concludes.

WAIT AND SEE ATTITUDE

Tim Nesbitt of SEIU Local 616 in Oakland says that counties should not act on layoffs until they know what they will be getting from the state surplus. "The Jarvis forces told people that there was enough money at the state level to bail out essential services," he says. "We should keep all our programs going right along full budget in anticipation of the county's share of the surplus."

Nesbitt adds that in the meantime people should press for progressive tax reform.

Frank Gold, a high school teacher in Mill Valley, reflects the position of the California Federation of Teachers; voters protested bureaucratic waste and highly paid managers, he says, but not the cop on the corner or the teacher in the classroom. Therefore, a major effort must be made to trim such items as travel and expenses for administrators, consultant fees, and other similar outlays while maintaining essential services. If, after those things are done, there is insufficient funding to pay for teachers' salaries and run the schools, the schools should not open in the fall until the money is made available.

As response to Proposition 13 develops some coalitions between community groups and unions are being formed in Los Angeles and Alameda County.

Women's crisis centers, health clinics, groups of disabled and elderly as well as those that provide legal and youth services in Alameda County, for instance, have joined with SEIU to form the Labor-Community Coalition for Jobs and Community Services.

Members have pledged that no one organization will compete with any other, and that the community groups will not be pitted against county workers. They have asked for a 90-day moratorium on layoffs, and for the county supervisors to declare human services the top priority for allocation of funds. A demonstration June 13 drew 500 people, who cheered speakers demanding that corporations be taxed to make up for revenue losses. The county supervisors, scheduled to begin budget hearings that day, postponed their session.

School board leaders and labor leaders have proposed a ballot measure in November that would cancel Proposition 13's benefits for business and landlords, but Gov. Jerry Brown opposes it.

Says SEIU's Nesbitt, "We should have had our own tax relief bill on the ballot before; everybody realizes that now. We made a total mistake in California."

SUPPORT GROWS FOR OVERALL TAX LIMIT

(By Mary Ellen Leary)

Efforts to slash property taxes in other states are sure to ride on the wave of victory sparked by the "Taxpayers' Revolt" in California, where Proposition 13—the Jarvis-Gann initiative—won in the June 6 primary by a margin of two to one.

The initiative, which cuts property taxes statewide by an estimated 57 percent and sets new standards for the legislature in implementing it, is being viewed as a "new mandate against politicians and insensitive bureaucrats whose philosophy is 'spend, spend, spend, tax, tax, tax,'" Howard Jarvis said in an election night victory speech.

Jarvis, who with Paul Gann sponsored the measure, said the win was the beginning of a "national campaign against property taxes . . . I am going to do everything within my ability to help people [in other states] get started."

Before the victory, however, organized efforts to ride the tax revolt were under way in at least 30 states. And the man behind much of that movement is Lewis K. Uhler, president of the National Tax Limitation Committee and an aide to Ronald Reagan when he was California governor.

Uhler views the acceptance of the Jarvis-Gann initiative as support for his campaign of several years to reform taxes. "California's response to Proposition 13 has given the tax-cut movement an explosive push . . . Voter power has become a reality overnight. People see they can do something effective after all: They can control government."

"This is just what we hoped for, to make people understand and support our program," he says. The emotional charge from Jarvis-Gann is bringing into Uhler's organization "key political figures with powers in their own states to draft and enact laws." Currently, he says, the National Tax Limitation Committee is involved in tax-reducing moves in about half the states.

In mid-May the committee held its first convention in Chicago. Thirty-eight states were represented and 50 legislators were present. Not only was there a universal commitment to halt the growth of local governments, Uhler says, there also was a consensus that the federal government's tax bite also must be muzzled.

"A new phenomenon has simply burst out, all across the country. A lot of folks will run with the same drive that fueled the Jarvis-Gann campaign here—the same anger at unjust tax burdens, the same annoyance at declining public service, the same frustration at a government that is so big it can no longer be contained."

The Jarvis-Gann style of simplistic slash and roll-back is not, however, the National Tax Limitation Committee's concept of the way to control over-taxation, Uhler says. A far tighter curb on the politicians can be devised with less disruptive immediate consequences. His group aims to fashion a better-structured, long-range mechanism to stop the jack-in-the-beanstalk growth government has exhibited the past two or three years.

Uhler backed the Jarvis-Gann measure as "the only game in town." But he is critical of its broad sweep and its aim at only property taxes. His committee seeks to put a cap on all taxes by holding government revenues, or government spending, at a fixed ratio of total capital in the public's hands.

In general, the aim is to hold government about where it is in proportion to government's rake-off from the money the total public earns. The committee estimates that all taxes today pluck in the aggregate about 40 percent of America's earnings. Other economists fix the sum lower at around 35 percent.

Restraint over future government growth can be achieved, Uhler contends, by fixing a formula into the Constitution.

Such a plan was proposed in California's Proposition 8, the Behr bill, which was rejected by a close margin.

Uhler's committee's hope of implementing something akin to the Behr bill limitations has not been deterred by the Proposition's 13 victory. In fact Uhler expects to work in California in coming weeks to help bring about some new form of restraint on state taxes—perhaps as early as the November ballot.

"It is clear that some clean-up kind of legislation will be needed, once the dust settles and emotions are reduced," Uhler says.

"Oddly enough," he says, "our ideas, which shocked the state and got defeated when proposed in 1973, look pretty conservative today in the context of the Jarvis-Gann hatchet-job. We think there will be a lot of new interest in our plan to curb state government, perhaps in exchange for easing some of the problems caused by Jarvis-Gann."

Coincidentally, some business leaders are eyeing a measure for the November ballot that might tie a government spending curb similar to the Behr plan to a split property tax roll. In exchange for a constitutional limitation on future state tax collections it has been reported that some business leaders would accept a split property assessment roll that would levy higher rates on business and commercial property than on homes.

Were taxes on commercial real estate to be set at, say, twice the rate of homes, the additional money for local governments would ease the gap Proposition 13 created.

Businessmen are studying the move in anticipation of political outcry once it is realized that the larger share of benefits from Jarvis-Gann goes to corporations rather than home-owners.

An analysis by the legislature's budget adviser, William G. Hamm, showed that in the aggregate homeowners would receive about 36 percent of the total tax reductions, and renters about 19 percent, but commercial and agricultural properties (which change hands less often) eventually would reap a total of 45 percent.

Uhler says he believes that a long-range state revenue limitation written into the California constitution might be bartered for new taxes on business property—a politically acceptable exchange if tied to a promise that no new state taxes would come along later to hit business.

It will be weeks before such maneuvers sort themselves out, but the feeling is strong in many quarters that the concept of an overall tax limitation is not dead.

[From the In These Times,

May 31-June 6, 1978]

JARVIS-GANN SMASHES THE STATE

(An editorial)

While many on the left talk about "smashing the state," California rightwingers with considerable mass support are doing something about it. Not by barricades in the streets but by aiming ballots at the power of the purse. The intent of the Jarvis-Gann property tax limitation initiative to be submitted as Proposition 13 to California voters June 6 is to dismantle large sectors of the state apparatus by limiting the tax power and forcing cutbacks on government spending, services, and employment. (See story, page 3.)

It would be a mistake to view Proposition 13 as simply a "right-wing" issue. In addressing itself to lowering taxes and raising income, it involves a popular issue on which the right has adroitly cashed in.

For the left, the Jarvis initiative presents endless ironies, not the least of which involve seeing the right make political hay out of issues the left has long been raising but without anything like the right's boldness and current success.

The left has argued again and again the regressive nature of the property tax.

It has emphasized the inequalities, as between richer and poorer communities, resulting from substantial funding of essential services from that tax.

It has pointed to the fact that tenants (accounting for over half of California's population) in effect pay landlords' and utilities' property taxes through the rents and rates they pay, just as they pay other business taxes through prices.

The left has attacked private speculation and "development" schemes that drive up land and real estate prices (hence property taxes) and squeeze out small farmers and homeowners.

The left has drawn attention to the tax exempt income accruing to banks and insurance companies holding municipal and "redevelopment" bonds, funded substantially by property taxes.

It has pointed to corporate aversion to reducing the property tax for fear of seeing bond values decline and taxes shifted to levies on the income of corporations and higher-income individuals.

The left has been first in raising all these issues, but now watches flat-footed as the right picks them up, runs away with popular support and scores big. But perhaps the supreme irony is that after years of hard work in building an anti-corporate coalition in the movement for Economic Democracy, the California left finds itself aligned with the corporate and liberal political establishments in an eleventh hour effort to defeat the Jarvis initiative.

The left, like most of the people, finds itself caught between the right, which promises lower taxes through cutting back on public services essential to working people, especially the poorest, and the corporate-liberals, who promise to maintain these services but only through rising taxes and eroding working class incomes.

The Jarvis initiative brings home the urgency of the left's formulating a distinctive program of its own that can combine the quest for greater democracy with effective measures for reducing taxes and stabilizing or improving the real income of the majority.

Short of the commitment to building a popular movement for socialism—public enterprise and social control over the price and investment system—there can be no such distinctive left program.

The crushing burden of the property tax on people with low, moderate or fixed incomes comes not from tax rate itself but from the rising values dictated by the workings of the private market, which raises the tax bill whatever the rate.

Maintaining and improving essential services, and the salaries and wages involved in delivering them, require public revenues. But as long as private interests own virtually all productive and profitable enterprise, the revenues must come from taxes. If the attempt is made to shift the tax burden to the corporations and the rich, they will either pass the taxes on in higher prices or take their capital elsewhere. The result must be a mix of rising prices, further income erosion, unemployment, and lower public revenues.

The left can and does match the right in having the courage of its convictions, but

more than the right it must have the courage to face up to the implications of its convictions. As long as the left shrinks from explicit advocacy of and organizing around a socialist alternative addressed to such issues of immediate concern to the people like taxes and prices, it will, as the Jarvis initiative demonstrates, remain outflanked by the right and co-opted by corporate power. ●

SOVIET COMPLIANCE WITH THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has accomplished a rather interesting feat recently. They have acted in such a consistent and persuasive manner in handling Russian human rights activists that the press seems to have lost interest in the subject. But then so has President Carter lost interest in the subject or at least as far as Communist countries are concerned. The coverage of the recent trial and conviction of one activist seems to have represented the peak in journalistic interest. Meanwhile, any Soviet citizen interested in taking advantage of the encouragements provided by the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki accords is immediately arrested and jailed. Special attention and handling is accorded to those attempting to monitor Soviet compliance with those provisions. With emigration severely restricted, those who apply for permission to do so are harassed. If permission is refused and the applicants demonstrate in public they are arrested and locked up for "malicious hooliganism." I mention all of this because I believe it casts doubt on the value of the Soviet signature, and raises some question about the value of President Carter's promise actively to pursue the issue of human rights.

All of this became important when, in August 1975, the Soviet Union and 33 other nations signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Helsinki accords or agreement, as it is popularly known, took 3 years to negotiate and is voluminous and complex. Article 7 of the first section is entitled "Respect for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." It is this provision which the Soviet Union has violated in spirit if not in principle by numerous actions, but especially by the arrest, in early 1977, and sustained detention incommunicado of three key Russian human rights activists. All were involved with the Helsinki Monitoring Group, a unit set up to scrutinize Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the accord.

On May 18, 1978, Yuri Orlov, noted nuclear physicist and organizer of the monitoring group, incarcerated since his arrest in February 1977, was convicted in a hostile and kangaroo-style Soviet court. He was sentenced to 7 years in prison and 5 years of external exile in

Siberia. He is the first of the three to be tried. His crime was to send reports of the Soviet abuses concerning denial to emigrate, forced emigration, religious discrimination, and psychiatric hospital detention to Western journalists and governments. Also charged and awaiting trial are Alexandr Ginsburg, director of a relief fund for political prisoners, and Anatoly Scharansky, computer specialist and spokesman for Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel. Scharansky is charged with treason because a onetime roommate had confirmed connections with the Central Intelligence Agency. His trial is thought to be a test case for associating dissent with the capital crime of treason. If this linkage is effected, a precedent of considerably sinister import will have been made. The treatment of these and other Soviet citizens constitutes a slap in the face to the United States and the other free world nations who signed the Helsinki accords. The Soviets believe that they can take liberal advantage of any agreement they make for the only action the West ever takes is to issue mild verbiage.

How can anyone say that the Soviet totalitarian regime does not have a brutal grip on its citizens? There seems little question but that they have institutionalized anti-Semitism to a fare-thee-well and have planned, set, and sprung a cruel trap on Russians believing in their government's word and signature. Is there any question how very different the United States is compared to the Soviet Union?

On June 5, 1978, I introduced a resolution and statement which addressed this issue. The New York Times carried a column by William Safire on May 29, 1978, that supports my actions. I ask that the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD and recommend it to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1978]

RESCIND HELSINKI

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—"Okay, so our African policy has turned out to be a disaster," says a Carter supporter heatedly. "And okay, we look a little desperate blaming Congress now for constraints that we supported all along. But what do you want us to do to discourage the Russians in Africa—send in U.S. troops? Break off the SALT talks? Blockade Cuba?"

American diplomats who would like to find a way to penalize Soviet expansionism without resort to brinkmanship might consider a proposal that is beginning to be discussed in hard-line circles: the renunciation of U.S. approval of the 1975 Helsinki Agreement.

That misbegotten 35-nation accord, which does not have the force or status of a treaty ratified by the U.S. Senate, marked the high-water mark of Brezhnev diplomacy. The Helsinki "final act" fulfilled a generation-long dream of Soviet leaders: to have the Western nations ratify and implicitly endorse the Soviet conquest of Eastern Europe. The U.S. was roped into the negotiations leading to this Soviet triumph during the heyday of detente. In 1972, we agreed to negotiate toward a European Security Conference in return for a Soviet promise to negotiate toward a Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) agreement, which we believed would have lessened the danger of war in Europe.

Both negotiations began, as agreed. But as the Soviets planned, the MBFR negotiations led nowhere—they are still dragging on hopelessly—but the border-fixing negotiations that the Soviets wanted to succeed were crowned with success.

After conservatives in the U.S. began to wonder about the wisdom of giving the Soviets the border-approval they wanted in return for nothing, the Ford Administration—in need of a summit—came up with a reason to go to Helsinki: "Basket Three," an addition to the accord that promised human rights to the oppressed, human dignity to the dissidents, and a new openness in communication across the Iron Curtain.

Some accommodationists swallowed this line; when hardliners gagged at the empty promises, a final sweetener was put in the deal to convince conservatives that the Soviets would be held to account: a follow-up conference was to be held in Belgrade in 1977 in which progress on the human rights "basket" was to be carefully reviewed.

The Soviet Union began ignoring their human rights promises the day after the Helsinki agreement was signed. Immigration was restricted; refuseniks were harassed; dissidents were jailed in a new crackdown.

The Belgrade review conference which ended a few months ago was a mockery; U.S. representatives whimpered a bit for the record, but the Carter human rights crusade turned out not to apply to Communist countries. Our Executive-Congressional commission fretted and then voted itself a new junket in a few years so the newly hired staffers can fret some more.

What did we get for agreeing to negotiate the agreement the Soviets wanted so badly? Nothing. What did we get for our pains in writing in human-rights guarantees? A horse laugh from Moscow. And what are we doing to retaliate? Just going along with what the Soviets wanted, recognizing the inviolability of their European borders.

We are not required by international law to go along with this charade. Since the Helsinki Agreement is a "declaration of intent" and not a treaty, what a stroke of the Ford pen has done can be undone with a stroke of the Carter pen.

Would this be going back on our "word"? Just the opposite: it would be assessing, as we had promised, Soviet performance on human rights. They have broken their word; therefore, we should notify the world that the U.S. signature is nullified.

A resolution of the Congress asking the President to consider this action would surely cause consternation in the Kremlin. Informal discussions of this idea among NATO diplomats now in Washington might induce a couple of our allies to stop complaining about lack of U.S. leadership and to follow our lead.

The hard-liners know that serious discussion of formal rejection of the Helsinki "final act" would be a bargaining chip itself. Previous U.S. Presidents were able to use the Mansfield Amendment (calling for the return of U.S. troops from Europe) as a lever in getting our European allies to share more fairly in their own defense; in the same way, this President could use a "rescind-Helsinki" action to dramatize to the Soviets that adventurism has specific diplomatic costs.

This is no parlor game: Mr. Brezhnev is proud of the pledge to honor Soviet conquests extorted from the West at Helsinki. And Kissingerians will react contemptuously to a move to rectify their blunder.

But a move to cancel our approval of the agreement that the Soviets have already broken would be legal, nonbelligerent and cost-free. It would send a message to the Kremlin that their continued duplicity will make the "final act" no act at all. ●

TAXATION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE AWARDS

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, today I am sponsoring legislation with Representative TIM LEE CARTER which will amend and clarify current tax law to provide for a permanent tax exclusion for money received in the form of National Research Service Awards. These are awards given by the Federal Government to recognize and support achievement and training in biomedical and behavioral research, operating at both predoctoral and postdoctoral levels. These awards, which are authorized under section 472 of the Public Health Service Act, by title I of Public Law 93-348, represent almost 50 years of congressional support for research training.

The provisions of this program direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make awards to individuals and to institutions training such individuals. In 1977, approximately 9,000 people received such awards, totaling about \$114,000,000 in allocated funds. In return for the funds, recipients are required to engage in 1 year of research or training.

Traditionally, recipients of the awards who were candidates for doctorate degrees have been permitted the exclusion of their awards from their taxable incomes, and persons with doctorate degrees were allowed to exclude received funds to the limit of \$300 for 36 months as a maximum. However, a September, 1977 ruling by the Internal Revenue Service held that all funds allocated under the National Research Service Awards Act of 1974 were and are fully taxable income, which imposes tax liability presently and ex post facto from 1974.

The effect of this ruling is to severely diminish the attractiveness and usefulness of the National Research Service Awards, and to cause approximately 11,500 recipients to pay unexpected retroactive taxes, burdening all past and future recipients of the awards.

It is doubtful that Congress intended the National Research Service Awards to be included as taxable income when the program was established. The IRS ruling puts the Federal Government in a position of giving awards to support research and training and then taxing them away.

This legislation treats the National Research Service Awards as tax-free scholarships or fellowships under section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which excludes such amounts from taxation. Thus, predoctoral award recipients will be permitted to exclude all allocated funds under the National Research Service Awards, and postdoctoral award recipients will be allowed to exclude a maximum of \$300 per month for 36 months. It is the intent of this legislation that all past, present, and future recip-

ients, will be exempted from paying taxes on the above specified amounts.

The National Research Service Awards were established by Congress to aid in furthering research in the biomedical and behavioral sciences. I urge adoption of this legislation in order to demonstrate properly and effectively that commitment. ●

THE DOCTOR'S FEE: THE TRUTH ABOUT PHYSICIANS' FEES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, much of the talk about the rising costs of health care center on the charges by doctors for their services. In a recent article in Private Practice magazine (June 1978), Hans Sennholz, the noted economist, pointed out that doctor's fees really are a function of the marketplace. Doctors deliver a relatively scarce and needed product to society so that their prices are a direct function of supply and demand. However, as creatures of the marketplace in a highly skilled profession, they are also subject to consumer choice based upon their fees and skill as perceived by the public. Thus, there is a self-adjusting mechanism in the equation. A massive infusion of Government regulation, via a national health plan, could control prices, but would not improve the quality or speedy delivery of health services one whit, in fact, it would do just the opposite. The article by Mr. Sennholz follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PHYSICIAN'S FEES

(By Hans Sennholz, Ph. D.)

The hue and cry about doctors' fees conceals a basic economic problem: what determines individual income? What is the exchange value of services we render to others? These questions have puzzled men since the beginning of time.

Throughout the long history of medicine, rulers readily provided the answers and enforced them ruthlessly. They fixed prices and wages, and regulated the rewards and penalties of their medical men. At the dawn of recorded history, King Hammurabi of Babylon imposed his code and inflicted his punishment. The Roman emperors built hospitals and appointed public physicians whose fees were fixed by law. In modern times, the kings and princes of Europe often intervened in the care of the sick in times of public crisis. The absolute state, like the Roman state, assumed major responsibility for public health, and claimed the right to determine individual compensation for medical care.

Only during the 19th century, when political authority retreated from regulating every aspect of economic life, was the physician left free to practice his noble profession.

Contemporary discussion differs little from that of the past. Political authority has returned again to nearly all economic pursuits, and once again is claiming the right to guide and direct the medical profession. The limitation of doctors' fees and income is merely one aspect of the basic issue of our time: the shrinking margin of individual freedom and the growing role of the provider state.

Most people have lost faith in the benefits of freedom. They are convinced that the private property order deprives less produc-

tive people of what is rightfully theirs. The state is the embodiment of morality, which government must impart to economic and social life. Pointing at some real or assumed conditions of poverty, which they misinterpret completely, they are eager to return to the oldest system of all: the command order. They put their faith in political wisdom and rely on legislation and regulation. Government is called upon to meet all the important needs of life.

If government is called upon to subsidize medical services, it must have a voice in the allocation of its funds. The hospital that seeks and accepts public funds cannot seriously object to the wishes and conditions imposed by the donor. The doctor who favors and accepts government funds cannot logically object to bureaucratic attempts at managing those funds. He may argue with government officials about the wisdom and desirability of this or that regulation, but cannot deny them the right to impose their conditions. Similarly, the doctor who readily accepted and benefited from public funds during his years of training cannot be surprised at the public expectation, upon completion of that training, to be favored in return. He owes the public some consideration for the rest of his natural life.

Without consistency there can be no moral strength. The physician must choose between professional freedom with all its ramifications of independence and self-reliance, and the command order with all its implications. In matters of remuneration, he faces the choice between compensation according to contract without government favors and supplements, and the pay allotted according to political merit.

The American system of medical care reflects the fierce struggle between the two economic and social orders. It suffers from all the syndromes of transition from which one or the other order must emerge. The ideological battle rages over such issues as the rising costs of medical services, the soaring costs of Medicare and Medicaid, the rising incomes of physicians and dentists, the different prices charged for the same service, and many others.

In defense of their rising incomes, doctors are quick to point to the costs of the medical service they render. It takes many years of schooling and training to become a doctor. Therefore, so they argue, their fees should be high enough to compensate them for the lean years of schooling and their great investment in time and money.

Unfortunately, the costs of a service never determine its price. If this were the case, other professional groups with more years of training would command higher incomes. The philosopher with five academic degrees, the scientist in a research laboratory, even the college professor with a PhD that took ten years to earn, incurred higher costs of schooling than the physician. And yet they generally earn much lower incomes.

If production costs determined price and income, all businessmen would enjoy stable returns on their investments. But many fail and go bankrupt because the yield does not cover the costs. Costs do not determine the value of a service; it is the significance or usefulness it possesses for an individual that affords economic value. When usefulness is paired with scarcity relative to the demand for the service, we arrive at a certain price.

Let us assume an isolated exchange between one doctor and one patient. The doctor's fee can then be anywhere within a range of value. The upper limit is the patient's valuation of the medical service, the lower limit is the doctor's valuation of his own time and effort. This range usually leaves a wide margin for bargaining. The fee may be higher or lower, depending on which of the two exhibits the greater inclination to bargain.

In reality there is competition on both sides, among doctors and patients. In a competitive situation the fee is established at a point within a narrow range of valuation by all the participants. A uniform or "market price" emerges as a result of countless subjective valuations in a zone where supply and demand are quantitatively in exact equilibrium. Or if we use the traditional and vague catchwords, the price of all goods and services is determined by the relation between supply and demand.

Expenditures for private medical care in the United States rose from under \$4 billion in 1929 to more than \$70 billion in 1977. The earlier amount was about four percent of personal spending, while the 1977 amount represents almost seven percent. There can be no doubt that the American people chose to purchase an ever-increasing amount of medical services. It was this rising demand that caused doctors' fees and incomes to rise.

The supply tends to adjust to changing demand. But it takes several years for the rising demand to effect higher prices and fees, which in turn then tend to induce an influx of additional labor. Schooling and training of young physicians takes time, especially in highly specialized fields. Medicare, which greatly boosted the demand for medical services, came into existence in July 1966. By 1970 Medicare spending was accelerating and doctors' fees were rising accordingly. By now, in 1978, the number of young physicians emerging from medical schools is rising rapidly.

Some doctors are charging different prices for essentially the same service to different patients. Realizing that the amount people are willing to pay for medical care is directly related to income, they are charging higher prices to patients with higher incomes, and lower prices to patients with lower incomes. Wealthier members of society reportedly pay "from five to thirty times the average fee."

Whatever the motivation for such price discrimination, to maximize income or to favor the poor, it is a dubious practice that can damage the physician's reputation in the community. After all, the affluent businessman cannot charge different prices for identical products and services. It would not occur to him to double or triple the price of his merchandise when a physician enters the store. He cannot charge more for his furniture, automobiles, or groceries, for fear of instantly losing his customers. The physician himself, who may be an affluent member of his community, would soon resist such discrimination and seek other suppliers.

We suspect that price discrimination causes doctors to lose more patients than dissatisfaction with their medical services. The intended victims, the more productive people with higher incomes, usually are very quick to detect the discrimination and react to it by patronizing another physician. The discriminator may soon earn the reputation, perhaps undeservedly that he is motivated by financial gain, crudely charging "whatever the traffic will bear." Under that cloud of suspicion, it is difficult to pursue any profession, especially the healing arts.

There are several other objections to price discrimination according to patient income and wealth. Even if it were a sound professional practice, the doctor is prone to make many mistakes. He is not equipped to conduct a "means test." Appearance is deceiving, and reputation may be undeserved. A "pauper" in the doctor's office may actually be a millionaire, and a well-known merchant seeking the doctor's help may face foreclosure. To build a fee schedule on such data is to invite resentment and hostility.

Of course, this is not to deny that there are times and places where price discrimination is in order. As mentioned above, the lower limit of a fee schedule is the doctor's valuation of his own time and effort. The value

he himself attaches to his service does change according to his own circumstances and conditions. His fee should change accordingly. Money that buys health can never be ill spent, nor our labors in defense of freedom for this noble profession. ●

JANE BRENNAN SPEAKS FOR NURSES ON MEDICARE AMENDMENTS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and its Subcommittee on Health I was very pleased to have one of my constituents, Miss Jane Brennan, testify today before the subcommittee's hearings on medicare improvement. Miss Brennan is executive director of the Visiting Nurse Association of Memphis, which is a certified home health agency that was established long before the medicare program.

Miss Brennan also serves as president of the Tennessee Association for Home Health Agencies and is chairperson of the National League of Nursing's Council of Home Health Agencies and Community Health Services. This council serves as the spokesman for 1,500-member agencies, performs an educational function, and attempts to upgrade standards.

As a strong advocate of improved home health care under medicare I would like to share with my colleagues in the House Miss Brennan's statements on behalf of the National League of Nursing and on behalf of the Visiting Nurse Association of Memphis. The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL OF HOME HEALTH AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING

MEDICARE AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Jane Brennan, Executive Director of the Visiting Nurse Association, Memphis, Tennessee. I appear before you today in behalf of the Council of Home Health Agencies and Community Health Services, a national organization representing 1,500 Medicare-certified home health agencies. Accompanying me is Leah Brock who coordinates the Council's government relations program.

The Council commends the subcommittee for holding these hearings and for recognizing the need for improvements in the Medicare program. We believe that the improvements cited by the subcommittee will go a long way to eliminate some of the barriers to the delivery of health services which exist in the Medicare program.

We have confined our testimony to five of the issues outlined in the subcommittee's news release, all of which affect the home health benefit provided under Medicare.

ELIMINATION OF THE 3-DAY PRIOR HOSPITALIZATION REQUIREMENT

The Council supports this recommendation as a cost effective measure.

The mounting costs of health care are well documented and foremost among these is the cost of inpatient hospitalization.

Home health services can eliminate or diminish the need for admission or re-admission to hospitals, or reduce the number of hospital days through early discharge.

The current requirement forces patients who do not have Part B coverage to be admitted to a hospital in order to be eligible for home health benefits. In some areas of the country this can mean utilizing a \$250 per day service for three days to establish eligibility for a \$25 per day service.

This requirement is restrictive in another way. The home health services provided under Part A are limited to those services directly related to an illness that required hospitalization and precludes reimbursement to a home health agency for care not directly related to that condition. An example is a diabetic who is hospitalized for a broken hip, and was subsequently admitted to a home health agency. Only home health care related to the broken hip is reimbursable. Medicare reimbursement for care related to the diabetes must wait until the patient regresses to the point where hospitalization is required.

ELIMINATION OF THE 100-VISIT LIMITATION UNDER PARTS A AND B

The Council supports this recommendation as another cost effective measure.

The current 100-visit limitations affect a very small proportion of the Medicare population. Indeed, a November 1977 DHEW report entitled "Medicare: Utilization of Home Health Services, 1974" shows that:

The average number of visits per persons served was 20.6;

Less than one percent of the beneficiaries using Part B services exhausted the 100 visits;

Less than two percent of those using Part A services received more than 100 visits (notwithstanding the fact that an individual could receive more than 100 Part A visits in a year if there was more than one benefit period).

We believe these statistics are proof enough that eliminating the current limits will not open the floodgates of home health utilization. In fact, it may keep the small percentage of individuals who need the additional care out of costly institutions.

ADDITION OF AN EVALUATION VISIT BEFORE TRANSFER FROM AN INSTITUTION

We support this concept as a quality assurance measure.

The experienced professional nurse from the home health agency has the expertise to recognize and interpret the variables of providing care in diverse home and community settings.

Through a pre-discharge encounter the professional nurse from the home health agency is able to evaluate with a high degree of accuracy:

1. the abilities of the patient, family, friends to cope with managing illness at home;
2. the home as a safe, appropriate environment for continued care;
3. the adequacy of the resources of the home health agency to meet the care needs of the individual;
4. the availability and extent of other community services supportive to maintaining an individual at home.

Determination of the setting for the pre-discharge visit—hospital or home—should be made by the agency.

While the evaluation visit will go a long way in assuring the efficacy of home health services, it does not address a larger problem—that is, who is in the hospital, and with what degree of expertise, identifies patients as potential home health care candidates. We would like to see hospitals employ discharge planners who are professional nurses with home health agency experience. These discharge planners will have the abil-

ity to make sound and accurate initial judgments about the appropriateness of home care.

Lack of or inappropriate planning has frequently resulted in service that is untimely, fragmented, or incomplete.

ELIMINATION OF THE LICENSING REQUIREMENT FOR PROPRIETARY HOME HEALTH AGENCIES

We support this recommendation when coupled with a national certificate of need requirement and an upgrading of the current Conditions of Participation for home health agencies.

The Council has a long standing position in favor of certificate of need for all newly established agencies and all proposals for extensions of services. There are those who argue that certificate of need stifles the competition needed to lower costs. We would argue that the health care industry is immune to traditional economic theories and that the result of competition in this field is costly duplication and fragmentation of services. Comparing costs of Medicare-certified providers with non Medicare-certified providers is not valid. Certified home health agencies must maintain a higher level of supervision and qualified health professionals—undoubtedly incurring higher costs to provide the service.

We have supported state licensure as long as it is the only acceptable method for certifying propriety agencies. However, we have always tied licensure to a certificate of need requirement for home health agencies.

There is no evidence that licensure has enriched or reinforced Medicare certification. Rather, it may have had the negative effect of decreasing emphasis on much needed improvements in the certification process.

CHHA/CHS promotes the Medicare certification requirement as a uniform national test of legal compliance for home health agencies and will continue to work for the improvement of sanctions and upgrading of provisions in the certification process.

We have been working with HEW to upgrade the Conditions of Participation as part of the study mandated by Section 18 of P.L. 95-142. Some of the suggestions to upgrade the Conditions are:

The agency administrator shall be an individual with training and one year of experience or an individual with one year supervisory or administrative experience in home health care and must be a full-time employee of the agency;

All agencies must determine the range of other services available in the community and must endeavor to provide or arrange for such services for patients as needed;

All ownership interests must be disclosed. At least one-third of the governing body must be outside members having no financial, family or operational relationships with the agency. No member may vote on matters in which that member has a direct financial interest;

Governing body has responsibility for professional review conducted pursuant to Section 405.1222;

All personnel must be paid the minimum hourly wage;

The locus of responsibility for coordination of services between two agencies must be clearly defined;

Home health aides should have satisfactorily completed a basic generic curriculum which is recognized by HEW;

An annual report of agency's activities including the names of the governing body shall be published and made available upon request.

We also believe that the Provider Reimbursement Manual should indicate tighter fiscal controls, that these controls should be consistent from region to region, from intermediary to intermediary and that they should be applied equally to all types of agencies. We believe that application of new

regulations, guidelines, and rulings must be implemented on a prospective basis with sufficient lead time for agencies to come into compliance. We do not equate nonprofit with good and proprietary with bad. We think the rules should be the same for everyone and that decisions should be based on these rules and standards.

Considering that the Conditions of Participation and other regulations apply to all agencies, they must by their nature be minimal, base-line requirements. For those agencies voluntarily seeking a higher quality evaluation, the NLN/APHA Accreditation Program is available. This program operates from a base of predetermined, nationally accepted standards.

The program has applied to HEW for "deemed status", that is, to have the accreditation process accepted in lieu of the Medicare recertification process.

We and agencies that have gone through both processes are convinced that the accreditation program not only assesses all variables that Medicare does but assesses them at a higher level. The accreditation program also provides many incentives for continued agency growth.

It seems to us that agencies that voluntarily choose to become accredited because of the value they place on such a high quality process, should not also have to be resurveyed by Medicare. To go through both processes is time consuming and expensive. Agencies should be free to choose the process which more closely meets their needs since accreditation encompasses the Medicare requirements.

HEW has deferred action on this request until it completes the study of home health that was mandated by the Medicare anti-fraud and abuse amendments.

We recommend that any action on the licensure issue be deferred until all home health agencies are covered by a national certificate of need and after the results of the HEW study are made public.

ELIMINATION OF THE PRESUMED COVERAGE PROVISION FOR SERVICES PROVIDED BY HOME HEALTH AGENCIES

We support the elimination of this provision which has served little purpose while at the same time has added administrative costs to both the provider and the fiscal intermediary.

In testimony presented in 1970, we recommended to the Senate Finance Committee that procedures be developed for advance approval for home health benefits which would be sufficiently flexible to permit coverage for patients who continue to need care beyond the initially approved period.

Eight years later we are here to speak in opposition to this provision. The intent of the law—to do away with the uncertainty about determinations of eligibility of care—has not been served by this provision. Instead, a costly mechanism has been created which sets fixed maximums rather than guaranteed minimums of reimbursable home health visits to Part A Medicare beneficiaries.

SUMMARY

We have limited our remarks to those issues outlined in your press release. We believe, however, that the elimination of the prior hospitalization requirement and the visit limitations are just starting points in abolishing the barriers to utilization of home health care. We urge you to give careful consideration to three other changes which will provide for effective delivery of home health services. They are to more broadly define what is meant by the requirement that beneficiaries be homebound to be eligible for services, and to add homemaker/chore services to the home health benefit.

The third change refers to Section 1122 of the Social Security Act. While we do not believe this supplants the need for certificate of need for home health agencies, we do be-

lieve a major stride would be made by expanding this section to include home health agencies without regard to a specific capital expenditure amount. We recognize that many institutions or facilities are granted exceptions to the 1122 process and we urge that any service created as a result of such exception be deemed ineligible for federal reimbursement. We see this applying to all home health agencies—free standing or institutional based.

The Council of Home Health Agencies and Community Health Services appreciates the opportunity to present our views.

STATEMENT OF MISS JANE BRENNAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION OF MEMPHIS, TENN.

The Memphis Visiting Nurse Association is a voluntary, non-profit home health care agency which has been serving the community since 1953 (before Medicare). We have always been partially funded by our local United Way. Our philosophy has always been to provide care on the basis of need, rather than on the basis of the individual's ability to pay. However, there is a limit to community funds—especially when they have to be distributed to forty plus agencies.

I would like to cite a few examples from our agency which relate to the proposals being discussed here today.

Mr. B. was admitted to VNA service in October last year. He had Medicare A coverage only and he had not had a prior hospital stay. Therefore he was not eligible for Medicare home health benefits. His elderly wife was able to maintain their home, but was physically not able to provide the care he needed and there were no other family members in the city. The patient was not a candidate for a nursing home as he did not require that much care. Additionally and understandably, the couple wanted to remain together. From the time the patient was admitted to VNA service until he entered the hospital in early May, at which time he had a nephrectomy, we provided 16 visits by the R.N. and 28 visits by the home health aide. The financial arrangement reached with the family was that they would pay \$5.00 for each nursing visit—compared to our fee of \$30.00 per visit. We provided the home health aide care free.

The cost to our agency for providing this service was \$400 for nursing care and \$420 for home health aide care—a total of \$820. If Mr. B. had been in an ICF during this time, the cost would have been \$4,410 (this figure is based on the Tennessee Medicaid, ICF reimbursement rate of \$21.00 per day which is too low for most Memphis ICF's). The saving of home care during this time was \$3,590. Because he had only Part A coverage without a qualifying hospital stay, I'm sure Mr. B. would have been placed in an ICF if VNA had not been able to provide care. He has now been discharged from the hospital and we are providing care under Part A of Medicare and I might point out that we are providing the same level of care as we were prior to his hospitalization.

I can think of five stabilized chronically ill patients to whom we have been providing care for a number of years. Each of these patients requires skilled care, but their condition seldom changes and they have not been hospitalized. Therefore, only Part B coverage applies to them. Each requires approximately 138 visits per year (care by the home health aide twice weekly and care by the nurse once every two to three weeks). Obviously, each of these patients exceeds the 100 visit limit. If the 100 visit limit were removed, it would cost only an additional \$660 per patient per year or \$3,300 for the five patients. VNA is currently using community money to subsidize this yearly deficit. If these five patients were in ICF's the yearly cost would be \$38,325. Home health care costs

for these five are \$12,300 or a savings of \$26,010.

My last example is our classic, Mrs. P. We have had Mrs. P. as a patient for twenty years and will, I'm sure have her until the day she dies. She has had a nephrostomy tube in each kidney and the dressings around the tube must be changed three times a week. It does require the skill of a nurse to change the dressings as they are sterile and the nephrostomy tubes could be dislodged very easily.

Mrs. P., while she is essentially homebound can be maintained in her own home with our three weekly nursing visits and once or twice weekly visit from a homemaker supplied by another agency. Her children see that she has groceries, medicines and etc.

Mrs. P. became eligible for Medicare this past October. She, too, was only eligible for Part B benefits as she has not been hospitalized for several years. She requires about 150 visits per year. This means the community is subsidizing \$1,500 of her care each year (In the past the subsidy was \$2,700 because prior to October Mrs. P. had been on Medicaid and in Tennessee, Medicaid pays for only 60 visits a year).

The total cost of home health care for one year for Mrs. P. is \$4,500—\$3,000 paid by Medicare and \$1,500 subsidized by the community. The cost of caring for Mrs. P. in an ICF for one year would be \$7,665, so home health care represents a saving of \$3,165 per year.

However, Mrs. P. does not belong in an ICF; she does not require that kind of care. Additionally, she would create havoc in any kind of group setting in which she was placed because she is undoubtedly the most objectionable person I have ever met.●

WHY WORRY ABOUT AFRICA?

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial by William Randolph Hearst, Jr. on Africa:

WHY WORRY ABOUT AFRICA?

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—President Carter has been getting a lot of flack this week for worrying about Russians and Cubans in Africa, and expressing his worries with straight talk about threats to the security of the world. He doesn't deserve the abuse.

One newspaper columnist became so hysterical he resorted to regional name-calling, saying our leader from Georgia was developing a reputation as a "southern fried Jerry Ford." The point, insofar as there is one, is that the Democratic president is as preoccupied as his Republican predecessor with the growth of communist influence in such far-away places as Africa, Afghanistan and Iraq. Carter's critics, who know he is right, claim to believe his concern is exaggerated.

Americans of good conscience always have been troubled by stereotyped labels like "isolationists" and "interventionists." The first word is used to describe those who view the rest of the world as none of our business, the second to brand those who would have us put out fires anywhere in foreign lands, no matter what the costs or consequences.

If Americans have learned anything in the last half century, it is that neither extreme is consistently sound. A strict policy of isolation would have given Adolph Hitler all of Europe on a silver platter. On the other

hand, the role of an international policeman would bring us dishonor as a meddling nation, and lead to certain bankruptcy.

To use a trite but true phrase, the truth lies somewhere in between. It would be morally wrong and militarily unwise for the United States to declare war every time we think the Soviet Union or Cuba has crossed a border. It would be equally stupid, however, to wear blinders and make believe, as Sen. George McGovern apparently does, that communist expansion is the result of the "will of the people," and therefore should not be cause for concern.

The point is that the lengthening communist shadow over Africa cannot be dismissed as irrelevant to American interests. It is, and will affect the lives of us all. Geographical isolation from Africa does not mean political insulation from its troubles and future.

After World War II the United States inherited from Great Britain the role of global leadership we cannot ignore. It is not a commitment to shape other nations in our own image, but rather an obligation to be an active participant in the Free World, and a shareholder in its destinies.

A fellow journalist recently scoffed at those who get upset about troubled times in places we have trouble pronouncing, like Bujumbura, Zimbabwe, and Botswana. This is a red herring, of course, as the degree of familiarity with names of foreign lands has nothing to do with America's obligations to track the course of totalitarianism, and to formulate policies accordingly.

Pearl Harbor wasn't exactly a household word when something sudden and frightening happened there.

I wish it could be said today that events in Africa are not worth worrying about. Life would be far simpler for President Carter and those of us who value objectivity in our newspaper columns.

Unfortunately, news from Africa gives us no such comfort.

For instance, a look at the map shows the Soviet Union's influence implanted in five strategic areas: two in the north (Libya and Ethiopia), two in the south (Angola and Mozambique), and one in the center (Uganda).

These are five good reasons why Africa cannot be written off as of little concern to the Free World. These are good reasons not to sneer at a toughening policy toward a little known part of the global landscape just because it is dotted with tongue-twisters like Lumbumbashi and Okovanggo.

We are told not to get excited when Cuban-backed terrorists blow up a hamlet here or murder a few Rhodesians there. Well, no one knows when little wars will become big wars, but it has happened. While Senator McGovern still spoke glowingly of his visit with Fidel Castro and minimized the significance of Cuban troops in Africa, Joshua K. Nkomo was admitting that a Cuban cadre was training Zambian rebels to invade Rhodesia. What makes all this possible is Soviet financial assistance, which at the latest reckoning amounted to about \$9 billion since 1961.

Nothing I saw on my recent trip to Africa, or have observed in the press since, suggests any lessening of this build-up. On the contrary, the trend is in the other direction.

In 1975, the then secretary of defense, James Schlesinger, spoke as follows about the relative defense postures of the United States and the Soviet Union:

"... We have been engaged in the rather peculiar process of reducing our defense budget in real terms, while the Soviets have been raising theirs. ... The Soviets are spending more than \$100 billion a year on the military, and their allocations are growing at the rate of four to five percent a year."

Three years later, in January of 1978, the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. George S. Brown, gave his opinion of the relative military strengths of the two powers:

"... In light of the extensive growth in the military capabilities of the Soviet Union, it is questionable whether what has been done is enough to assure the security and well being of our country in the coming years."

This is a sobering reminder for those who seek world peace. It should be a sobering reminder for those who believe the recent communist conquest of Afghanistan is too remote a rebellion to plague the thoughts of Americans on these pleasant June days. It should be must reading for those who believe Cubans in Africa are part of a good-will mission to "stabilize" (to use Ambassador Andrew Young's word) the disjointed societies of a developing continent.

Today's liberals, who talk of the Cubans and Russians as "stabilizers," used to sell the idea in this country that the Communist Chinese were merely "agrarian reforms" bent only on the peaceful tilling of the soil.

That was the Communists' name for themselves, and the same type of person with the same soft feelings towards communism is now busily spreading the idea that Americans concerned over the spread of communism's stabilizing influence are "panicking."

There are those in this country who actually sympathize with the professed goals of communism. Some may naively believe that communism represents no threat to our free way of life.

Others are, in my book, not at all naive but merely communist sympathizers. Their present plan is to play down the global importance of Russia's activities in Africa. Be on the lookout for them on radio, television and in newspapers.

In Cuba, we are dealing with a government whose premier told President Kennedy there were not Soviet missiles in his country. In the Soviet Union we are dealing with a government whose foreign minister told J.F.K. the same lie at the same time and which recently sentenced a noted physicist, Yuri F. Orlov, to 12 years in prison and exile for telling the truth about Moscow's breaking its word on the Helsinki accords.

These examples of deviousness say a lot about the problems arising in Africa, and spilling in all directions as Moscow and Havana stake new claims of political influence. Everyone concerned with human rights and freedoms in that part of the world cannot in good faith look the other way.

The African continent is suddenly closer than we think. ●

NGO's SPEAK OUT FOR DISARMAMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to attend the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament now being held in New York. During that brief visit, I spoke with various representatives from nongovernmental organizations, and I was greatly impressed by their strong commitment to disarmament.

The United Nations has recognized the important contributions such organizations can make during the deliberations on how to reduce the threat of nuclear

war in the world. Without the constraints of governmental policies, the NGO's can appeal to the common humanity of all people of all nations and speak out on the urgency of ending senseless arms competitions.

On June 12, the General Assembly of the United Nations set aside time for these organizations to address the member states. I would like to share some of these speeches with my colleagues in Congress.

Today, I am including in the RECORD the introductory remarks of the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Special Session, Mr. Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina, and the speech of Ms. Salome Nolega of the Friends World Committee for Consultation:

INTRODUCTION

The Chairman (interpretation from Spanish): This meeting being held today by the Ad Hoc Committee could very well be considered a landmark in the history of the United Nations. By unanimous decision the General Assembly adopted the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee of the Special Session devoted to Disarmament to assign a special day to hear statements from 25 representatives of non-governmental organizations. When it considered this question in depth, the Preparatory Committee bore in mind the great interest and concern shown by the organizations in the various aspects of disarmament and the constructive contribution that they would be able to make to our work.

Disarmament is not the province of governments alone. It concerns directly all the peoples of the world and world public opinion, some of whose sectors will be represented by the speakers coming to the rostrum today. The General Assembly wished in this way to show that disarmament is a common undertaking in which everyone should be engaged.

With great good sense and a sense of history, the non-governmental organizations have thus been given a unique opportunity. It is now up to these organizations to show, with a sense of responsibility, that they can respond to the trust placed in them as they deal with the tasks before the General Assembly. I believe I am reflecting the feelings of all representatives here present when I express the hope that the non-governmental organizations will be able to be equal to the task, and that their submissions will promote greater understanding and co-operation among Member States in the United Nations. In other words, far from arousing potential confrontations, we hope that they will be a positive factor in cementing a climate of confidence and understanding on the basis of which it will be possible only to make real progress to curb the arms race and begin the stage of genuine disarmament.

Regrettably, limitations imposed by time and the procedure adopted have not made it possible for other organizations, which submitted requests after these 25 organizations were designated, to take part. I would like to thank them for the interest that they have shown, and we would like to assure them that while they are not with us in these deliberations, that certainly does not prejudice their competence or their authority when they present their valuable points of view on the subject of disarmament. I am confident that they will have this opportunity in the future when a meeting similar to the present one is convened.

The representatives of non-governmental organizations have been duly informed that they have a maximum of 12 minutes for their statements. I would request them to abide by that limit strictly. We will be listening very closely to their statements.

FRIENDS WORLD COMMITTEE FOR CONSULTATION

Ms. Molega (Friends World Committee for Consultation): Within the past year delegations of Quakers have gone to their Governments in the German Democratic Republic, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Cuba, New Zealand and elsewhere to urge support for disarmament; United States Quakers have protested at Rocky Flats, Colorado, where detonators for nuclear weapons are made; African Quakers have met in Botswana to study non-violence; and Quaker-sponsored programmes in education, agriculture and health care have gone forward in Mali, Kenya and Senegal; in Bolivia, Guatemala and Mexico; in Bangladesh, India and Laos; on the West Bank and in Gaza; and in other places around the world. All this activity grows from a fundamental belief in the value of every human being in the sight of God. Throughout its 300-year history the Religious Society of Friends, called Quakers, has sought to give witness to that belief by consistently working for peace and human dignity and against war and preparation for it.

It is with gratitude and hope, therefore, that we come to this special session on disarmament. We are grateful for the initiative of the non-aligned countries that brought it about, for the conscientious preliminary work of the Preparatory Committee and for the British proposal that gave non-governmental organizations a voice here.

Our hope is inspired by the presence of representatives of the whole human family. Together the world's people have been granted stewardship over the earth to enjoy it briefly and then to surrender it to succeeding generations for them to enjoy and to become stewards for still succeeding generations. The earth is not a possession but a trust. Those dramatic photographs from the moon showed us all what is ours to care for—a green and blue jewel shining in the blackness of space. What steward would risk turning such a gem into a radio-active cinder?

Yet that is the dreadful future that the present arms race offers. And widespread is the nightmare image of pin-striped, well-fed negotiators in airconditioned halls balancing billion-dollar missiles, while desperate poor go shoeless and homeless and the world rushes towards nuclear oblivion. From such a future, from such images, the nations of the world must turn decisively away. They must heed the pleas of the thousands who marched these New York streets and of the hundreds of Japanese who travelled half way around the globe bearing the signatures of millions of their fellow-citizens. Self-destruction is not the intended end of humanity.

There are urgent steps to be taken, however. Disputes and conflicts will not end. Nations will disagree; at times their disputes may be beyond their own capacities to resolve. Let the Members of the United Nations expand imaginatively the resources of this Organization for the peaceful settlement of such disputes.

An interdependent world requires acceptance of mandatory measures for conflict resolution. Just as no person may exercise freedom to the peril of his community, no nation should have unrestricted freedom to imperil the world. There is potential value in many current suggestions, such as the several proposals made here for regional conciliation and arbitration units; the proposals for a permanent United Nations force for peace-keeping and police roles. Member States could strengthen significantly the influence of the International Court of Justice. Other important options surely will be found within the United Nations system if they are earnestly sought.

Equally urgent is a realistic recognition of the nature of security. The justification always given for the arms race is national security. While acknowledging legitimate

concern for secure national boundaries and national structures, Quakers insist that security must mean first of all the security of persons. Too often we see the unsavory spectacle of Governments abusing their own citizens to protect the security of the Government, not the security of the person. Governments change, at best by peaceful means, but the security needs of persons remain the same.

The major threats to the security of the people of the world know no national boundaries. They include hunger, population, disease, pollution, desertification, lack of pure water, lack of energy. To address these problems requires equitable sharing of the world's resources and opportunities. The global economy should not be designed primarily to promote economic growth for the already affluent. Growth should be the goal and the reality for the poor. The gaps between rich and poor should cease to be the denials of our common humanity that they now are. No persons in even the poorest country should be without hope for themselves and their children. Efforts for greater economic and social justice must be redoubled in all the work of the United Nations.

Perhaps the most serious threat to security, however, is the arms race itself. It has bred world-wide inflation, which persistently throttles development growth. It increases insecurity, not security. No citizen of either of the super-Powers has yet been injured by the billions of dollars of armaments of the other super-Power. But the citizens of both super-Powers have been grievously injured by the weapons their own Governments have purchased at the cost of their social needs. The growing arms purchases of some third world States are being made at the cost of the security of the people of those States, whose educational, health, housing, nutritional and other needs are sacrificed to military hardware. Nations must recognize that only in peace is there security for people.

For the arms race to end, nations must make a real commitment to disarmament, demonstrated by imaginative disarmament proposals and strong national initiatives. Any nation, no matter how large or how small, can take such initiatives. We Friends are encouraged by China's readiness to become a full partner in the search for disarmament, by France's proposals for a disarmament fund for development. It is heartening to have Japan reaffirm its rejection of nuclear capabilities, to have Venezuela summon a regional commitment to conventional disarmament, and to hear Nigeria call for educating public officials in disarmament. There have been many such important proposals and initiatives already taken here. Much as we applaud them, however, they are not enough.

There must be some real disarmament, starting with this special session. The entire world would rejoice if only all 149 Members nations stood in this hall and proclaimed an end to all military forces except essential domestic police and service forces. General and complete disarmament—that is the goal. Genuine commitment to that goal will unleash, creative, problem-solving energies yet unimagined.

Let the nations act together for disarmament then, with universal participation. First priority must go to the problems of nuclear disarmament. Let nuclear-free-zones and other regional agreements be extended to create islands of peace as models for the rest of the world. Let there be force reductions and budget reductions based on full and precise information. The readiness of Australia and others to provide such information to the United Nations is a confidence-building act to be universally imitated. Let the United Nations create the world disarmament authority proposed by Sri Lanka to monitor

progress and to prod for more. It may help some nations to resist the persistent tendency to see disarmament as an East-West issue and to see all conflicts as East-West conflicts, without regard to the real interests of the parties involved. Let the voices of the world's people increasingly be heard in disarmament discussions. They speak urgently through marches and demonstrations, through individual acts of conscience, through petitioning their Governments and through non-governmental organizations. The will of the people for peace must not be frustrated by the failures of Governments.

The Secretary-General has pointed out the vast discrepancy between what the nations spend on weapons and what they spend on disarmament. Nearly half of all the world's intellectual power for research and development goes into weapons. Let that power be used instead for research on disarmament and for development of measures for peaceful resolution of conflicts. Genuine commitment to disarmament would make such a shift possible.

We Quakers confidently assert the possibility of a world where all people may live creative lives, where none shall need to be afraid. It is our experience that the spirit of truth, of love, of compassion, which we identify as the spirit of God, is at work in all persons, of every nation and culture, of every faith and of no faith. We urge all representatives, with the heavy responsibilities they bear, to consult that spirit at work in them, to respond with the best that they find within themselves. We do not doubt that then they will here successfully begin the process of disarmament and of turning human energies and resources to building a hopeful future for generations now threatened with no future at all.●

ISRAEL'S PROPOSALS ON THE WEST BANK ARE NOT UNREASONABLE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have followed with interest the unfortunate reaction of not only American Government officials, but some of Israel's traditional supporters in the Congress denounce the plan proposed by Israel for a resolution of the dispute over ultimate sovereignty over the West Bank of the Jordan. Once again, the Carter administration is contributing to a buildup of pressure on Israel to force them to accept a settlement which represents a potential threat to Israel's security.

The Carter's administration appears content to overlook the fact that there have been three wars in the Middle East over the past decade: The 6-day war in 1967, the war of attrition in the early 1970's, and the Yom Kippur war in 1973. Under the circumstances, Israel's statement issued on June 18 is entirely reasonable and positive; namely that it will reconsider and agree upon the future of the disputed territory after a period of 5 years has elapsed. The latter point is crucial: Israel is now committed to a final resolution of the question after a period of time has elapsed sufficient to test the willingness of the contiguous Arab States to live in peace with Israel.

Israel and Egypt should be encouraged to reach an interim settlement of the dispute, not the pressuring of one of the parties to settle on terms which it believes to be contrary to its vital security interests.●

CONSUMERS WILL PAY FOR AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 8729, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act, and H.R. 11986, the Noisy Aircraft Revenue and Credit Act. These two companion bills would, under the guise of dealing with aircraft noise reduction, effectively set up a massive new corporate welfare plan for the sole benefit of the airline industry, at the expense of the consumer.

In brief, these two bills would establish several new consumer excise taxes which would be used to pay for a substantial percentage of the costs incurred by airline operators in bringing their planes into compliance with already established FAA noise standards. The income from these taxes, estimated at \$2.4 billion over the next 5 years, would be used by the airlines to help retrofit, re-engine, or entirely replace their current planes.

Passage of this bill would mean nothing less than a huge handout of money to an industry fully able to pay its own way. The airline companies have grossly exaggerated the amount of money that they need in order to bring their fleets into compliance with the FAA standards by the 1985 deadline. Their present claim is \$7 to \$8 billion, but this represents the cost of fully replacing substantial parts of their fleets. In actuality, the airline industry could bring their planes into compliance simply by retrofitting their engines, a process which would, by their own figures, cost no more than \$950 million.

The airlines are perfectly capable of meeting the above expense by 1985. In addition to being allowed to depreciate fully a plane with a life of 20 years in only 9.5 years, the airlines have been granted such extensive tax benefits that in 1976 three lines were able to pay no taxes at all and three more paid less than 12 percent of their income. These two provisions helped the airline industry to make profits of over \$1.2 billion in the last 2 years. The money to meet the FAA noise rules could easily come out of these or future earnings. It is just that the airlines would rather that someone else pay.

The new taxes, in addition to being an unneeded handout for the airline industry, are a disaster for the consumer. The legislation provides for a 2-percent surcharge on all domestic passenger tickets—a surcharge that goes directly to the airlines. In order to keep tickets at

the same price and to keep furor to a minimum, the current 8-percent tax, which goes into the airport trust fund for airport safety improvements, has also been cut by 2 percent. This means that, although passengers are still being taxed at the same rate, they are being short-changed on safety at a time when many pressing airport needs are unmet. Clearly, safety is being sacrificed to the airlines' profits.

Finally, this legislation sets an extremely dangerous precedent. If Congress enacts these bills, it will be an open invitation for every other industry to come before us and demand a similar excise tax to meet those federally established environmental, safety, or health standards that apply to them. The only way to prevent a massive corporate lineup from starting is to vote down this outlandish request by the airlines for Federal aid to meet FAA standards. There is absolutely no reason why this self-sufficient industry should not be required to meet these standards on their own, without this fraudulent ripoff of airline passengers. ●

MR. BUCKLEY AT NOTRE DAME

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once observed that every society, no matter how democratic in its political order, is graced with a natural aristocracy of virtue and talent. When I listen to his wise counsels and read his crisp, finely balanced prose, I imagine that William F. Buckley, the esteemed editor of *National Review*, is the kind of man that the brilliant Jefferson had in mind.

I know that a minority (but growing number) of Members in this House are in sympathy with the sentiments of the editor of the *National Review*. But I entertain the hope—or is it fancy?—that somehow, someday, the ideas transported in his rich language will turn the tide in this skeptical deliberative body so that a "new" majority will flower, rooted in a love of individual liberty. For Mr. Buckley's wisdom does, indeed, match his wisely acclaimed eloquence.

Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Buckley was honored by an invitation to speak to the 1978 graduating class of the University of Notre Dame. In reading his address, one can readily discern that he is a man who yet loves academia, and appreciates the special mission of the university in training young men and women in the higher life of the mind and civic virtue.

His remarks were not, if anything, the standard graduation fare. He did not bore the graduates with platitudinous exhortations to build a better society, though he charged them with that duty. Rather, he used the occasion to tell them about the recurrent trials and tribulations of the human condition. He talked about the particular miseries that afflict

this world, including the dehumanization of men and women in Cambodia, China, and Soviet Russia, about lost vision and lost hopes, and most importantly about the weariness which is bound to come to young men and women whose optimism is constantly dashed against the hard rocks of history. Most moving was his description of the plight of Whittaker Chambers * * * his silent suffering * * * one who had known intimately the force of evil and the temptation of despair.

Mr. Speaker, as always, Bill Buckley rises to the occasion. While he warned his young listeners to beware of extravagant optimism, he reminded them, once again, no matter the darkness of this world, despair is still a sin, a grievous offense against Him who once agonized in the garden, supernaturally conscious of the evils of this world.

Perhaps we are yet far from another Periclean Age. If so, all the better it is for us to take heart in our own faith, and know that we have a destiny greater than the lilies of the field.

I commend Mr. Buckley's speech to my colleagues:

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, NOTRE DAME

(By William F. Buckley)

Father Hesburgh, ladies and gentlemen of the graduating class.

Today is a happy event, a witness to your achievement; and, in this, we share your pleasure, even while recognizing that today's formality is less than sacramental in meaning. It is, rather, an academic episode, with civil overtones. You began your learning a long while ago. You will continue to learn after you have left Notre Dame. Before today you became aware of the mysteries of history and the keenness of the human experience. After today your perceptions will continue to sharpen, and, even while enjoying bread, wine, love, poetry, the air we breathe, and the season's changes, gradually you will begin to understand why it is that so many men grow weary. "History hit us with a freight train," Whittaker Chambers wrote me, one month before he died. . . . "We"—he continued—"my general breed—tried to put ourselves together again. But at a price—weariness." Life, he is telling us, goes on. "People tend to leave Oedipus, shrieking with the blood running down his cheeks—but I was about 23 when I discovered, rather by chance, that Oedipus went on to Colonnus. Camus must have been about nine while I sat reading the Oedipus at Colonnus. But each of us, according to his lights, was arrested in time by the same line—the one in which Oedipus, looking out from precarious sanctuary after long flight, sums up: 'Because of my great age, and the nobility of my mind, I feel that all will be well.' One cannot"—said Chambers about himself, even though few men qualified more conspicuously than he, "pretend to live at that height. And yet to reach it even at times is something. . . . [But] there remains the price—the weariness I mentioned which none of us complain about, but should take good care not to inflict on other people's lives."

So why inflict it on you? As a gentle, not to say penitential, demurral from the words uttered from this space one year ago, when the speaker said to your graduating predecessors, as if the struggle was won, that, I quote him, ". . . we have found our way back to our own principles and values, and we have regained our lost confidence."

Where is the evidence?

Earlier in his address the speaker had said that, "being confident of our own future, we are now free of that inordinate fear

of Communism which led us to embrace any dictator who joined us in our fear." If we are so confident of our own future, why does he still tell us that life and death await the results of our SALT negotiations? The President of the United States went on to say that "for too many years we have been willing to adopt the flawed principles and tactics of our adversaries, sometimes abandoning our values for theirs. We fought fire with fire, never thinking that fire is better fought with water. This approach failed, with Vietnam the best example of its intellectual and moral poverty."

Herewith a few observations:

1. In August of 1973 Lord Home, opening the great conference on European Security at Helsinki, spoke these words to the assembly: "If your conference is essentially about people and about trust, then it is essential that we should do something to remove the barriers which inhibit the movement of people, the exchange of information and ideas." Elaborating on these sentiments one month later before the General Assembly of the United Nations, Lord Home said, "I trust that the Communist countries will be able to prove that they are for the basic freedom of people everywhere."

Two years later the Helsinki Accords were promulgated.

Last week Yuri Orlov, a Soviet citizen who undertook to monitor Soviet compliance with the terms of accord the Soviet government had initiated, and then signed, was sentenced to seven years of hard labor, to be followed by five years of exile in Siberia. He was not allowed independent counsel, was not permitted to question his accusers, was held incommunicado for the 15 months preceding his conviction. He was tried in a courtroom in which the words of Lord Home were mocked, and from which the press, charged with expediting the "exchange of information" of which Lord Home had sung at Helsinki, was matter-of-factly excluded. To be sure, the family were present. The wife of Yuri Orlov was in the courtroom. On Thursday, leaving the chamber, she was stripped naked by three Soviet women officials in the presence of three male Soviet officials, and searched. Perhaps she was suspected of carrying the text of the Helsinki Accords in her underpants. May we suppose that Yuri Orlov's fear of Communism has not proved to be inordinate?

2. A week ago Saturday, the *New York Times* published an extensive dispatch collating information, gathered from numerous observers, on recent doings in Cambodia. There in Cambodia in recent months there have been aggravated shortages. Of the usual things—food, fuel, shelter, medicine; to be sure. But most pressing, it appears, has been the shortage of ammunition with which to kill Cambodian civilians. Accordingly, on orders of the government, headed by Cambodia's ruler Pol Pot, the Cambodia militia has shown great economic ingenuity. Instead of wasting precious ammunition, tens of thousands of men and women suspected of having been related in some way—perhaps they had gone to school together, or grown up in the same hamlet—to men who had resisted the Khmer Rouge, tens of thousands have been clubbed to death while standing, arms tied behind their backs, in ditches they have thoughtfully dug out to receive their imminent remains. The younger children of these men and women, we are informed, are bounced about playfully on the bayonets of the soldiers until they are dead, or almost dead, upon which they are tossed into the common ditches. Pol Pot does not devote the whole of his time to overseeing this enterprise in population control. He is otherwise engaged, at least one part of the time, for instance, as guest of honor recently in Peking at a banquet tendered by the rulers of the People's Republic of China who, now

that we have got over our inordinate fear of Communism and our corollary addiction to dictators, we are finally ready to embrace.

Who, contemplating Cambodian hell alongside official optimism, can get by without feeling the cold wind of weariness?

3. In the period since the Class of 1977 was informed that we are now "confident of our own future," having "found our way back to our own principles and values"; enabling us therefore to eschew the use of fire against fire, our ideals repristinated by the pledge to use only water, we have diluted the Voice of America, which no longer fires the libertarian spirits of the Yuri Orlovs; instead, in the spirit of detente, dousing them with water, cold cold water. We have watered the little Cuban garden in Africa, and now its blooms decorate much of the continent. In Europe, by way of expressing our confidence, we have risen above the vulgar attractions of enhanced radiation technology, having previously soared above even the stratospheric reaches of the B-1 bomber. And we have given concrete form to our contempt for anti-Communist dictators by embracing the democratic leaders of Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, and hailing our purposes in common.

In the groves of quiet thought we tell ourselves—quietly—that we care about all this. Care about poor Orlov, about the new holocaust in Cambodia, about the creeping hegemony of Communist thought and techniques in both hemispheres. But ours is a fugitive solicitude, whose expression is damped by the prevailing rhetoric, which is one part evangelistic, one part pharisaic, one part anaesthetic. Our foreign policy is bad enough. The rhetoric of our foreign policy is, if not the efficient cause of, then the sufficient reason for, the three-martini lunch.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can give you on this feast day—like Our Lady's Juggler—only that little I have to offer. It is, at this juncture in history, the settled view that we have traveled further—much further—than ever we really intended to go when we began our retreat from the Wilsonian idea. Two hundred years ago we proclaimed the universality of those truths we hold about the nature of man. One hundred and fifty years ago President John Quincy Adams cooled a burgeoning national idealism with the astringent observation that though the American people are friends of liberty everywhere, they are custodians only of their own. The most explicit modern expression of Wilsonianism was quite recently uttered—during your infancy—by John F. Kennedy, at his inaugural, when he cried out to the world that we Americans will "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty." This was an objective commitment by a chief executive.

But surely he acknowledged the awful weight of that commitment?

On the contrary: "In the long history of the world," he continued, "only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

Well then, instead of going forward burdened down by a great weight, our mission transports us. Will our idealism prove contagious?

There was no hesitation on the morning of the 20th of January, 1961: "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

Looking back, it is as if the glow from that fire had been routinely blacked out by the Department of Energy. Granted, it is everywhere agreed nowadays that our Marines cannot be made available to axe down anti-democratic growths in the halls of Montezuma. But neither are our short-wave facilities available to transmit the record of

non-compliance with the Helsinki Accords. In our retreat, there were those who thought to modify our idealism by suggesting practical alternatives. Senator William Fulbright, during the most despondent period of the Vietnam War, articulated a useful distinction when he said that the American Government has no proper quarrel with any country in the world, no matter how obnoxious its domestic doctrines, so long as that country does not seek to export them. Under the Fulbright mandate, we are charged to contain Cuba, while ignoring Haiti. Contain Cuba where?

Our immobility, our incoherence, is more, merely, than the consequence of strategic indecisiveness and rhetorical confusion. What happened, during the Johnson-Nixon years, was a great seizure of self-disgust which fused handily with the new-found exigencies of our foreign policy. Even as, a generation earlier, during a brief period when it was politically convenient to do so, we had looked tolerantly on "old Joe," the grand engineer of Gulag for whom President Truman publicly confessed a certain fondness, this time we discovered, far more profoundly, the great society of Mao Tse-tung, concerning whose material achievements there may be differences of opinion, but concerning one achievement, none at all. Under Mao the Chinese achieved the total suppression of every liberty catalogued in our own Bill of Rights; none to practice one's religion, to speak out, to read, to educate oneself, to travel, to own land or a home, to trial by due process. But our wise men traveled there, poets, priests, and piccolo players, returning with expressions of undiluted praise: Richard Nixon, John Kenneth Galbraith, Seymour Topping, Harrison Salisbury, Barbara Tuchman, Shirley MacLaine. My favorite of the lot is James Reston, who perfectly expressed the veneration of the new by means of the rejection of the old. He wrote, "I am a Scotch Calvinist. I believe in the redemption of the human spirit and the improvement of man. Maybe it's because I believe that, or I want to believe it, that I was struck by the tremendous effort [in the China of Mao Tse-tung] to bring out what is best in men, what makes them good, what makes them cooperate with one another and be considerate and not beastly to one another." Those words were spoken in 1971, even before the Cultural Revolution could be said to have ended.

So that our retreat has been not only from the practical evangelism of Wilson, but even from a metaphorical commitment to Wilsonianism, as witness the reluctance of the President to speak about human rights where they are most systematically suppressed—in China. Slowly, disillusionment comes, and for those who have charged so often up the mountain, only to come down again, weariness is experienced. The fire that John Kennedy shouted out would illuminate the whole world, flickers here at home. Not only shall we withdraw our troops from Southeast Asia, we shall look if not quite benignly, at least the other way, as the societies we abandon get down to the business of transforming men, according to the vision of James Reston and the Bishop of Cuernavaca, who proposed the canonization of Chou En-lai. On odd days, the State Department or the White House will issue demurals, often self-described as "strong protests." But mostly our talk is an endless extension of the homily with which Lord Home launched the Helsinki conference. Our leaders wish to say to the oppressors of this world that they must not continue in their oppression. Because if they do?—our statesmen will have nothing to talk about at Commencement addresses.

This, I think, is the demon that made Whittaker Chambers weary, this dialectic helplessness: you see what ought to be done, you shrink from the exertions required to do it, you compensate by elevating your rhetoric, whose inevitable hollowness subverts

the very ideals that animated you. This experience, Sisyphean in our time, brought Chambers to predict that that weariness would almost certainly in due course strike out at his more sensitive countrymen.

But in your case, not yet; not nearly yet. It isn't only that you are young, and properly hopeful. Your education has been touched by those intimations of purpose, divine and irreversible, that make hope natural, and despair sinful. "And I heard a great voice from the throne saying, 'Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God himself will be with them; He will wipe away every tear from their eyes. . . .'" Whatever the reasons for objective concern, the imperative continues. In the first month that I knew Whittaker Chambers he wrote me that "it is idle to talk about preventing the wreck of Western civilization. It is already a wreck from within. That is why we can hope to do little more now than snatch a fingernail of a saint from the rack or a handful of ashes from the faggots, and bury them secretly in a flowerpot against the day, ages hence, when a few men begin again to dare to believe that there was once something else, that something else is thinkable, and need some evidence of what it was, and the fortifying knowledge that there were those who, at the great nightfall, took loving thought to preserve the tokens of hope and truth."

Seven years later, the final paragraph of his final letter—after he confessed his weariness from which, before the month was out, he would be forever relieved, was a sharp reproach, which I pass along to those of you who flirt with melancholy. "Something quite different which struck me," he wrote—"what seems to have been your desolation [Malraux's novel] *Man's Fate*. But Hemmelrich goes back (supreme tenderness) to close the door left too hastily open on the bodies of his murdered wife and son. Tchen, about to throw himself and [the] bomb under the automobile, believes that Pei (spared to life because Tchen acts alone) will be able to write more meaningfully by reason of Tchen's act. Kyo takes the cyanide with the sense that the concept of man's dignity enjoins control over his own death. Katow, surrendering even that ultimate, divides his cyanide with those less able to bear man's fate; and walks toward the locomotive [into whose furnace he will, by his executioners, be dropped alive] through a hall of bodies from which comes something like an unutterable sob—the strangled cry. It may also be phrased: 'And the morning stars sang together for joy.' It may also be phrased: 'Il faut supposer Katow heureux.'—One must assume that Katow was a happy man; even as [Camus concluded], " 'Il faut supposer Sisiphe heureux'—one must assume that Sisiphus was a happy man. "For each age," Chambers concluded, "finds its own language for an eternal meaning."

You will contribute to the formulation of your own idiom for our times. Make room in it—for the love of God—for the love of God; for the love of our fragile and embattled and wonderful country; and for this university, which has cared so deeply for you. ●

"NATIONAL PORT WEEK"

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce that with the following Members listed below we have surpassed the required 218 cosponsors for the House joint resolution which authorizes the President to

proclaim the week of September 17-23 as, "National Port Week." So many aspects of our Nation's history have been influenced by our ocean and inland ports. Collectively this Nation's ports comprise the largest port system in the world.

Today, the United States is first in world trade. Of this trade 98 percent is comprised of waterborne imports and exports. Through this trade, our ports provide employment for 1,046,800 Americans. They stimulate a direct dollar income to the local and regional communities around which they serve. On the national level our ports are responsible for an annual personal income of \$19.1 billion. They supply some \$30 billion to the Nation's GNP, and thereby have a direct favorable impact on our balance of payments.

In addition to the vital importance that our four seacoasts and inland waterways have played in linking our urban centers of trade, our ports stand ready as a vital asset to our national defense by serving as a basic link to our transportation system. In the event of war or other national emergency it will be the ports' efficient operation and utilization of facilities which will determine the result of such action.

"National Port Week" will acknowledge the past, present and potential contributions of our ports to the welfare and vitality of our American way of life. I wish to thank all my colleagues listed below for acknowledging the recognition that our ports rightly deserve. I invite them and all Americans to join in celebrating "National Port Week."

The following Members are cosponsors of these two joint resolutions: Mr. AMBRO, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAPUTO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DODD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

A list of all 222 Members, by State, who have cosponsored "National Port Week" resolutions follows:

SPONSORS OF "NATIONAL PORT WEEK" BY STATE

ALABAMA

Tom Beville, Jack Edwards.

ALASKA

Don Young.

ARKANSAS

Bill Alexander.

CALIFORNIA

Glenn M. Anderson, Clair W. Burgener, John L. Burton, Phillip Burton, Don H. Clausen, Del Clawson, James C. Corman, Robert K. Dornan, Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Mark W. Hannaford, Augustus F. Hawkins, Harold T. Johnson, William M. Ketchum, Robert J. Lagomarsino, Robert L. Leggett, Jim Lloyd, John J. McFall, George Miller, John E. Moss, Jerry M. Patterson, Leo J. Ryan, B. F. Sisk, Fortney H. (Pete) Stark, Lionel Van Deerlin, Henry A. Waxman, Bob Wilson, Charles H. Wilson.

CONNECTICUT

William R. Cotter, Christopher J. Dodd, Robert N. Glaimo.

DELAWARE

Thomas B. Evans, Jr.

FLORIDA

L. A. (Skip) Bafalis, Charles E. Bennett, J. Herbert Burke, Bill Chappell, Jr., Louis Frey, Jr., Andy Ireland, Claude Pepper, Paul G. Rogers, Robert L. F. Sikes.

GEORGIA

John J. Flynt, Jr., Bo Ginn, Larry McDonald, Dawson Mathis.

HAWAII

Daniel K. Akaka, Cecil (Cec) Heftel.

ILLINOIS

Frank Annunzio, Tom Corcoran, John G. Fary, Henry J. Hyde, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Robert H. Michel, Morgan F. Murphy, Melvin Price, Tom Rallsback, Dan Rostenkowski, Marty Russo, Paul Simon.

INDIANA

Adam Benjamin, Jr., David L. Cornwell, Floyd J. Fithian, John T. Myers.

KENTUCKY

Tim Lee Carter, Carroll Hubbard, Jr., Gene Snyder.

LOUISIANA

Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, John B. Breaux, Bob Livingston, Gillis W. Long, David C. Treen, Joe D. Waggoner, Jr.

MAINE

David F. Emery, William S. Cohen.

MARYLAND

Goodloe E. Byron, Marjorie S. Holt, Clarence D. Long, Barbara A. Mikulski, Parren J. Mitchell, Gladys Noon Spellman.

MASSACHUSETTS

James A. Burke, Silvio O. Conte, Joseph D. Early, Edward J. Markey, Joe Moakley, Paul E. Tsongas.

MICHIGAN

James J. Blanchard, David E. Bonior, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., John J. Dingell, Carl D. Pursell, Philip E. Ruppe, Guy Vander Jagt.

MINNESOTA

Richard Nolan, James L. Oberstar, Albert H. Quile, Bruce F. Vento.

MISSISSIPPI

David R. Bowen, Trent Lott, G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery.

MISSOURI

William (Bill) Clay, Richard A. Gephardt, Robert A. Young.

MONTANA

Max Baucus.

NEVADA

Jim Santini.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman E. D'Amours.

NEW JERSEY

Edwin B. Forsythe, James J. Florio, Harold C. Hollenbeck, James B. Howard, William J. Hughes, Joseph A. Le Fante, Joseph G. Minish, Edward J. Patten, Matthew J. Rinaldo, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Robert A. Roe, Frank Thompson, Jr.

NEW MEXICO

Manuel Lujan, Jr.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jerome A. Ambro, Mario Biaggi, Jonathan B. Bingham, Bruce F. Caputo, Shirley Chisholm, Thomas J. Downey, Robert Garcia, Benjamin A. Gilman, S. William Green, James M. Hanley, Elizabeth Holtzman, Jack F. Kemp, John J. LaFalce, Norman F. Lent, Matthew F. McHugh, John M. Murphy, Henry J. Nowak, Charles B. Rangel, Frederick W. Richmond, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Stephen J. Solarz, Samuel S. Stratton, Ted Weiss, Lester L. Wolff, Leo C. Zeferetti.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles Rose, Charles Whitley.

OHIO

Thomas L. Ashley, Charles J. Carney, William H. Harsha, Ronald M. Mottl, Mary Rose Oakar, Donald J. Pease, J. William Stanton, Louis Stokes, Charles A. Vanik.

OKLAHOMA

James R. Jones, Ted Risenhoover.

OREGON

Les AuCoin, Robert Duncan, Al Ullman, James Weaver.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph S. Ammerman, Lawrence Coughlin, John H. Dent, Joshua Ellberg, Allen E. Ertel, Daniel J. Flood, Peter H. Kostmayer, Raymond F. Lederer, Joseph M. McDade, Marc L. Marks, William S. Moorhead, Austin J. Murphy, Michael O. Myers, Robert N. C. Nix, Fred B. Rooney, Doug Walgren, Gus Yatron.

RHODE ISLAND

Fernand J. St Germain.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mendel J. Davis, Butler Derrick, John W. Jenrette, Jr., James R. Mann, Floyd Spence.

TENNESSEE

Robin L. Beard, John J. Duncan, Harold E. Ford.

TEXAS

Jack Brooks, Omar Burleson, E de la Garza, Bob Eckhardt, Bob Gammage, Henry B. Gonzalez, James M. Jeffords, Abraham Kazen, Jr., Robert Krueger, Ray Roberts.

VIRGINIA

Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Herbert E. Harris II, J. Kenneth Robinson, Paul S. Tribble, Jr., G. William Whitehurst.

WASHINGTON

Don Bonker, John E. (Jack) Cunningham, Norman D. Dicks, Mike McCormack, Lloyd Meeds, Joel Pritchard.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nick Joe Rahall II.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Cornell, Henry S. Reuss, William A. Steiger.

WYOMING

Teno Roncalio.

PUERTO RICO

Baltasar Corrada.

GUAM

Antonio Borja Won Pat.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Ron de Lugo.

VERMONT

Olin E. Teague, John Young. ●

EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF HIJACKING

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide more effective methods of dealing with the grave problem of international terrorism.

The threat of terrorism remains very high. In a recent report to Congress, FAA Administrator Langhorne Bond indicated that there were 30 hijackings of scheduled air carrier flights in 1977 (5 United States, 25 foreign)—more than in any year since 1972. According to

the report the high visibility of civil aviation will continue to make it an attractive target for these criminal acts.

The bill is designed to deal in a comprehensive way with the threat terrorism poses to Americans both at home and abroad. It will aid law enforcement officials in preventing terrorists acts and bringing to justice the perpetrators of such acts. It will give the President the tools necessary to deal with threats and acts of terrorism and to work toward closer international cooperation in bringing the curtain down on terrorists.

I realize there is little time to consider such an important measure in this session. However, due to the nature of the subject matter I believe it is imperative that we act this year to provide a means for our Government to deal more effectively and promptly with terrorism. In this regard, the Aviation Subcommittee, which I chair, will hold hearings on this bill in July.

I am introducing this bill along with my colleagues, Chairman "Bizz" JOHNSON of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, and Mr. HARSHA, ranking minority member of the committee, and Mr. SNYDER, ranking minority member of the Aviation Subcommittee. It incorporates what we believe is an informed and constructive approach to the problem. We have worked jointly on the bill, and with your assistance, Mr. Speaker, we hope to move this bill expeditiously through committee and to the floor this session. ●

PRESIDENT OPENS NEW ERA FOR THE PANAMA CANAL AND THE HEMISPHERE

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1978, a major event in the history of the foreign relations of this country occurred—the United States and the Republic of Panama exchanged the instruments of ratification of the Panama Canal Treaty and the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Operation and Neutrality of the Panama Canal.

I had the great honor and privilege to accompany President Carter on this mission to Panama and to witness the ceremonies.

The President of the United States, Jimmy Carter, did not send an emissary to make the exchange. His presence, which he determined was necessary despite possible criticism, gave additional visible proof of this President's genuine commitment to bringing about a new era of understanding and cooperation with our neighbors in this hemisphere.

I found it particularly illustrative of this President's mettle that during his visit to the Isthmus of Panama, he took the time to address residents of the Canal Zone, many of whom deeply resent the impending change of living under the jurisdiction of another country. The

President brought home two key themes in his message—that the United States appreciates the loyal service of canal employees, and that the United States cares about the future of the canal's workers. He told the Canal Zone's residents:

First, the American people and I appreciate what you are doing here, and, second, the American people and I care what happens to you.

Moreover, the President supported his assertions by pointing out some specific examples of the rights and benefits of canal workers that would be protected. He said:

For example, we have tried to preserve during the life of the treaty as many as possible of the civil liberties that Americans cherish to ensure that they will be respected. I discussed them with the Panamanian officials yesterday and told them of the importance that we attach to these basic and important rights.

In addition to assuring U.S. canal employees of the good faith of their Government, the President's message was important because it was a call of responsibility and for responsibility.

The President took full responsibility for the policy of forging the new treaty relationship with Panama—a treaty relationship which has had a political baptism of fire. The President called upon canal workers to respond to the change in a responsible way—to carry out their duties as diligently and efficiently as they always have. In this day when the premium on great leadership is so high, President Carter has shown us the responsible character that has made our Nation a great moral as well as military power.

The importance of the President's visit to Panama did not relate to the canal alone. The visit had important ramifications for the conduct of our hemispheric relations. That was recognized by the participation of the elected leaders of Colombia, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Jamaica in the United States-Panamanian exchange.

In his call for a commitment to the principles of mutual cooperation and peace, the President appealed to the highest human values. He asked that the principles of peace, nonintervention, mutual respect, and cooperation be applied to the settlement of territorial disputes, the development of new treaties, advancement of human rights, and social justice.

Many of President Carter's statements in Panama are reminiscent of the policy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Roosevelt declared, in opening the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on December 1, 1936:

Peace comes from the spirit and must be grounded in faith. In seeking peace, perhaps we can best begin by proudly affirming the faith in freedom and its fulfillment which has proved a mighty fortress beyond reach of successful attack in half of the world.

That faith arises from a common hope and a common design given us by our fathers in differing form but with a single aim—freedom and security of the individual, which has become the foundation of our peace.

We do not know whether the complex and divisive world problems that beset us can be solved, but it is clear that they will not be solved unless the nations recognize that they must appeal to our highest ideals, as President Carter has done.

President Carter's trip should be recognized for its importance. I believe the President should be commended for his understanding that the first operational requirement of the canal is a dedicated and loyal workforce. He should be commended for his willingness to make the hard points. He should be commended for emphasizing a foreign policy of justice and fairness that has made the United States the great hope of the world.

The Congress of the United States has the responsibility of implementing the new Panama Canal Treaty relationship. The successful conclusion of the new relationship is particularly dependent upon wise legislation. Despite the stormy politics that have attended the canal issue to this time; despite the deep-seated and sometimes emotional national sentiment aroused over the canal; despite these, the Members of this Chamber must exhibit the same seriousness of purpose, sincerity, appeal to high ideals, and commitment as has the President.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the public, I wish to spread on the RECORD at this time the President's addresses in the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone. I would also like to point out that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee spread on the RECORD on June 19, 1978, page 18121, the full texts of the instruments of ratification:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S SPEECH DELIVERED AT PANAMA CANAL TREATY RATIFICATIONS CEREMONIES IN THE NEW SPORTS COLISEUM, JUNE 16, 1978

"General Torrijos, President Lakas, President Perez, President Lopez Michelsen, President Lopez Portillo, President Carazo, Prime Minister Manley, distinguished guests and friends."

"I want to thank General Torrijos and President Lakas for their invitation to participate in this ceremony. I came to Panama and accepted it because I want to dramatize my appreciation for this achievement—a firmer, more productive friendship between the United States of America and Panama, and, more broadly, a gain for the causes of peace and cooperation among all nations."

"We are honored by the presence of the leaders of the five democratic countries who gave encouragement to us and advice to both nations during the final treaty negotiations. I am grateful to them—not only for the serious and helpful role they played in those final days and weeks, but also for their continuing leadership in dealing with such crucial matters as world peace, nuclear non-proliferation, the status of human rights and democratic government, and better relationships between the developed nations and the developing countries."

"It is now three-quarters of a century since the first spade of earth was turned in the building of the Panama Canal. This 'path between two seas' remains one of the greatest and more benevolent creations ever wrought by human labor and by human ingenuity. As a neutral artery for the ships of all nations, the canal has contributed im-

mensely to the peaceful work of the world. The treaties we solemnize today will help perpetuate that peaceful work for many generations to come."

"Under the treaties, our two governments agree to maintain the neutrality and security of the canal. At the same time, we reaffirm our commitment to honor national sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention. These principles are enshrined in the charters of the organization of American States and the United States.

"During the long and difficult negotiations, both sides held to a vision of friendship and goodwill. Both sides were determined to build a new relationship of mutual respect, fairness, and equity. Because of that vision, because of that determination, we were finally able to reach agreement."

"Now—after fourteen years on opposite sides of the bargaining table—we are equally committed to putting into practice the agreements we have forged."

"During the period of transition which lies ahead, the United States and Panama will be working closely together. Both our countries want that transition to be smooth and effective. Under the treaties, both nations are committed to safeguarding the interests of those Americans and Panamanians who have operated the canal so efficiently and so expertly during its period of American stewardship."

"Together, our two countries have set an example for peaceful and successful negotiation that had few parallels in history. We have demonstrated our mutual sincerity and goodwill. In the face of disagreements, not only between the two nations, but within the nations themselves, disagreements, that were initially very deep, in the face of our vast disparity in size and power, we dealt with each other in good faith as equals, and with equal determination to overcome our difference."

"During the years ahead we will work as partners to make the promise of the treaties a reality. We, the people of the United States and you, the people of Panama, still have history to make together."

TEXT OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S SPEECH AT A RALLY FOLLOWING THE EXCHANGE OF INSTRUMENTS OF RATIFICATION, JUNE 16, 1978

This day marks the beginning of a new partnership between Panama and the United States. The new treaties embody our mutual commitment to work together to assure that the Panama Canal shall always remain open, secure and accessible to the vessels of all nations.

With the help of the five great American democracies whose leaders are with us today, Panama and the United States reached agreement. In the process, we breathed new life into old principles—principles of peace, non-intervention, mutual respect and cooperation.

It is easy to honor these principles in theory. What our two countries have done is much harder, and much more meaningful: we have made them the basis for action. We have shown that even great changes in international relations—changes that involve deep emotions and powerful material interests—can be accomplished through putting these principles to work.

That is why the significance of our joint achievement goes far beyond the special concerns of the United States and Panama; that is why I believe that we stand on the threshold of a new era of Inter-American understanding and cooperation.

Let us now apply these principles to the overriding concerns of our hemisphere—peace, human rights and dignity, and economic development.

Let us resolve anew to settle the remaining territorial disputes in our hemisphere through peaceful negotiation.

Let us work together to bring into effect the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which bans nuclear weapons from Latin America.

Let us advance the cause of human dignity and build a hemisphere in which citizens of every country are free from torture and arbitrary arrest, free to speak and write as they please, free to participate in the determination of their own destiny.

Let us build a fairer, more cooperative international economy—one which fosters social justice and helps the world's poor lift themselves out of misery.

As we move toward these goals, we will need not new slogans, but a new spirit. In the peaceful process of negotiating the treaties, we have shown the world a spirit which recognizes and respects the rights of others and seeks to help all people to fulfill their legitimate aspirations with confidence and dignity.

That spirit must continue to bind us together in the years to come—the people of Panama and the United States and the people of all the Americas who are working to bring into being a hemisphere free from war, free from want and free from any oppression of human liberty.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT CARTER'S SPEECH DELIVERED TO THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY AT FORT CLAYTON, JUNE 17, 1978

"Distinguished officials who have operated and defended the canal, who have performed superb service for our government, who are an integral and admired part of the American community:

I come here with a sense of history, a sense of appreciation for what you have accomplished and are accomplishing for our country; a sense of gratitude to you.

A few months ago as I was visiting with David McCulloch, who wrote the book "The Path Between The Seas," I began to sense and to feel the enthusiasm for the extraordinary engineering achievement that the canal represents.

I have just returned from a flight over the canal to see the beautiful operation of it. I have been looking forward to a chance to visit Fort Clayton, Miraflores locks, so that I could see first-hand the professionalism and the dedication that makes this canal work and which keeps the canal secure.

I am very proud of those of you who belong to the various military components of the southern command. (Cheers) I was in the Navy for 11 years. And as you well know, we depended on the army to take care of the canal so that we could go from—(applause)

Through a long and difficult period you have maintained a very high level of preparedness for the defense of the canal and for the protection of American lives and property and for the representation of the spirit and character of the United States in the most superb way.

It is your effort and your training that have kept Americans assured of our strength and our security here and I thank you for it. (Cheers and applause)

Those of you who are civilian, both Americans and Panamanians, have contributed immeasurably to the operation of the canal.

My life would be easier if every government employee showed the same consistent combination of efficiency and talent as your group does and we all appreciate the superb performance. You always do your job and you do this well. (Cheers and applause)

For many years, the legal arrangements governing the Panama Canal and the zone have been a source of contention and argument and dispute between the United States and Panama. Most people who looked at the situation agreed that some change, of some kind, was called for. I think most

of you who live in the canal zone agree with that statement. We disagreed not about whether there should be changes, but what those changes ought to be.

As you know, my predecessors in the White House, President Ford, President Nixon, President Johnson, President Kennedy, understood that some changes had to be made. I know each of you has known you were defending American interests here in the Canal Zone, and I respect your convictions and your spirit and your loyalty to your country, even though we did not always agree about the best course to take.

The Senate of the United States has acted, and the treaties are now a fact. I am not here to justify them, or to suggest that if you understood the treaties better that you would because for you, they are not just a distant and impersonal foreign policy abstraction, but something that alters your lives in a direct and immediate way.

You know, as I do, that a great deal will change as a result of these treaties. A few of you will be leaving the only place on earth you have ever called home. That is a hard and a painful thing to do. The adjustments and uncertainties that you now face will not be easy.

I understand that. I understand, too, why you love this place. Seventy-five years ago, Americans came here as builders. In quiet ways, often unrecognized, often unappreciated, we have been builders ever since. For all the rest of your lives, every one of you will be proud, and justifiably so, to have been part of this canal, proud of what you have built and protected and loved.

That is evident, not only from what you say, but what you do. The care and affection which you continue to show in the operation of the canal is clear evidence of the deep feeling which you and the American people have for the canal. So I come here today not to win you over to the decision made by me and the American Congress, but because there are two things that I want very much to say.

First, the American people and I appreciate what you are doing here and, second, the American people and I care what happens to you.

In the millions of words spoken and written about the treaties, our appreciation and our concern have not been clearly expressed.

We have tried to demonstrate these sentiments in the treaties as well as in the separate agreements and the annexes.

The rights of American workers will be protected. The treaties guarantee to employees:

First, in general, terms and conditions of employees which are no less favorable than they are now; nothing will be done to decrease the quality of your status as employees; secondly, the right to collective bargaining and, as you know, for the next 22 years, the entity with which you will bargain will be a part of the United States Government; third, optional early retirement for those who desire it.

We hope that as you understand clearly the conditions under which you will be working and living, that you will decide to stay on as a constructive and a helpful and a dependable employee. But if there should be individual instances where you find this not to be true, then earlier retirement benefits will be made available to you so that you will not suffer under any circumstances.

The United States Government will be responsible to you for implementing the treaty provisions fully and fairly. We will continue to do so in the enabling legislation which the Congress will begin to consider later this year and next year.

We will see to it that this enabling legislation ensures government-wide job placement, and liberalized retirement benefits, better than those that you have now. To the

limit of our ability in an international agreement, our negotiations with Panama have sought to secure your rights and your welfare and your safety and your peace of mind.

For example, we have tried to preserve during the life of the treaty as many as possible of the civil liberties that Americans cherish to ensure that they will be respected. I discussed them with the Panamanian officials yesterday and told them of the importance that we attach to these basic and important rights.

Everyone understands that we want to enter upon a new era of harmonious cooperation and good will between the people of Panama and the Americans associated with the canal and that there is no room for bad faith in that relationship.

It requires a hospitable and a cordial attitude only on our part, but on Panama's as well. I think all of you may have observed yesterday the tremendous outpouring of appreciation and friendship expressed by the Panamanian people. The largest crowd that I have ever seen came out in a spirit of appreciation and commitment to a good partnership in the future, based on mutual respect, a desire for peace and a realization that the operation of the canal without interruption is important not only to our two countries and our people, but to the rest of the world.

We know that Panama will show strict regard for all its responsibilities toward you.

We have also tried to carry out our obligation to you by ensuring that the terms and conditions of your employment will generally stay the same when the treaty goes into effect. We know that the circumstances under which you work matter a great deal, as do good schools, medical care, and other services. These have not been neglected in the long negotiations over the last 14 years.

According to the treaties, the canal will increasingly be a place of Panamanian employment. Some of you might leave very soon; others will remain for many, many years. I am relying on all of you to help make this transaction as smooth as possible. That is your duty, your responsibility, and the people of both nations expect nothing less. You have never disappointed our country in the past. I am sure you will not do so in the future.

We are trying and we hope that you will help us to succeed to bring a successful new chapter in the history of the canal that you have managed and cared for so long. You have brought credit to yourselves and to your country by operating the canal efficiently, honestly, and honorably for the benefit of all nations.

The time when this was America's job alone is now coming to an end. The treaties reflect that time, and in so doing, they help guarantee that the rest of the world will recognize our essential fairness and decency as a people.

The future of this waterway will depend upon the cooperation and the understanding of both Panamanians and Americans. I know that some day we will join in looking back, with admiration, and respect, at the dedication and devotion of the thousands of employees, American and Panamanian, who made and continue to make the canal one of the supreme human achievements of all time.

That is part of the history of our great country. That is part of the future of our great country. In this time of change, as President of the United States, you can consider me to be a partner of yours. (Applause)

I have instructed all the officials, both military and civilian, in this canal zone, to contact me directly to alleviate any concerns, any maladministration, any differences between ourselves and the people of Panama as these changing times approach.

And to close my statement to you, I would like to repeat again that as the leader of our great nation, the greatest on earth, I am

proud of what you have done in the past and what you are doing today and I have complete confidence that you will continue to represent our nation in the finest spirit of dedication, of competence and of good will in the years to come.

Thank you everyone. God bless you. ●

DAVID HALSTEAD—TORRANCE DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, each year the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce confers its "Distinguished Citizen Award" on the man or woman who has exemplified the highest standards of community service. This year's award winner is truly deserving of his award, for few individuals have contributed as much to the growth of a community as has David Halstead to the city of Torrance.

For 18 years—16 of them as chairman—David served as a member of the Torrance Planning Commission during a time when Torrance underwent a period of tremendous growth. A contractor by trade, David Halstead was a guiding force not only in seeing that development served the best interests of the people of Torrance, but in the evolution of the Torrance Planning Department into the highly efficient, professional unit it is today.

Born in San Francisco on October 1, 1918, David moved to the Los Angeles area at the tender age of 2, and graduated from Hollywood High School in 1938 after playing guard on the school's football team. He entered the contracting business in 1940, and during the Second World War worked as a civilian employee at the Pearl Harbor Naval Base.

He returned to California following the war, and reentered the contracting business in partnership in the firm of Spraker Halstead. In 1956 he moved with his family to the Hollywood Riviera section of Torrance.

It was in 1959 that David Halstead was appointed to the Torrance Planning Commission. At that time, the planning department consisted of three employees, and the commission members volunteered their time, as they do now. After 2 years, Dave became chairman of the commission, a post he held until his retirement from the position last year.

Dave Halstead brought energy, leadership, integrity, and a professional knowledge of the problems influencing a community's growth and development to the commission. It came at a critical time in the development of Torrance into the third largest city in Los Angeles County. In 1962, a year after he became chairman of the commission, Torrance led all cities in the United States in terms of percentage growth.

One of Dave's first priorities was the hiring of a professional planning staff to help the commission in its decision-making process. He helped not only to

train the staff, but to encourage them to make independent judgments for the commission's consideration. Dave also initiated field tours of proposed developments, and asked for citizen's advisory recommendations to insure public input.

David's leadership on the commission was outstanding, and his background as a developer enabled him to operate as a professional on behalf of the people of Torrance. With his direction, the planning commission and the city council adopted stricter parking, density, landscaping, signing and procedural requirements—and made sure they were followed. The beauty, utility, and vitality of Torrance today is due in no small measure to David Halstead's foresight and leadership.

However, David Halstead's contributions to the Torrance community were not limited to his outstanding work on the planning commission. He is a member of the Torrance Kiwanis Club, the Elk's Lodge of Redondo Beach, and has long been an active force in the Riviera Homeowners Association. In the latter capacity, he was responsible for setting up parks and recreational facilities for the residents of his neighborhood.

Dave was active in the Girl Scouts of America while his daughters, Phyllis and Debora, belonged to that organization. He has always been concerned with education, and was very active in a local school bond election in 1963 and the tax override in 1964. In addition, he has long been a supporter of Little League activities, and has sponsored a team for many years.

Mr. Speaker, few people have left their mark on a community in such a positive fashion as David Halstead has in Torrance. His retirement from the planning commission in August 1977, marked the end of an exciting era in Torrance development, but the high standards of professionalism and concern for community betterment he gave the commission will stand as his heritage.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating David Halstead on being selected the "Distinguished Citizen," and also in commending the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce in their deserving choice. We would also like to extend our best to Dave's lovely wife, Mildred, and their two daughters, Phyllis and Debora. ●

MR. SOLZHENITSYN AND THE POST

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, is not it annoying to read an editorial that is so far off the mark that it screams out for rebuttal? Pomposity and platitudes, misplaced piety and shallow thoughts were the twists and turns of the pathetic, Washington Post editorial rejecting the Harvard commencement address of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Perhaps I find many Post editorials tiresome, because I harbor a deep sus-

picion that the editorialists of the Post, too, are tired. They rarely surprise me—or for that matter anybody else—with their daily pontifications on problems foreign and domestic. One wonders whether the once vast reservoirs of the liberal imagination have dried up, or whether the writers, saying the same things year in and year out, are intellectually bored with their own prescriptions.

If anything, the Post is a true bastion of a flaccid, trendy, superannuated establishment liberalism. I do not think that we will read many Earth shattering editorials emanating from this powerful paper in the foreseeable future. The reason for this was advanced some years ago by Prof. Richard M. Weaver, a brilliant member of the department of English at the University of Chicago:

If Liberalism stemmed out of some deeply anchored and coherent philosophy of life, if it expressed some compelling vision of existence, we might not apply the term complacency to its habit of mind. But with its non-committal attitude toward all the positive issues of life, it cannot rise to the dignity of a philosophy which might unify an epoch and provide ground for constructive creations.

What would the defenders of Post World War II liberalism do if, indeed, they were presented with a challenger who posited a coherent philosophy of life, deeply anchored in a strong and enduring intellectual tradition?

Mr. Speaker, we received an answer to that question in the June 11, 1978, editorial on Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's commencement address at Harvard University: "Solzhenitsyn as Witness." The editorial begins:

Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's personal credentials—as one who suffered and survived to bear witness to the suffering of others—compel the closest attention to his public utterances.

One cannot but agree. And one is likewise compelled to pay the closest attention to the editorials of the Post.

Let us consider the several points the Post raises.

The Post correctly observes that Solzhenitsyn has made a discomfiting historical analysis of the intellectual trends prevailing since the collapse of medieval European unit. With the coming of the Renaissance, he tells us, and continuing into that period termed "The Enlightenment," man lost his vision of God. Man turned his attentions almost exclusively toward self. The material life was exalted at the expense of the spiritual life—a reaction to the excessive spiritualism of the Middle Ages. This transition in thought and feeling was not without its practical significance. The triumph of this secularistic world view was an hierarchical perversion, and was at the bottom of a whole series of modern intellectual, moral, and spiritual crises that plague us to this very day.

In speaking to the graduating class of Harvard University, Solzhenitsyn told them that we in the West have abandoned a vast tradition of learning and the rich, spiritual heritage that defines, and gives vitality to, the culture of the Judeo-Christian West. And for that rea-

son, a resurrected Russia could not expect to follow our lead. His exact words:

No; I could not recommend your society in its present state as an ideal for the transformation of ours.

Note well, my friends, Mr. Solzhenitsyn speaks in the present tense. He does not say that our essential principles, our fundamental convictions, rooted in the Judeo-Christian religious tradition and in the venerable Greco-Roman legal and political experience, are wrong. Not at all. He only tells us that we have deviated from ancient and enduring principles, as well as standards of excellence, and this deviation has resulted in a multidimensional decline in our art, our literature, our music, and our statesmanship. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that Solzhenitsyn is only speaking in the present tense. He is a Christian and, by that fact alone, he knows that no man, no people, is irretrievably lost.

That, in essence, is his thesis.

Consider the Post's response.

First, "Yet he launches his critique from a position betraying a gross misunderstanding of Western society, which has chosen to organize its political and social and cultural affairs on the basis of a respect for the differences among men." The Post resorts here to an invalid subterfuge, an argumentum ad hominem. There is no attempt, not even a paragraph, to debate or challenge the substance of what the great Russian author has to say. No; the Post is content to brand a Nobel Prize winning author as simply ignorant. By logical implication, men with a correct understanding of Western society would not say such things. They would say other things, the kind of things uttered in Post editorials. What unmitigated low-grade baloney.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is simply a refusal to join issues. Also, I agree that much of what Mr. Solzhenitsyn has to say is unpleasant, but no adult has the right to act like a child, or rather a petulant little brat who responds to sober criticism by sneering and sticking out his tongue.

The editorial continues:

But his views remain very Russian: they arise from particular religious and political strains remote from modern Western experience.

This statement is a combination of error and oversimplification. That Solzhenitsyn speaks for a venerable, intellectual, and spiritual tradition that is Russian is obvious enough; but that is no reason for overlooking the equally obvious, and more important fact, that his views are also Christian, and, contrary to the Post's observation, wish, or desire, far from remote to the modern Western experience.

The truth is that Solzhenitsyn's social and political views are similar to those held by numerous Western writers and philosophers dead and alive. Scholars, writers, essayists, and religious leaders have been saying many of the same things found in Solzhenitsyn's speech for a very long time. The problem is that we entertain a tendency to dismiss those who disagree with liberal assumptions, rather than join in serious argument. As

the American philosopher, George Santayana remarked in his 1937 work "Character and Opinion in the United States":

We do not nowadays refute our predecessors, we pleasantly bid them good-bye.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders of the American Republic were steeped in a strong Judeo-Christian tradition. They believed that the politics of the society must be governed by morals, and not morals by politics. The authors of the Federalist Papers, Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, knew well what far too many politicians fail to realize: That a political system is not merely a set of legal relationships, but must rest solidly, not only on the wisdom, but on the virtue of a self-disciplined and upright people. Montesquieu, a venerable teacher of the founders, also reminded them that the danger to republics comes not from poverty or adversity, but from luxury and affluence.

Solzhenitsyn told his Harvard audience:

The constant desire to have still more "things" and a still better life and the struggle to obtain "them" imprints many Western faces with worry and even depression, though it is customary to conceal such feelings. Active and tense competition permeates all human thoughts without opening a way to free spiritual development.

Consider a related observation made a little over 100 years ago by Orestes Brownson, a great American political theorist, author of "The American Republic," a brilliant and profoundly patriotic commentary on the American Constitution:

Liberalism, taken in its practical workings in a society, with weak faith, a movable religion, and no loyalty, tends to develop wants which it is impossible to satisfy, because the wants it develops all demand their satisfaction from the material order. But the multiplication of wants which can be satisfied only with material or sensible goods, is not a good, but an evil.

So much for the exclusive "Russian-ness" of Solzhenitsyn's views. But—but after declaring Solzhenitsyn an ignorant Russian, the Post levels a more serious charge: Solzhenitsyn, from his comfortable vantage point in the West, in a society of tolerance and diversity, uses "tolerance and diversity, that are the splendors of the West, to attack tolerance and diversity."

Mr. Speaker, I leave it for philosophers and historians to debate whether or not "tolerance and diversity" are the "splendors of the West." However, I have pored over the Russian author's speech in order to find an attack on tolerance and diversity, and lo, I cannot find it. I can only conclude that the charge is not only erroneous, but false. In fact, to the contrary, I discern a clear and unambiguous fear on the part of the great Russian for the protection of diversity and the preservation of tolerance within mass democracy. He fears for the integrity of the individual, especially the gifted artist or writer, the man who is unfashionable or different. So he writes, "... what is not fashionable will hardly ever find its way into periodicals or books or be heard in colleges." He fears that the perceived need "... to match

mass standards frequently prevents independent people from giving their contribution to public life."

Mr. Speaker, the Post is setting up a strawman. It is not, by resorting to such a strategem, doing anything to enlighten the public mind. It is resorting to the old demagogic ruse of the stump orator: When in trouble, confuse the issue.

Then we come to foreign policy. From arguments ad hominem, childish carping, and cant, the Post takes us to the nether depths of hypocrisy. Note the editorialist's lofty tone:

For the West, respect for diversity has an international dimension as well as an individual one. If Mr. Solzhenitsyn understands this, he does not accept it. He speaks for boundless cold war.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Solzhenitsyn understands it very well. And so does the Post—though it seems to make it pompous observations from very high altitudes, on very special occasions, and on very selective topics.

The fact that Solzhenitsyn respects international diversity is borne out by the very fact that he believes that our own, Western, industrial society, is not, at least in its present condition—a fit model for a future Russia. He realizes that one cannot blithely superimpose one set of political, cultural, and social institutions on another, grounded in a

radically different historical experience. The fact that he says this is proof enough, and, in itself, a refutation of the Post's 180° distortion of meaning.

But what does the Post really mean when it speaks of international "diversity." What kind of "international diversity" does—or rather, following the prescriptions of the Post—should, the West respect? The key phrase—what makes the Pavlovian dogs of "détente" slobber—is, according to the Post, "boundless cold war." Our respect for international diversity should extend then, to Soviet totalitarianism, the Eastern bloc, and others. But, judging from past Post editorials, it does not seem to stretch to South Africa, Chile, Rhodesia, or South Korea. There are, after all, limits to the virtues of "tolerance and diversity." Those "splendors of the West" ought not to be squandered, but held in reserve for the right causes, that is, causes that tap the liberal imagination, rather than any rigorously logical and universally applicable standard of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether hypocrisy is born of intellectual bankruptcy or the reverse. But I think I do know the cause of anguish among Solzhenitsyn's critics: He scored a direct hit on modern liberalism. And they know it. Solzhenitsyn's target is a West infected by modern liberalism, not the West of

the classical and Christian tradition. A relativistic, secularistic, and materialistic culture is morally and intellectually bankrupt. And the premises of modern liberalism are unquestionably relativistic, secularistic, and materialistic.

Again, Mr. Speaker, our cause is a great cause. Our duty is to recover our intellectual, moral, and political heritage. We must fire the imagination of the Western world, as we did once before. But we must take stock of ourselves, and not allow ourselves to fall victim to a complacency that will prevent us from realizing our destiny. As Professor Weaver, whom I quoted earlier, reminds us:

Man's very reality depends upon his carrying the past into the present through the power of memory. If he does not want identity, if he has actually come to hate himself, it is natural for him to try to get rid of memory's baggage. He will travel light.

Let us remember who we are.

A footnote: Mrs. Rosalyn Carter's supershallow remarks in response to Alexander Solzhenitsyn's ringing words of challenge are really too banal to be analyzed. One obvious point for the Carters to deeply ponder. In the preholocaust Nazi Germany of the early thirties there were lots and lots of volunteers working in the hospitals, soup kitchens, and orphanages, you dig? * * * God help the West.●

SENATE—Friday, June 23, 1978

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 17, 1978)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. KANEASTER HODGES, JR., a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Reverend C. Keith Elliot, pastor, the First Christian Church of Miami, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, quick to still the restless wave yet slow to chastise the impatience of Thy creation, we humbly seek Thy grace. We come, wishing only to serve Thee, bringing nothing in our hands, waiting in contrition for the strength of Thy love.

Forgive us if we rely only on our own devices and provide us a vision of Your purpose in the midst of our decision-making. Grant us hope when the way seems unclear. Stir our imagination when our choices seem limited.

Walk with our President, that he be inspired by Thy presence. Shower upon the Members of this Senate Thy wisdom and courage as they seek to worthily fulfill the trust placed in them by You and their constituents. In all ways, as always, guide this Nation. "Grant us wisdom, grant us courage, that we fail not man nor Thee." 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 23, 1978.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KANEASTER HODGES, JR., a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HODGES thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF LEADERSHIP

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished acting minority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Robin Keuhl and Dennis Fradley, of my staff, be granted privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mr. HAYAKAWA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. John Backer, of my staff, be granted privilege of the floor during the discussion of this measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORT EFFORTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Wednesday the Foreign Agricultural Policy Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry gave tentative approval to legislation intended to upgrade and improve our agricultural export efforts. The bill is based primarily on S. 2968, legislation which I introduced