

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SUMMER FEEDING PROGRAM

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

• Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the summer feeding program was established and funded by Congress to be implemented by the Department of Agriculture. I have consistently supported the program, based upon the simple assumption that children are the unwilling victims of poverty. As they are unable to do anything by themselves to improve their lot, it remains for society to at least assure that they have some semblance of an adequate diet during the summer months spent away from school.

Insofar as the program has resulted in nutritious meals for poor children, it has been successful. Yet, even its most enthusiastic supporters must face the fact that there have been far too many instances of mismanagement within the program. These, in turn, have resulted in many serious problems, the losers being not only the children, but the Federal Government and the private firms which participated as well.

Until this year, the program has been implemented in New York State by the State Department of Education, which approved nonprofit sponsors to distribute the meals. The sponsors, in turn, contracted for the procurement of food with private vendors. In a number of instances, the Department of Agriculture alleged that several sponsors—the regulation and control of which has been its responsibility—failed to keep the necessary records to establish that the meals were distributed to eligible children. Therefore, the Department has withheld funds from these sponsors, leaving the companies, which acted in good faith to provide the food, with nowhere to go for reimbursement.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Members the plight of one of those persons who has been victimized.

John Krauss, Inc., is a 45-year-old, meat-processing company located in my congressional district, in Jamaica, Queens, N.Y. The company has built a fine reputation for providing quality meals in accordance with all of its contractual obligations. Among its many satisfied customers, incidentally, is the Department of Defense.

John Krauss, Inc., agreed to participate in the summer feeding program as early as 1972. All of the children who were served meals containing meat provided by John Krauss certainly benefited from the program. However, for the meat processor, the company's involvement was a distinct disaster. During the period 1975 to 1977, John Krauss provided over \$900,000 worth of food, for which he has not yet been reimbursed.

If there has been some wrongdoing in

the program, it is the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to ferret it out. But, John Krauss is an innocent who has acted honestly and in good faith. It is a burden of almost catastrophic dimensions for a small business to absorb a \$900,000 loss. The cost of carrying so large an account receivable is in excess of \$125,000 per year. A well-established company, which employs 260 people in the depressed south Jamaica area of Queens, is now threatened with bankruptcy. John Krauss has been forced by his bank to institute legal proceedings against the sponsor agencies. However, the sponsors are nonprofit agencies with no real assets. Thus, John Krauss must also incur large legal costs for a futile legal effort.

John Krauss told me that he would still participate in the summer feeding program this year, in spite of his previous difficulties. Such is his devotion to what he considers a worthwhile Government project. However, his bank will not extend to him the necessary credit, as they consider participation in the program to be an unsafe investment. Thus, the operation of a worthwhile Government program is hindered, because the private sector cannot be assured that their accounts will be paid on time, if at all.

The cost of mismanagement in the summer feeding program is measured in more than dollars. For John Krauss, the cost could be his business—his family's productive effort for the past 45 years. For the people of Queens, the cost could be the loss of 260 jobs in a company which has given substance and vitality to a deteriorating neighborhood. And, let us not forget the children, who, as I said before, are the unwilling victims of poverty. The summer feeding program provides them with the nutritious meals they need to grow up to be intelligent, active, and contributing members of society. If not a threat to this entire worthwhile program, the mismanagement at least prevents the full participation of Government, private agencies, private enterprise, and children. The fuller the participation on all sides, the greater the number of children who can benefit.●

STATEMENT OF PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

• Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 23, 1978, I was present on the floor and voted "yea" on rollcall No. 491, H.R. 11493, authorizing \$768.25 million for fiscal year 1979 for Amtrak. Apparently my vote was not recorded correctly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was marked as "not voting" on this bill and I wish to correct this inaccuracy.●

FREEING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WORKERS

HON. BRUCE F. CAPUTO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

• Mr. CAPUTO. Mr. Speaker, the age discrimination in Employment Act, enacted into law, April 6 of this year represents a major stride in American society. I would like to submit for the RECORD, a precis of an article by Dr. Leonard M. Greene, president of the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies, which highlights some of the attributes of allowing our competent American citizens to engage in employment beyond the age of 65:

ONLY THE BEGINNING ON FREEING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WORKERS

(By Dr. Leonard M. Greene)

The stereotypes on which mandatory retirement has been built will only slowly fade away. Automatic ejection at 65 has become a heavily encrusted institution since 65 was arbitrarily picked as "the" retirement age in the Social Security Act of 1935.

The discrimination faced by older workers is not a true reflection of their actual working abilities and potentials. Even in the 60-82 age group, the ability to learn new tasks is only slightly lower than for younger workers. Absenteeism is 20 percent less among workers at or above the "retirement age" as compared to younger workers.

Some companies have capitalized on the advantages of older workers with great success. The Burpee Seed Company in 1975 had workers aged 56 to 85 with an average age of 68 and an 85-year-old president!

Not only depriving the nation of productivity, early retirement also poses a serious threat to pension plans. Many private pension funds are underfinanced. Increasingly, corporations are trying to persuade personnel to delay retirement. The current crisis will remind us that at any age retirement is still, in historical terms, a relatively untried innovation.

Is U.S. affluence sufficient? Have our social aspirations again outstripped economic reality? Certainly those arguing for the end of retirement at 65 did not disguise the fact that our Social Security system could not afford it. Now it is hoped that enough workers will delay retirement to allay pressure on Social Security. Even so, the high cost of retirement upon society remains apparent. Congress is reeling over a taxpayer revolt against the high level of Social Security "contributions" now exacted of every wage earner in order to bail out the system.

With the possibility of continuing stagflation, a faltering dollar and the unpredictability of world supplies of such essentials as food and petroleum, the danger of permitting continued proliferation of mass retirement seems all the greater. To pull through straitened times, the overriding need may be for more work and more workers.

The new era wherein mandatory retirement no longer confronts employees at age 65 will certainly impose a far-reaching necessity on management; it will again be required to manage! The practice of waiting for compulsory retirement to dislodge the "deadwood" will have to be replaced with standard

measures of performance to be applied to all employees.

Easy acceptance of this form of lotus-eating may well be a factor in the declining productivity of American industry and its inadequacy upon the world market. Few demands have been made upon workers or management alike.

Many of our aged want to work and need to work. Because society does not have sufficient abundance to abide substantial members of non-producers, the skills and experience of older workers should be utilized. To do so effectively will require that the "deadwood" that we discard be that in our minds.●

A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING ENRICO FERMI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the archives of history are filled with the names of famous men who distinguished themselves in various fields of endeavor. Such a man was Enrico Fermi: Nobel Prize winner and Italian nuclear physicist. Since 1979 is the 25th anniversary of Fermi's greatest scientific contribution, the splitting of the uranium atom, I would like to take this opportunity to speak for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in his honor.

During Dr. Fermi's lifetime, he was a very prominent Italian-American who represented what the working class of America is all about. Born in 1901 from working class parents, he was, by 1939, recognized as one of the world's foremost scientists by his selection for the highly coveted Nobel Peace Prize. Among Dr. Fermi's greatest contributions in nuclear physics was the construction of the first American nuclear reactor in 1942. His unselfish dedication in the field of nuclear fission won him the Hughes Medal of the Royal Society.

Dr. Fermi's contributions, though, did not end there. Through amazing perseverance, he achieved scientific immortality as the first man to split the nuclei of uranium atoms by bombarding them with neutrons, thus producing the first radioactive substances.

After his death, Dr. Fermi was inducted into the Italian-American Hall of Fame to take his rightful place among those of Italian ancestry who have made outstanding contributions to this country.

With this brief synopsis of Dr. Fermi's contributions, I am sure you all can understand my interest in honoring Dr. Fermi with a commemorative stamp. He certainly fits all the criteria to be considered in issuing such a stamp. For the last 10 years, I and many others have urged the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee to issue such a stamp. Unfortunately, the committee seems quite content to issue stamps for horses and butterflies rather than for men such as Dr. Fermi who have contributed so much to the American way of life.

It is also important to consider that with the exception of Christopher Columbus, few, if any Italo-Americans have

been so honored by a commemorative stamp. Thus, in addition to honoring a great man, the issuance of such a stamp will also honor the millions of Italo-Americans who take pride in the contributions of Dr. Fermi.

With all this in mind, I ask all of you here to join with me in urging the Citizen Stamp Advisory Committee requesting that there be a commemorative stamp to honor Enrico Fermi. The committee will be meeting July 28 to conclude the 1979 stamp program and begin work on the 1980 program. Therefore, it will be necessary to exhibit a massive surge of interest for such a stamp before this date. It is perhaps most appropriate that now, at a time when we seek to find new ways to supply world demands for energy that the progenitor of the atomic age, Enrico Fermi, be acknowledged for his most important contributions. Hopefully, the Citizen's Stamp Advisory Committee will agree.●

HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the harsh sentences handed out to Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel in the Soviet Union. Slepak has tried for 8 years and Nudel for 7 years to be granted permission to emigrate. In separate incidents in Moscow, Slepak, and his wife, Masha, and Nudel hung banners outside their apartments to demonstrate their desire to emigrate to Israel. For this they were charged with "malicious hooliganism." Slepak was sentenced to 5 years exile and Nudel to 4 years. Masha Slepak will be tried later, because of illness.

Obviously, the Soviets wanted to punish Slepak for his leadership in forming the "Helsinki monitoring group" to assess the progress, or lack of it, on the part of the Soviet Union in complying with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Accords. Soviet authorities have been systematically wiping out the leadership of the dissident movement in the Soviet Union, through exile to Siberia, or deportation. I am very concerned by this campaign of the Soviets. After a short period of relaxation, the Soviet Union seems to be returning to Stalinism, to the total repression of human rights, civil liberties, and cultural expression.

Here in the United States, one of our most precious freedoms is the freedom of speech. It is hard to understand how hanging a sign on one's balcony asking to emigrate to Israel could be an offense so severe that it must be punished with a sentence of 5 years in Siberia. Such a harsh response to dissent only demonstrates the incredible extent to which freedoms are repressed. It is almost incomprehensible to an American how one could stand to live under conditions where one fears to speak out, to demonstrate, to stand up for what one believes.

For most people, the threat of spending 5 years in Siberia would be enough to stifle any thought of speaking up, of demonstrating for their convictions. The penalty for these "crimes" demonstrates the tremendous courage on the part of those who do stand up for their convictions. Vladimir and Masha Slepak and Ida Nudel have shown themselves to be most courageous.●

ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLES' LAND ENTITLEMENT IS OF NATIONAL INTEREST, TOO

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 39, the "Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act" passed the House on May 19 by an overwhelming margin of 277 to 31. The bill designates certain public lands in the State of Alaska as units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, National Forest, and Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems. Portions of the new units and parts of existing conservation system units are designated as wilderness.

These are the "National Interest" lands of Alaska—lands owned by all of the American people. But there are other public lands of Alaska which are of "National Interest" too. These are the public lands in that State which were granted to Alaskan Native peoples—Eskimo, Aleut, Indian—by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 which gave the Alaskan Native peoples 44 million acres in exchange for extinguishment of their aboriginal rights to the land. To date, however, due mostly to bureaucratic snafus and delays, Natives have received only about 5 million acres of their entitlement.

While conducting public hearings in Alaska last summer I told Native witnesses, who brought the land transfer delay problem to our attention, that the trail of broken promises would end with passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. Accordingly, H.R. 39 contains an expediting procedure by which the prompt transfer of Native Lands is assured.

Delay in consideration of H.R. 39 by the Senate will not only continue the existing uncertainty affecting most Alaskans by postponing the resolution of the status of the public lands, but will postpone a contract the Congress made with Alaskan Native peoples, proud citizens of that great State, whose land grant is in the national interest, also.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Tundra Times of June 7, 1978, speaks eloquently of the need for the Senate to move quickly on passage of an Alaska lands bill, so that an as yet unfilled promise finally will be kept. The editorial follows:

UNFULFILLED PROMISES

The Treaty of Cession, swiftly negotiated between the United States and Russia in 1867, did little to define the rights of Alaska Natives. It did, however, set the stage for a

relationship between the Government and Natives which holds sway even today.

Article III of the Treaty, almost as an afterthought, states the following: "The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."

One-hundred and four years later, when the Congress consented to define what rights Natives did possess by virtue of aboriginal occupancy, the language was vaguely familiar in part. Section 25 of the Settlement Act states, "The Secretary is authorized to issue and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

While Congress made a clear declaration of policy, the regulation drafters and the gray administrators securely squirrelled away in their mid-fiefdoms subverted the intent of the law. Burdensome easement provisions were written, and conveyances of lands to the Natives were painfully slow or more often nonexistent. Apart from misdeeds of the bureaucrats, oversights in the original legislation came to light. No definition of the rights of the subsistence user, for whom there is no alternative to subsistence, had been provided.

One section of the Claims Act provided for a further opportunity to bring before the Congress further legislation, and hence to bring to the Congress' attention the failure of the Government to implement the law earlier passed. Also existed the opportunity to bring forth the neglected subsistence question. Much progress has been made by Natives in bringing both issues to light, with resulting development of favorable solutions to these problems. The legislation has been adopted by the House and is now before the Senate.

Some have suggested delaying tactics to dispense with less attractive aspects of the proposal. Others have suggested that misjudgments of certain bureaucrats resulting in unfortunate but hastily corrected incidents, will indicate poor future treatment of subsistence users.

From the broader view, Natives had waited 104 years for a resolution of their rights. After settlement was made, they have been left with unfulfilled promises. While every effort must be made to ensure as much as possible that the promises will be kept with this legislation, time is of the essence. The promises must be kept. There should be no filibuster. The drastic consequences of the failure to keep the promises in a timely manner are becoming evident on the front page of this week's newspaper. They will be further evident in the lives of neglected subsistence users.

The promise best be kept and the deed best be done. ●

**MRS. ANNE M. AIGNER RETIRES
AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF
THE COMMUNITY NURSING SERVICE
OF CHESTER AND VICINITY**

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the career of Mrs. Anne M. Aigner, one of my constituents, who will be retiring on Friday. Mrs. Aigner is the executive director of Community Nursing Service of Chester and

vicinity, and she is culminating 16 years with that agency and 40 years of community service. I have been informed that she desires to avoid publicity concerning her many achievements, but I believe that it would be unfortunate not to acknowledge her contribution to the well-being of those who I represent.

I last met Mrs. Aigner when she testified at field hearings in Delaware County which I arranged for the House Select Committee on Aging. She continues to impress me as a forceful and dynamic speaker, and I suspect that we will find her retirement a great loss to Delaware County in general, and to the Community Nursing Service in particular. ●

EFFORT TO INCREASE ALTERNATIVES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. MILLICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, over 1 million elderly Americans—5 percent of those who are over 65—live in nursing homes, and many of them will spend the rest of their lives there, isolated from friends and from family members. Although many of these people need the nursing care which can be provided only by an institution, a 1977 Congressional Budget Office study has estimated that 20 to 40 percent of them could be cared for at less intensive levels if funds and adequate community-based facilities were available to them. On March 20, 1978, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11648, which would provide alternatives to institutionalization for these people.

Existing health insurance programs for the aged have a strong institutional bias. Under present medicare law, payments are not permitted for home health care unless the individual has been hospitalized for 3 days, is deemed eligible for skilled nursing care, or for physical or speech therapy, and is considered "homebound." Medicaid supports the vast bulk of federally subsidized long-term care, yet only a tiny percentage of these funds is used to pay for home health care. With funds available to those who are in institutions, but not to those who might be able to stay home, the incentives all point toward institutionalization, even when this is neither the desired nor the appropriate level of care for the senior citizens.

If some of the money currently used for institutional care could be made available to those individuals or to their families, many could avoid institutionalization altogether. The Government would be encouraging family unity, rather than discouraging it. Also, several studies have demonstrated that home health care is considerably less expensive than care in a hospital or skilled nursing facility. In other words, maintaining many elderly people at home instead of sending them to institutions could be accomplished at considerable savings to the taxpayer.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Joseph A. Califano, Jr., has stated that he is "committed to finding workable alternatives to institutionalization." My bill would provide the groundwork for many such alternatives, by authorizing demonstration projects where, in those people eligible for medicare or medicaid nursing home care would be paid a tax-free stipend which they could use to finance alternative forms of care. The stipend, which would be equal to 50 percent of the average nursing home benefits to which they were entitled, would enable these senior citizens to arrange for a home care situation, either with their own or with foster families, with friends or in cooperative arrangements with others, pooling resources. Since eligibility would be based on already established medicaid and medicare guidelines, there would be no danger of abuse or overuse.

For example, an elderly grandmother in my home State of New Jersey, where more than half of the nursing home population is dependent on Federal assistance, might be maintained in a nursing home with public funds at a cost of \$1,000 per month. With a tax-free stipend of \$500—half the cost—she might well be able to stay at home with her family and contribute to the household income. Then her daughter, who perhaps was planning to go to work to help with the grandson's college expenses, would be able to stay at home. Or she might use the stipend to pay for part-time health or nursing care. Any such living arrangement would be reviewed periodically by a registered nurse or other health official who could determine whether the money was being used to the individual's satisfaction—whether the elderly individual was happy with the situation. A 1977 study by the Urban Health Institute of East Orange has estimated that as many as 35 percent of those senior citizens currently institutionalized in the State of New Jersey might be able to benefit from such an arrangement.

I have introduced the bill with the expectation that while saving a considerable amount of money, it can provide independence and dignity for a great many elderly persons in this country. Separation from one's family or from one's community ought not to be required or encouraged by Government regulations and incentives. Institutionalization ought, rather, to be the option of last resort. For the record, a complete text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11648

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") may provide, through demonstration projects payments to individuals who are receiving, or are eligible to receive, benefits with respect to post-hospital extended care services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act or intermediate care facility services or skilled nursing facility services under title XIX of such Act, who do not require 24-hour nursing care or supervision, and who desire to establish a noninstitutional living arrangement which will meet their medical and other needs.

(b) The amount of any payment made to any individual under this Act shall be an amount determined by multiplying—

(1) the number of days in the period for which the payment is made, by

(2) 50 percent of the average daily benefit paid for the services described in subsection (a), in the State in which such individual resides, on behalf of an individual under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act.

(c) Any payment received by an individual under this Act shall be used for the purpose of financing an appropriate noninstitutional living arrangement which meets the medical and other needs of the individual. The Secretary shall provide that such living arrangement will be reviewed periodically by a registered nurse or other appropriate health official for the purpose of determining whether the individual is satisfied with the care as a result of such arrangement.

(d) Any payment made under this Act shall be made on such terms and conditions, in advance or by reimbursement, in such installments, and for such length of time as the Secretary determines will best meet the medical and other needs of the individual receiving the payments.

(e) Such payments shall not be includable in gross income under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(f) (1) The Secretary shall design demonstration projects established under this Act for the purpose of determining—

(A) the economic, medical, psychological, and sociological feasibility of transferring inpatients of skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities to noninstitutional living arrangements;

(B) the types and percentage of such inpatients who could live effectively in a noninstitutional living arrangement; and

(C) the types and percentages of such inpatients who would benefit economically and qualitatively from transferring to a noninstitutional living arrangement.

(2) The Secretary shall, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, transmit a report to each House of the Congress concerning the findings and conclusions which have been made with respect to the matters described in paragraph (1). In addition, such report shall contain recommendations, if any, by the Secretary for legislative action with respect to such matters.

(g) Funds made available under this Act shall be made in appropriate part, as determined by the Secretary, from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund (established by section 1817 of the Social Security Act) and from funds appropriated to carry out title XIX of the Social Security Act. ●

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA EMIGRATION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is periodically, in connection with a consideration of our diplomatic and trade relations with the People's Republic of China, a discussion of Chinese emigration practices. I found the following article from the June 4, 1978, issue of the *Guardian* to be enlightening in this regard:

A NEW CHINESE INFLUX

(By Harold Jackson in Hong Kong)

The Bridge at Lo Wu, where Hong Kong borders with the mainland of China, is a

scruffy place at the best of times. But the government of the territory is watching it with the sort of rapt fascination that would normally be fastened on the Taj Mahal or the Parthenon. Those clanking planks with their single line of railway tracks down the centre could well determine the future prosperity of the place.

In the past few months they have seen an influx of immigrants from China which has not been matched since the nervy days of 1973, when a thousand a month were being given exit permits by the Peking government and were teeming down on every train from Canton. During that period 55,300 Chinese arrived to join the 4½ million already inhabiting the territory.

So far this year nearly 14,000 have come clutching their bundles and their cooking pots, all of them given the required permission by the Chinese authorities. This flow is quite distinct from the steady dribble of people who choose, at considerable danger on occasions, to swim across Mirs Bay as illegal immigrants.

After a general flap in 1973 it emerged that the Peking government was fed up with giving political asylum to these refugees and had used the easiest pressure available to make the point. When an agreement was concluded that the "illegals" would be repatriated the flow across the Lo Wu bridge dried to its normal proportions.

No one is quite sure what the present surge indicates. At the rate of 140 immigrants a day it is not quite running at the 1973 level, but it is coming perilously close. As a comparison, the flow in the past three years has been at something like half the current rate. Given that the vast majority of these legal immigrants settle in Hong Kong even this lower rate has meant that the population of the territory has swelled by 72,543. It may sound like a drop in the bucket among 4.5 million but, to the hard-pressed administration it means that yet another new town will have to be built to accommodate them.

And that is where the heart of the business lies. Last year, simply to meet its aim of getting the existing population into some sort of reasonable housing, Hong Kong built 14,000 new flats. Within two years it hopes to get the rate of building up to 40,000 a year—and it will still take six years to get to grips with the basic problem. If China were to continue its current policy of letting 140 of its citizens emigrate to the territory every day the Hong Kong authorities would be faced with housing another 300,000 people by the end of its present building programme.

Given the complexity of relations between Peking and Hong Kong—under which the diplomatic stance by the Chinese is that the city is part of their territory which happens to find itself under foreign control—there is little the territory can do to stop the flow. "What are we supposed to do?" one official said resignedly, "have the Gurkhas shoot them on the bridge?"

The best official guess at the reasons for the present flood is that it represents no more than a liberalisation of policy by the new regime. It has been noticeable that a far higher proportion of the arrivals are young people who have usually been stopped in the past.

But, whatever the reason, the only answer available to Hong Kong was that made by Mr. Philip Haddon-Cave, the acting Chief Secretary to "inform China of our concern." In the twilight world of nods and winks of relationships between the island and its giant parent nation, it may be that the Peking government will note the message and tighten up on the issue of exit permits.

Nobody in Hong Kong is going to express any such wish, of course. For one thing it would annoy the Chinese and for another it would be a pretty left-footed stance for an administration which is ferociously free-

enterprising in its general stance. But, underlying it all, is the observation made by a senior official contemplating the future of the territory in a relaxed moment. "All they have to do," he confided, "is to send in two million of the buggers out of Kwantung Province and we can kiss it all goodbye." ●

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND AMERICAN DIPLOMACY—IV

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in *Science* magazine highlights the importance of international scientific activities to U.S. foreign policy. This importance has been recently underscored by action of the House of Representatives in adopting title V on science, technology and American diplomacy in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1979. As the author of the editorial notes, "Scientists cannot do everything, but if they select limited and doable objectives, they can make a meaningful difference."

Title V of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 1979 is intended to give direction to the international scientific activities of the U.S. Government. I would hope that in the future, the Department of State could sponsor or otherwise assist some of the activities discussed in the following editorial. Such sponsorship is the kind of activity the International Relations Committee had in mind when it adopted language calling for the State Department to operate and manage some international activities on behalf of the U.S. Government.

The article follows:

SCIENTISTS AND WORLD NEEDS

(By Philip H. Abelson)

Scientists have a long tradition of international cooperation. Initially their interaction was based on admiration for scientific contributions. With time the intensity and scope of interaction have increased. Air travel and the telephone have multiplied the opportunities for meaningful contacts, mutual respect, and friendships. In consequence scientists have tended to be unusually internationally minded.

Until the last decade cooperation among scientists was focused strongly on fostering science. But now substantial emphasis is being directed toward important world problems. In seeking to be helpful in meeting human needs elsewhere, scientists have discovered that the practical problems are complex and difficult; quick solutions are enormously costly. The world's scientists possess a substantial fraction of relevant intellectual capacity; they have very little control of funds.

Under such circumstances, it would be easy to become frustrated. But this has not happened; rather the tempo of organized efforts has increased, stimulated in part by the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development. But activities by scientists will go on long after the meeting at Vienna in August 1979.

An important focus of the continuing efforts will be the International Scientific Unions. One example of activities involves the International Union of Pure and Applied

Chemistry (IUPAC). Its activities are carried out by 1500 experts from 43 member countries who cover the spectrum of chemistry-related sciences and technologies. For most of its 59 years of existence the Union devoted its efforts to the regulation of atomic weights, chemical nomenclature and symbolization, analytical procedures, and standard methods of assay.

But IUPAC has recognized that though such activities are useful they are not enough, and it has created a mechanism designed to aid in identifying and solving problems of chemistry having direct impact on human needs. The effort bears the title Chemical Research Applied to World Needs (CHEMRAWN). IUPAC's initial enterprise under CHEMRAWN is a first World Conference on Future Sources of Organic Raw Materials. This major conference will discuss alternatives to petroleum as future sources of chemicals and chemical feedstocks. The conference, to be held in Toronto from 10 through 13 July 1978, will be attended by world leaders from government, industry, and academia. They will seek to define those factors that will determine the sources of organic raw materials at the end of this century.

Another example of effort by the scientific unions is an activity spear-headed by the umbrella organization for all of them—the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). Through ICSU initiative, a number of nongovernmental organizations including those of engineers and social scientists will host a symposium in Singapore during late January 1979 that will involve participants from many countries. Objectives of the meeting include identification of substantive inputs into the U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development. Of more lasting consequence is exploration of institutional and other innovations which would enlarge the opportunities for scientists and engineers to participate in future years in the improvement of the human condition. One of the important objectives of the symposium is to illuminate the basic conditions necessary for the assimilation of science and technology into developing countries in a manner which significantly contributes to the development process. The symposium will explore such questions as "how can a systematic approach be made country by country to selection of technology relevant to it?" Such an approach is required because the various nations differ greatly in educational levels, technological know-how, internal markets, natural resources, financial strengths, managerial talents, and political climates.

Scientists cannot do everything, but if they select limited and doable objectives, they can make a meaningful difference. ●

FIREWORKS NOT WORTH RISK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I, as much as anyone else, enjoy the Fourth of July observances. However, I believe that fireworks constitute more of a public menace by producing unnecessary suffering and serious injuries than the temporary enjoyment that they create. As I am sure that most Members agree with me, I wish to insert the following very pertinent and informative editorial that appeared in the June 21 West Proviso

Herald, serving the suburban areas of Cook County, Ill.:

FIREWORKS NOT WORTH RISK

As the Fourth of July approaches, everyone naturally thinks of celebrating. But with the very American tradition of celebration comes danger in the form of illegal fireworks.

Sadly, as traditional as picnics and parades are on the Fourth, serious injuries to life and limb—often permanent—have become just as much of a tradition. We urge parents to make sure their children are not keeping illegal fireworks.

Fireworks may seem like innocent fun. But in most places (Illinois included) they are illegal to purchase. Even if bought in places where their sale is legal, it is against the law to bring them into Illinois. Since most fireworks are sold at least on the fringes of the law, there is no possible way to know what you're getting. There's nothing approaching a manufacturer's warranty, and setting off fireworks certainly isn't worth the risk.

Of course, with small children the risk of children playing with matches should be sufficient warning to keep parents on guard.

State law defines illegal fireworks as "any combustible or explosive composition, or any substance or combination of substances, of articles prepared for the purpose of producing a visible or an audible effect by combustion, explosion, deflagrations or detonation."

If you have any question whether articles your children bring home are illegal fireworks, phone your fire departments of Bellwood, Berkeley or Hillside.

You still can have fireworks fun by attending any of the numerous officially sanctioned shows held throughout the Chicago area. Fireworks there are set off by professional experts. And the explosives are purchased under strict regulation by a bureau of the U.S. government. But to set off fireworks on your own risks bad injury and even death, for example if a fire should start. That is no way to celebrate our nation's birth. ●

JOURNEY TO CHINA, PART III

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD the third installment of C. L. Dancey's "Journey to China" as printed in the Peoria Journal Star:

THE FACTORY: IN RED CHINA IT IS A COMMUNE
(By C. L. Dancey)

It has a production chief and a political chief and the political chief is senior.

The "wise director" of production runs the factory, whereas the "wise leader" of the commune runs the whole shooting match. He has responsibility for the factory, the housing assignments of the workers, the "hospital" or "clinic," the nursery, the school, the recreation program, the commissary or general store—the whole community.

Thus the factory commune is much like a farm commune or farm village (with one boss) although set down in the middle of a city of millions. It is the old fashioned "company town"—only in spades!

The words are a little tricky. The "hospital" is most likely not like any hospital we know. Its doctors may have no more formal preparation, in fact, than our paramedics or a registered nurse. The clinic is apt to be manned by some housewives of the commune

who have received a short course in first aid and old family style remedies.

Thus they aren't as good as the words sound—but neither are they as bad as the description sounds. You must remember that millions of older Americans survived reasonably well many injuries and several diseases on little more than first aid and family remedies . . . and are still around, doing pretty well.

There is a double culture-shock when you go from visiting the 1400-year-old structures where the emperors worshipped their ancestors—a site 3,000 years old—gaze on those elaborate and uniquely graceful structures and grounds and then proceed to the modern heavy equipment factory at Taiyuan.

The Taiyuan plants makes giant earth-movers, excavators actually, on order from the government, used mainly for mining operations.

We saw mostly the foundry and the early "rough cuts" and finishing work on parts . . . and they didn't get much done while we were walking through.

Most of you would be familiar with the basic steel plant scene, with the huge closed car of a lift about three or four stories overhead on tracks near the roof, used for heavy lifting of either molten steel or ingots or castings, with either furnaces, or lathes, or other machinery down the sides of the building at ground level.

As we passed down the center, groups of laborers formed by in knots, standing, grinning, and clapping their hands as we approached. Those farther away were apt to be craning their necks, stretching and waving.

Women high overhead in the huge cabs of the lifts leaned out, incredibly tiny against the roof, and waved frantically at us.

We felt like visiting dignitaries instead of an ordinary gang of tourists.

There were two people, usually women, at the lathes, and Vic Traenkenshuh of Caterpillar pointed out that one was the operator and the other, apparently, an apprentice. When you looked closely, that became obvious.

Vic said it was quite a respectable operation as far as he could see, except that there were "about 10 people for every job." He pointed out, however, that when really interesting visitors arrive at any plant anywhere, all kinds of people from other parts of the operation find reasons to show up where they can get a look. It's hard to judge.

There was no sign of safety glasses, ear protections, or standard safety precautions familiar to us. The "wise leader" told us that such were made available, but the workers didn't like to be hampered by them and production was faster without them.

Much the same was true in the cotton mill we visited, and in the incredible "factories" for art work, oriental carpets, and handicraft objects. Some of the latter seemed like they had gathered up people from a score of back-room workshops and assembled them into communes where they line up in rows under badly lighted drills to carve out ivory and jade figures of incredible delicacy—and all on a quota system posted on the wall.

The largest "factory" we saw was the heavy equipment place which had 12,000 workers, and the smallest has about 400 workers.

The most interesting interview was at the cotton mill, an impressive place with thousands of spinning spools and tricky machines—and with women performing daily the impossible job of hand-threading the needles for the machine banks.

There I asked the householder what he did, and he said he was responsible for repairing machinery and keeping it in good order—a machinist.

I noted that was a special skill and asked him if he was paid more than others. His reply was specific: he received 82 yuan a

month, while his wife, as a winder in the plant, got 56 yuan.

When you deal in the small numbers chosen for the Chinese economy, it doesn't sound like much—but he makes half-again as much as she.

It goes with the "wise leader's" misquote from Marx, which we heard several times in the same form in China.

Marx wrote, in fact: "From each, according to his ability. To each, according to his need."

The Chinese "translation" repeatedly says: "From each, according to his ability. To each, according to his work."

In general, however, except for this worker and the farmers (who got their own garden and private project on the side and one yuan a day) almost everybody claimed to make about 60 yuan a month, from laborers to government officials, and to pay about six yuan rent—and a yuan and half to three yuan for "utilities."

Since the authorities assign housing, etc., however, I have no idea what a bigshot gets for his six yuan rent compared to the ditch diggers—providing the figures are accurate.

As for the utilities, while such figures may sound great to CLCO customers, even on a payroll of less than \$15 a week—you must remember that "utilities" often means one light bulb—and, if you are lucky, cooking gas.

One thing is clear—the effort to get from each the maximum "according to his ability" is impressive and important. Giving to each "according to his work" is less clear, and more subtle—but they made no bones about it. ●

THE LATE SENATOR FRANCIS CASE

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, June 22, 1978, was the 16th anniversary of the death of Senator Francis Case, a beloved South Dakotan who served in the Congress of the United States for 25 years. Much of my own interest in public service originated from the opportunity which I had to serve as an aide in his office some years ago. I have always been impressed by the ability of this man to retain his purpose, principle, and integrity in public office.

The impact on public service careers, from technological advances combined with other complexities of contemporary life, has caused me to reflect a bit on the origins and political career of this distinguished public servant from my home State. It is interesting to me that from roots, which go back to a humble beginning in a minister's family in a sparsely populated part of an agrarian State, the stimulus developed to become a doer of many things in public service which have had an impact not only in South Dakota, but throughout the world.

Francis Case was the grandson of a sturdy pioneer who crossed the country in a covered wagon in the last century and started a family which transmitted a spirit of determination and fearlessness, which is reflected in the lives of

many of his descendants. These determined people include educators, historians, developers and curators of museums, editors, scientists, and even an astronaut-scientist (HARRISON SCHMITT) who is currently a Member of the U.S. Senate.

The interests of Francis Case were always global. This was earliest exemplified when, as a sophomore at Dakota Wesleyan University in Mitchell, S. Dak., he wrote an oration for the National Peace Contest, traveled alone to Lake Mohonk, N.Y., to deliver the speech, and won this prestigious national contest. His oration, "The Modern Paradox," has a theme as current today as it was in 1974—the philosophical conflict of a nation that speaks peace, but plans for war.

The written and spoken word continued to be of great importance to this man. Francis Case began his career in South Dakota as a small town newspaper editor—often accepting potatoes for subscriptions during the Depression—an occupation where the belief in the importance and power of the people in the community is paramount. Throughout his career he took the time to converse with local merchants, farmers, ranchers, fellow fishermen or hunters and shaped his philosophies of what was important to South Dakota from real knowledge of South Dakotans.

Motivated to run for public office by a desire to help South Dakota, Francis Case became a dedicated public servant who believed that he held a trust for the people of the State. Because of his newspaper background, the media used when he first ran for public office was the distribution of handbills which he had printed himself. Until the rising costs of more technical media in the early 1950's, Senator Case felt that no person should contribute a sum greater than \$25 to his campaign.

His record in a wide range of accomplishments in public works and water resource conservation is evidenced by maps dotted with reservoirs and bridges dedicated to his memory. At the time of his death in 1962, he was editorialized throughout South Dakota as the most respected man ever to hold public office in the State. I believe that this review of his philosophy, motivation for seeking public office, and the framework within which he accomplished this, are an appropriate commemoration on the anniversary of his death, and I am proud to be able to add my own statement of respect at this time. ●

VOTE EXPLANATION

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1978, I was recorded incorrectly on rollcall vote No. 458, the Armstrong amendment to H.R. 12935, the Legislative Branch Appropriation bill. My vote should have been recorded as "yea." ●

THE NEED TO INDEX PERSONAL INCOME TAXES

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, each time I go back to my district and talk with my constituents on economic issues, our conversations revolve around three dominant topics:

First, Federal taxes are too high;

Second, inflation is pricing individuals and families out of the market for basic necessities and adequate housing; and

Third, taxpaying citizens are realizing diminishing benefits from their hard work while noting substantial increases in the level of Government spending.

These are observations which, I am sure, have been brought to the attention of many of my colleagues.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation which addresses all of the issues listed above. The legislation that I propose is to index personal income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly discuss why indexing is one answer to the criticisms of rising Federal taxes, inflation, and the level of Federal spending.

With rising inflation, people seek increased wages to compensate for hikes in the consumer price index. Many Federal programs including social security, SSI, Federal civilian retirement, and military retirement are indexed for inflation. Such allowances permit individuals to keep up with inflation. Yet, as many people have experienced, the inflation adjustments often catapult them into a higher tax bracket and, in some instances, result in less take-home pay. Indexing Federal income taxes to the increases in the inflation rate will help solve this dilemma.

Such a revision in our tax laws will reflect an honest tax system which will distinguish the taxation of real income as opposed to illusory, inflation-induced increases.

There is no question but that the inflationary levels experienced by the economy in recent years are making it almost impossible for the middle class to keep up with price increases. In essence, the distortions of a nonindexed tax system have overtaxed the American public by \$14 billion in 1970, \$19 billion in 1971, \$25 billion in 1972, \$28 billion in 1973, \$37 billion in 1974, and \$42 billion in 1975. While periodic tax cuts have trimmed the margins of such inflation-induced taxes, that mechanism alone has not been the most effective tool in abating inflationary pressures.

Finally, an indexed system of Federal income taxation is one of the most effective ways to control Government spending. As I discussed earlier, inflation causes Government revenues to increase because of the tax bracket shove which occurs. Mr. Speaker, a study titled, "The Effect of Inflation on Federal Expenditures" which was prepared by the Con-

gressional Budget Office for the Joint Economic Committee's Fiscal Policy Subcommittee claims that a 10 percent increase in the price level will increase Federal tax receipts by 12.3 percent. Indexing Federal income taxes will prevent such revenue increases and contribute significantly to a reduction in Federal spending and the inflation rate. The Canadian Government has instituted an indexing system which has reduced revenues and has subsequently lead to declines in the growth rate of government spending from 16 percent in 1974 to 3 percent in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that indexing Federal income taxes is imperative if we intend to maintain a progressive tax system and put a stop to the hidden tax increases which are currently being perpetuated.

The provisions of my Anti-Inflation Tax Relief Act are:

First, to provide automatic adjustments in tax rate tables to reflect changes in the rate of inflation. These adjustments will prevent individuals from being pushed into higher tax brackets due to inflation.

Second, to provide for automatic adjustments in the personal exemption based upon changes in the inflation rate. For example, the \$750 personal exemption would be substituted by an amount equal to \$750 multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment plus the original \$750. Thus, with an annual inflation rate of 6 percent, the personal exemption rate would be increased to \$795.

Both indexing provisions are important. The latter provision is necessary to assist individuals such as senior citizens and the working poor with large families whose income levels are not likely to rise and who deserve protection from further erosions in buying power.

Printed below is the text of my proposal:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for cost-of-living adjustments in the amount of the personal exemption and in the individual tax rates

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Anti-Inflation Tax Relief Act of 1978".

SEC. 2. COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS IN AMOUNT OF PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions) is amended by striking out "\$750" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the exemption amount".

(b) EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—Section 151 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) EXEMPTION AMOUNT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'exemption amount' means, with respect to any taxable year, \$750 increased by an amount equal to \$750 multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins. If the amount determined under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of \$10, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10 (or if such amount is a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be increased to the nearest multiple of \$10).

"(2) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost-of-living adjustments for any calendar year is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(A) the CPI for the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(B) the CPI for 1977.

"(3) CPI FOR ANY CALENDAR YEAR.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the CPI for any calendar year is the average of the Consumer Price Index for the months ending in the 12-month period ending on September 30 of such calendar year.

"(4) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—For purposes of paragraph (3), the term 'Consumer Price Index' means the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor. In the case of periods for which a Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers has not been published, the Secretary shall establish a comparable index based on information provided by the Secretary of Labor."

SEC. 3. ADJUSTMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL TAX RATES SO THAT INFLATION WILL NOT RESULT IN TAX INCREASES

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax imposed) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) ADJUSTMENTS IN TAX TABLES SO THAT INFLATION WILL NOT RESULT IN TAX INCREASES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 15 of each calendar year, the Secretary shall prescribe tables which shall apply in lieu of the tables contained in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) with respect to taxable years beginning in the succeeding calendar year.

"(2) METHOD OF PRESCRIBING TABLES.—The table which under paragraph (1) is to apply in lieu of the table contained in subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e), as the case may be, with respect to taxable years beginning in any calendar year shall be prescribed—

"(i) by increasing—

"(1) the maximum dollar amount on which no tax is imposed under such table, and

"(ii) the minimum and maximum dollar amounts for each rate bracket for which a tax is imposed under such table,

by the cost-of-living adjustment for such calendar year (as defined in section 151(f)(2)).

"(B) by not changing the rate applicable to any rate bracket as adjusted under subparagraph (A)(i), and

"(C) by adjusting the amounts setting forth the tax to the extent necessary to reflect the adjustments in the rate brackets. If any increase determined under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$10, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10 (or if such increase is a multiple of \$5, such increase shall be increased to the nearest multiple of \$10)."

(b) DEFINITION OF ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT.—Subsection (d) of section 63 of such Code (defining zero bracket amount) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'zero bracket amount' means—

"(1) in the case of an individual to whom subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of section 1 applies, the maximum amount of taxable income on which no tax is imposed by the applicable subsection of section 1, or

"(2) zero in any other case."

SEC. 4. ADJUSTMENTS IN WITHHOLDING

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to requirement of withholding) is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, prescribe tables which shall apply in lieu of the tables prescribed

above to wages paid during the succeeding calendar year and which shall be based on the tables prescribed under section 1(f) which apply with respect to taxable years beginning in such succeeding calendar year."

(b) PERCENTAGE METHOD OF WITHHOLDING.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(b) of such Code (relating to the percentage method of withholding) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, prescribe a table which shall apply in lieu of the above table to wages paid during the succeeding calendar year and which shall be based on the exemption amount (as defined in section 151(f)) which applies to taxable years beginning in the succeeding calendar year."

(c) WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(m) of such Code (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$750" and inserting in lieu thereof "the exemption amount (as determined under section 151(f) for taxable years beginning in the calendar year)"; and

(2) by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) an amount equal to the maximum amount of taxable income for taxable years beginning in the calendar year on which no tax is imposed by section 1(a) (or section 1(b) in the case of an individual who is not married, within the meaning of section 143, and who is not a surviving spouse, as defined in section 2(a))."

SEC. 5. RETURN REQUIREMENTS

(a) Clause (i) of section 6012(a)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "\$2,950" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of the exemption amount and the zero bracket amount applicable to such an individual".

(b) Clause (ii) of section 6012(a)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking out "\$3,950" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of the exemption amount plus the zero bracket amount applicable to such an individual".

(c) Clause (iii) of section 6012(a)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking out "\$4,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "the sum of twice the exemption amount plus the zero bracket amount applicable to a joint return".

(d) Paragraph (1) of section 6012(a) of such Code is amended by striking out "\$750" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the exemption amount".

(e) Paragraph (1) of section 6012(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) The term 'zero bracket amount' has the meaning given to such term by section 63(d).

"(ii) The term 'exemption amount' has the meaning given to such term by section 151(f)."

(f) Subparagraph (A) of section 6013(b) (3) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$750" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "twice the exemption amount", and

(2) by striking out "\$1,500" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "twice the exemption amount", and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'exemption amount' has the meaning given to such term by section 151(f)."

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATES

(a) The amendments made by sections 2, 3, and 5 of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978.

(b) The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1978. ●

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PRINTING
THE HOUSE DAILY CALENDARS,
AND RELATED MATTERS

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the legislative appropriations bill earlier this month, I planned to offer an amendment to cut wasteful expenditures relating to the printing of the House business calendar. Daily, a thick calendar is delivered to my office. Probably 99 percent of the information in it is identical to the previous day's issue.

My amendment would have provided that the House business calendar be printed weekly in comprehensive form, and updated daily. The daily update would provide only changes from the previous week's issue. Thus, not only would there be a saving of paper, but I and my staff would be able to see at a glance the changes in status of legislation.

Paper savings could be substantial. The calendar at the adjournment of the 94th Congress was 276 pages long, for example.

On September 1, 1976, I proposed this idea in a letter to the Clerk of the House. I regret that I never received a reply. This year, I requested that the Congressional Research Service analyze the costs and benefits of my suggestion. I would like to share with my colleagues the response from the Service, which I received in time to offer the amendment. Unfortunately, I was more concerned with my amendment to delete funding for eight wasteful water resource projects, so I did not offer this proposal as an amendment to the legislative appropriation bill:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1978.

To: The Honorable Robert Edgar.
From: Paul Rundquist, Government Division.

Subject: Appropriations for Printing the House Daily Calendars, and Related Matters.

This memorandum responds to your request concerning possible cost reductions to be achieved by changing the format of the daily House calendar, and the procedure to be followed in offering a suitable amendment to the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill to achieve that purpose.

No exact itemization for the cost of printing the daily House calendars is seemingly available. After telephone discussions with staff members in the Office of the Clerk of the House, the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and in the Government Printing Office, I was unable to obtain official reports on the costs for printing either the House or Senate daily calendars.¹

Some reliable estimates are possible, however. Information contained in the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Hearings

¹ Among the officials consulted were Benjamin Guthrie, Deputy Clerk of the House; Harold G. Ast, Legislative Clerk of the Senate, and members of the staff of the Congressional Information of GPO.

for FY 1979 shows an estimated cost of \$2.2 million to print the House and Senate business calendars for the coming fiscal year.² In a telephone discussion, Mr. Bryan Mercer, the comptroller of the Government Printing Office, explained that GPO billings to the House and Senate for printing the daily calendars are based upon the number of pages in the edition and not upon the number of copies printed. The principal cost would appear to be the labor and materials charges associated with producing press-ready plates and other production materials; paper costs for larger press runs do not directly determine the charges, according to Mercer.

On the basis of total House and Senate daily calendar pages printed during FY 1977, Mercer estimated that approximately 64% of the document pages (and hence, the printing costs) were for the House daily calendar. On the assumption that the relative sizes of the House and Senate daily calendars would remain constant during FY 1979, roughly \$1.4 million would be needed to print the daily House calendar in its current format.

As you explained in our telephone conversation, you would propose keeping the weekly (Monday) complete indexed House calendar, but would limit subsequent daily calendar publications to listing only those items the status of which had changed since the last complete calendar edition. The "changed status only" format for the remaining Tuesday-through-Friday calendars should require the printing of fewer total pages than those currently in one daily calendar. Anticipated savings in printing the House daily calendar could be as high as sixty percent, or about \$600,000, even if the status of each bill listed in the House calendar changed once during the week.

Calendar Printing Requirements in House Rules. The printing of the House calendar on a daily basis is required by Rule XIII, clause 6. Prior to 1911, there was no provision in the Rules regarding the printing of the various House calendars, although the calendars were then issued twice weekly. From 1911 until the beginning of the 68th Congress in 1923, complete indexed calendars were printed daily; beginning in 1923, the indexed edition was issued weekly on Mondays, or on the first session day of the week.³ The requirements for preparing the indexed editions are not contained in the House Rules. The Rules do not contain stipulations as to the format of the daily calendar.

Appropriations Amendments. Several criteria must be met for an amendment reducing expenditures in an appropriations bill to be in order. The so-called "Holman Rule" (Rule XXI, clause 2) permits the introduction of legislation in appropriations bills so long as the effect of the amendment is to reduce Federal expenditures, and the amendment is germane to the subject of the bill. The amount of the reduction proposed in the amendment does not have to be large (instances have been recorded of a retrenchment amendment reducing expenditures by as little as \$1,000), however, it is incumbent upon the sponsor of the amendment to show that a reduction in expenditures would result from its adoption. In addition to other qualifications, the amendment reducing expenditures may not impose additional duties or responsibilities upon Federal employees or

² U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1979 . . . Hearings. 95th Congress, 2d Session. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off. (1978), p. 217.

³ Hinds and Cannon's Precedents of the House, VI, sec. 743.

officials.⁴ Space in this memorandum, and the time constraints of your request, do not permit a more detailed description of the requirements of the Holman Rule.⁵ In drafting your amendments, it is suggested that you consult the staff of the Office of Legislative Counsel who are familiar with the various requirements.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, please feel free to call me at 426-5824. ●

THE VOA AS MINISTRY OF TRUTH

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the great English author, George Orwell, was most famous for his fictional works on the coming of a totalitarian political order, notably "Animal Farm" and "1984." The novel, "1984," was an especially terrifying work. For Orwell skillfully transported the reader into a dehumanizing future society totally controlled by a bureaucratic elite. In the future society nothing was sacred, neither privacy nor personality, language nor history. The chief apparatus for brainwashing the drones was a Ministry of Truth—an information agency designed to obliterate any idea contrary to the official views of the regime. In substance, Mr. Speaker, the real horror conveyed by Orwell's novel, what really curdled the blood of his readers, was his gripping description of the regime's war against truth. Truth itself was the enemy, the outcast, banished from the life of the future society by, of all things, the "Ministry of Truth."

Mr. Speaker, when lying becomes commonplace we tend to take it for granted. We simply absorb it, neither challenging it nor taking it seriously. The lies become engrained, part of the political landscape. The code words of lying may even creep into our own language, like some insidious parasite, eating away at the vitality and precision of our communication.

Consider some examples. Western opponents of communism are often denounced by their critics as "fascists," a Soviet hate word, even though these men and women are sincere votaries of majority rule, popular sovereignty, political equality, a limited state, and the widest range of personal liberty—in other words everything that could possibly exclude them from embracing the statist doctrine of Fascism. But the lie becomes second

⁴ For a discussion of the precedents of the House, and definitions of additional duties and responsibilities, see floor discussion and rulings of the Chair pursuant to the Hyde Amendment prohibiting use of Federal funds to finance abortion payments. *Congressional Record*, daily edition, v. 105, June 17, 1977, pp. H8062-8063.

⁵ For a brief summary of parliamentary rulings on amendments offered under the Holman Rule, see *Constitution, Jefferson's Manual, and Rules of the House*, 95th Congress, 1st Session, sec. 844.

nature: "Fascists" are everywhere, in our Government, in our businesses, in our labor unions, in our movie industry, and, though less frequently, even in our universities.

Soviet Russia's lies are so fantastic, so enormous, and so repetitive. They now conjure up only a yawn—and this is dangerous. Consider. The various political divisions within the U.S.S.R. are called "independent republics." The purpose of the Berlin wall is designed to "protect" the East Germans. The Soviet Union officially describes itself as a "democratic" political order and a friend of "peace-loving peoples." And, on and on, the lies are spewed out, mass produced—and consumed—like MacDonald's hamburgers. It is not without sound theological reason that Satan is described as the Father of Lies, the Lord of Darkness. And his children multiply.

Truth is most often profaned in the rewriting of history. The Soviets are masters of this: They indulge this sort of thing every time they have a change in the Kremlin leadership. Ritual book burnings precede republication of standard histories.

Much the same goes on, with more or less efficiency, in Eastern Europe. In protest of this madness, a Polish writer recently risked life and limb in appearing before the Polish Writers Congress. He denounced the Soviet mass murder of some 15,000 Polish army officers in Katyn Forest in 1940. (The official Soviet line is that the Nazis did it). His statement was greeted with wild applause. Somebody had the guts to stand up and say what everybody else knew was the truth, a truth unearthed—literally—by independent researchers years ago.

A correspondent for the Voice of America carried this statement to his superiors, who then doctored the final version for broadcast over VOA channels. The final version fit nicely with the official lying of the Soviet leadership. Incredible? Not at all. To paraphrase James Russell Lowell, we should not be surprised to see truth swinging from the gallows, while falsehood sits in comfort on the thrones of men.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Anderson is to be commended for bringing this matter to the attention of the public:

CENSORSHIP ON THE KATYN MASSACRE
(By Jack Anderson)

In a strange case of censorship, the Voice of America recently tailored a story about a grisly World War II massacre to fit the Soviet distortion of history. American authorities deleted precisely the facts that the Soviet censorship code prohibits the press from publishing behind the Iron Curtain.

There is a poignant human story behind the incident. A bold Polish writer and poet, Andrzej Braun, dared to protest against the Soviet-imposed censorship before the Polish Writers Congress. It was a dangerous defiant act, which was reported to the Voice of America.

Afterward, the lonely hero listened eagerly for word that the Voice of America had broadcast the story of his protest. Incredibly, he heard an account that sounded as if his story had been censored by the Kremlin. Sources in contact with the dissident Polish writers reported his reaction; they told us he was absolutely "crestfallen."

Our sources brought this discouraging word from inside Poland: "We look upon the United States as the world's greatest democracy, with a free press. Yet the censorship reaches even there."

Why did the Voice of America follow the Soviet censorship code in reporting on the massacre? We tried to find out.

The infamous event, known as the Katyn Forest Massacre, occurred during the Soviet occupation of Poland in 1940. Thousands of Polish army officers, their hands bound behind them with a rope looped around their necks, were gunned down and buried in mass graves.

The horror was later uncovered, and international researchers conducted painstaking autopsies of the disinterred bodies. They discovered that the Poles had been shot with German bullets. But these were of a type that had been exported to Russia during Josef Stalin's pre-World War II pact with Adolf Hitler. The rope was of Russian origin, and the loop-around-the-neck technique was one that the Soviets used to prevent their victims from struggling.

Letters and clippings found in the pockets of the dead men also established the time of the massacre as the spring of 1940, when the Soviets controlled the Katyn Forest. Yet the allies, having joined the Soviet Union in the war against the Nazis, kept the atrocity hushed up.

After the war, the Kremlin imposed severe restrictions on any mention of the Katyn Forest incident by the communist press. We have obtained the actual ruling from the Polish Communist Party's Book of Directives and Recommendations. "Any attempt to blame the Soviet Union for the death of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest," it decrees, "should not pass the censor."

For scholarly works, the directive permits only such phrases as "shot by the Nazis at Katyn," "died at Katyn" or "perished at Katyn." But it adds sternly: "No statement of this type can be published with a date of death earlier than August 1941," which the Soviets insist was the date of the massacre. This, of course, was safely after the Nazis took over the Katyn Forest.

The brave Andrzej Braun, risking possible imprisonment, spoke out against the censorship at the Polish Writers Congress. His heroism did not go unrecorded; the Warsaw correspondent for the Voice of America, Ron Penstein, filed an account of Braun's remarks to Washington.

We have seen Penstein's original dispatch. It reports that the poet, as an example of censorship, "cited the murder of Polish officers by the Soviet Union at Katyn Forest in 1940." The dispatch went on to say that his speech drew "wild applause from the writers at the congress and attacks from party officials."

Penstein filed his dispatch in Warsaw at 10 a.m. on May 5, 1978. By 10:32 p.m. on the same day, all critical references to the Soviet Union had been excised. The censorship occurred in two stages. First, the words "by the Soviet Union" were removed. Then later the 1940 date was dropped. The final story, which the Voice of America broadcast, stated simply: "Braun cited the murder of Polish officers in World War II."

By a strange coincidence, the deletions were the same ones that the Soviet censorship code specifies. Thus the broadcast conformed completely with the official Soviet version of the Katyn Forest incident.

This offended 11 Poles who work for the Voice of America. They drafted a letter of protest to Hans Holzapfel, who heads the Voice's European Division. He responded by convening a meeting of his Polish employees and scolding them. ●

WHAT ABOUT OUR FLAG?

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Roy Shoffner, Publisher-Editor of The Enterprise Ledger, Enterprise, Ala., has written an essay for the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Speak Up for Democracy" program. Shoffner's beautiful essay was printed as the editorial for the Ledger's Wednesday, June 14, 1978 edition.

While for many, traditional love and patriotism for our country has become passé, and the butt of much misguided irreverence, that is obviously not the case with Roy Shoffner. I am thankful for my region, and for our Nation, that there still are writers, editors, and publishers who feel as strongly and as patriotically toward our flag and Nation as does Roy Shoffner.

I commend to my colleagues, and to any who are fortunate enough to read the following essay, Roy Shoffner's answer to the question—"What About Our Flag?"

The essay follows:

WHAT ABOUT OUR FLAG?

(By Roy Shoffner)

Let me ask you a question that is being asked in the capitals of almost all the nations of the world. "Is the United States ready, willing, and able to oppose aggression, defend freedom and honor its commitments around the world?"

I don't expect you to answer that question, although the answer is vitally important to our friends . . . and also our enemies.

It is important that our friends have the assurance that commitments made, treaties entered into, and long friendships will be honored. Our friends must know that if they become the victim of any armed aggression, the United States stands ready to come to their assistance.

Even more important to the peace of the world is the complete understanding, by our potential enemies, that this nation has the means and the strength of purpose . . . has the national will so to speak . . . to act in defense of freedom against any aggressor.

However, since the United States has, during the past few years, assumed the role of world "Whipping boy," the world is no longer sure of America's stand on the issue of world freedom. In other words, "Freedom versus Communism."

Ever since American leadership began drifting away from its strong pro-freedom, anti-Communism stand, the idea has taken root that there is really very little difference between free and Communist nations. And, what little difference does exist, is about as important as the difference between calico and gingham.

How utterly wrong that idea is . . . the difference between freedom and Communism is as vast as the difference between freedom and slavery . . . good and evil . . . life and death.

What can be done about our current position? Well, first and foremost, when you look at the world situation and see the apparent rise in military strength of our most obvious potential enemy . . . the Soviet Union . . . don't panic. The Soviet Union is a superpower, but so are we . . . and we must continue to be strong and to use that strength in our dealings with the rest of the world. ●

That shouldn't be hard, the United States is a strong nation. All this nation needs is firmness on the part of our leadership, firmness in what we believe in and what we stand for.

Americans are optimistic by nature, and it's good that we are, for this country was built and has waxed great because of the prevailing optimistic hope for a better future.

America's characteristic optimism was the catalyst that bonded a sprawling, brawling, rowdy, rugged frontier into a strong, vibrant nation.

A firm belief in our own abilities and a prevailing hope for a better future became basic threads in the tapestry of America's national character. This tapestry started taking shape back before 1776, and it still isn't finished.

Each era America passes through becomes another panel in the tapestry. The Revolution, the Monroe Doctrine, the Louisiana Purchase, the great tragedy of the Civil War, the relentless westward march, the great Depression, all the great wars, men landing on the moon, all these parts of the tapestry.

Let's carry our characteristic optimism forward and continue to follow its lead in this century, for no century needs optimism more than the present one.

However, we must ensure that our optimism is not clouded by the naive belief that the rest of the world will finally come to its senses and see thing in their true perspective . . . or at least in the perspective that we believe to be the true one. Strange as it may seem to you, the policies of the United States are not necessarily the policies the rest of the world will choose to follow. However, that is no reason not to pursue the policies that are in our best interest.

As we push ahead we must remember the lessons of the past. There's an old adage that says, "Those who refuse to learn from the past, are doomed to repeat it".

History has many lessons for us. One of the most important is that every time this nation of ours has lowered its defenses, it has received a very unpleasant slap in the face.

If we become complacent; if we begin to feel secure in the present atmosphere of world superpower detente, or if we consider ourselves to be so powerful that we can ignore the military and diplomatic advances of other nations, we open ourselves to another slap in the face . . . another Pearl Harbor.

A strong and free government in the United States is the world's best hope for a future blessed with liberty. One of the best ways to ensure a strong and free United States is for us to have the strongest military and naval forces. But, do we now have such a guarantee? Once our Flag flew over the greatest array of military and naval might that the world had ever known. Now there is some doubt about whose flag flies over the strongest nation . . . ours or the Soviet Union's.

Speaking of flags, it was 201 years ago on the fourteenth of this month that our Flag was born. On June 14, 1777, the Marine Committee of the Continental Congress passed a resolution that read: "Resolved that the Flag of the United States be made of 13 stripes, alternate red and white, that the union be 13 stars white in a blue field representing a new constellation."

It is unfortunate that in establishing the basic design of our National Flag, the members of the committee used phraseology that was so brief that much was left to the imagination and inclination of the flag makers of the day.

Here are just three of the most obvious omissions:

1. The resolution contains no provisions for representation of additional states that were likely to join the union.

2. No determination as to whether the stripes should be horizontal or vertical was made in the wording of the resolution.

3. Also, it didn't prescribe the arrangement of the stars in the blue field.

The people of Vermont and Kentucky, after these states were admitted to the Union, wanted their states to be represented on the National Flag, so Congress added another star and another stripe for each additional state. This brought the Flag to 15 stars and 15 stripes. Also it set the precedent of adding a star and a stripe for each additional state.

This was obviously a totally unworkable situation. The Flag would soon become too bulky to be functional.

So, even though five additional states were admitted to the Union, the National Flag remained the same . . . 15 stars and 15 stripes . . . for twenty-three years.

Then in 1816 a movement to give all the states of the Union equal representation on our National flag was started. The slogan of the movement was "A star for every state and a state for every star."

On April 4, 1818 both houses of Congress passed a bill entitled: "An Act to Establish the Flag of the United States."

This new act stated that the Flag should have 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white, to represent the 13 original states. And "that on the admission of every state into the Union, one star be added to the Union of the Flag; and that such addition shall take effect on the Fourth of July next succeeding admission."

Finally the design of the United States Flag was set . . . firmly defined . . . and just think, it only took forty-one years from the time the original Flag law was enacted.

June 14th was established as Flag Day in 1915 . . . one hundred and thirty-eight years after the original Flag resolution.

Actually, Flag Day came about because of World War I in 1915, it became apparent that internal strife was building in the United States because of the great war that was raging in Europe.

Because forces from both within and without seemed bent on drawing the United States away from the traditions of unity of action and purpose that Americans had always been proud of . . . doesn't that bring to mind the happenings of recent years . . . President Wilson felt a patriotic day of national significance was sorely needed.

So, in an attempt to re-kindle national pride and restore unity of purpose, the President proclaimed June 14th as National Flag Day.

In the message that accompanied that proclamation, President Wilson said: "I therefore, suggest and request that throughout the nation . . . in every community the 14th day of June be observed as Flag Day."

The President went on to say, "Let us on that day re-dedicate ourselves to the nation, 'one and inseparable' from which every thought that is unworthy of our forefathers' first vows of independence, liberty and right shall be excluded, and in which we shall stand with united hearts for an America which no man can corrupt, no influence draw away from its ideals, no force divide against itself, a nation singly distinguished among all the nations of mankind for its clear, individual conception alike of its duties and its privileges, its obligations, and its rights."

The message President Wilson put into those few words is as important today as it was then. Perhaps even more important in light of current history . . . and in the light of the scandalous way our Flag was treated during the sixties and early seventies.

Our current flag with its 13 stripes and its 50 stars in recent years has suffered more indignities at the hands of those it represents than any other Flag in the history of this great country. It has been torn down, dragged through the streets, disgracefully defiled, and publicly burned in protest by those who would have you believe they are Americans.

No true American could treat his Flag in such a manner and no Flag in history has deserved this kind of treatment less than our current Flag. For, the "fifty-star" Flag of the United States represents a country that has done more to ease the suffering and erase the tyranny of the world than any other nation in the history of mankind.

Therefore, it behoves Americans everywhere to pay special honor to the Flag of the United States on this June 14th, not only because of its age . . . 201 years old . . . but also because of what it stands for and whom it represents.

There are those, even on this special holiday, who will belittle our Flag and say, "What's the big deal? The Flag is just a piece of cloth."

Is our Flag just so much cloth, stapled to a staff on which there are some red and white bars and some scattered white stars on a field of blue?

No, of course it isn't . . . no right thinking person would ever categorize it as such. Our Flag is the symbol of America's greatness, America's unity. It is the symbol of the American people's hopes, sacrifices, struggles and achievements, but . . . more than that . . . our Flag is what the people make it.

What is our Flag? Our Flag is first and foremost, the symbol of freedom. And, our nation . . . under this flag . . . is the last great citadel of freedom in the world. It may well be man's best . . . and last . . . hope for freedom on earth.

Still there are some who might ask, "What is our Flag?" "After all, it was designed by mere mortals, what makes it so unique?"

It is unique because it was conceived in the dream of liberty and born of the hope of free men. It was proclaimed the national emblem of a nation newly born on a wild new continent and fighting valiantly for its very existence.

The Flag of the United States has been a party to all the great events in our nation's history. It was born during our initial struggle for independence; it was seen in the early morning light, battle stained, but proudly waving over Fort MHenry.

Our Flag has flown from the mast of every ship in our Navy and has been the joy and inspiration to American fighting men through two World Wars, and in fights for freedom all over the world.

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

What does our Flag say as it floats in the "majestic silence" President Wilson spoke of? It speaks of liberty and equality under law; it speaks of honor and courage, and it serves to remind us that each new generation must dedicate itself to an undivided allegiance to the country and its high ideals.

For, as the poet said, "Honor, courage, and heroic deeds . . . are the flowers of freedom, not the weeds." ●

LIFT THE EMBARGO

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat whose arguments in favor of lifting the arms embargo against Turkey are compelling. The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 10, 1978]

LIFT TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO

One of the most puzzling performances in American foreign policy today is by those congressional leaders who feel compelled to engage in cutting off the nose to spite the face. It is as impractical as it is injurious.

And yet that is precisely what a majority of the members of Congress are doing in their spite-filled insistence on keeping in place the American embargo against shipments of arms to Turkey. The congressional bungling of three years ago has turned out to be one of the most botched-up operations in the history of United States foreign affairs. Congress could be sued for malpractice.

The embargo voted by Congress in 1975, forbidding the sale or gift of American weapons to Turkey, was a mistake from the outset. The reason for the action, said a wrathful Congress, was to punish the Turks for what Congress viewed as their illegal use of American arms against Greek Cypriots on the island of Cyprus the preceding year. This, Congress declared, was in violation of U.S. rules on foreign assistance.

What Congress blindly overlooked, however, was that Turkey didn't start the ruckus on Cyprus. Analysts of military-political affairs make it clear that the crisis started with an attempted coup by the colonels who then ruled Greece. The Greeks, it is reliably reported, were using modern weapons, and since Greece's chief supplier of arms was and is the United States, Greece broke the same rules that Turkey was punished for violating.

Congress also failed to see, in its hip-shooting at the Turks, that Turkish intervention in the Cyprus affair may have been justifiable on the basis of a treaty right to protect Turkey's interests on the island.

It is not too late, however, to rectify the mistakes of the past. This can be done by Congress in its coming debate on lifting the arms embargo against Turkey. How Congress decides this critical issue will have a direct bearing not only on the future of the United States but on the stability of the entire free world.

Reason argues it is imperative that America end the ill-considered embargo. As a means of punishing the Turks, it was wrongly conceived; as an instrument for forcing a solution to the Greece-Turkey-Cyprus question, it has proven totally ineffective. Rather than forcing Turkey to knuckle under in negotiations, as backers of the embargo have hoped it would, the arms ban has hardened the Turks' determination.

The embargo has had a profound effect on Turkey. It has caused rapid deterioration in the Turks' once powerful military forces, which are heavily dependent on American weapons and spare parts.

The embargo has humiliated and offended the Turks, a fiercely proud people. Worse yet, in this strategically located country that has for decades nurtured warm ties with Washington, friendship is turning sour and developing into an alienation that could have

enormously damaging consequences for the United States and the West.

President Carter has called on Congress to lift the arms ban. He is supported by five former supreme commanders of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Gens. Andrew J. Goodpaster, Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Alfred M. Gruenther, Lauris Norstad and Matthew B. Ridgway—who in a letter to Congress make a solid case for ending the embargo.

"We view with alarm the deterioration in NATO's southern flank caused by the sharp decline in Turkish military capabilities and the increasing alienation of Turkey from the United States. Turkey is vitally important to our Western collective security, for it:

"One: Controls the passage of Soviet war vessels from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean.

"Two: Houses large numbers of strategically important U.S. and NATO facilities, some of which are uniquely situated for collecting intelligence on Soviet military activities.

"Three: Provides an air defense warning critical to the operation of our Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

"Four: Provides a major contribution of army forces to NATO.

"Our need of our Western defensive alliance is now greater than ever in light of the ominous Soviet military buildup of recent years."

Equally strong in his call for lifting the embargo is Gen. Alexander M. Haig Jr., present NATO supreme commander, who warned that time is running out for restoration of Turkey to genuinely full membership in NATO. The present state in the eastern Mediterranean, he said, is "totally unsatisfactory and extremely and increasingly dangerous to the health and vitality of the alliance itself."

During the NATO summit meeting in Washington last month, alliance members pledged an unprecedented defense buildup that could cost \$80 billion or more over the next decade. This represents a monumental effort to counter the global expansion of the Soviet Union.

But the entire structure on which NATO is built could be undermined by events now transpiring in the eastern Mediterranean. Unless the Turkish connection is again made solid, the Western alliance will be outflanked by the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact. If Turkey feels rejected by the West, it very easily could drift into the Communist camp to the East. And if Turkey ever left NATO, there would be a perilous shift in the balance of power in the Middle East, because the buffer zone would be gone and other nations that are presently pro-West could be drawn into the Soviets' web.

Edward W. O'Brien, chief of The Globe-Democrat's Washington Bureau, has made an in-depth study of the Turkish situation, interviewing a broad range of military and political experts in the process. As Mr. O'Brien clearly documented in a comprehensive series on the subject, the consensus is strongly in favor of lifting the arms embargo in a move to normalize relations between the United States and Turkey.

This would not mean that the U.S. was siding with the Turks in the Cyprus dispute. Nor would it mean that the U.S. was trying to build up Turkey at the expense of Greece. Both countries are vital to the West as members of NATO, and it is clearly in Greece's best interests to keep Turkey oriented to the West. A Communist Turkey would put Greece directly on the Reds' firing line.

Congressional moralizing against Turkey is an exercise in stupidity. The sermonists are blind to the facts of life, failing to see that the arms embargo against a country which has always been one of NATO's strong-

est allies is self-defeating. It is also one of the most self-destructive foreign policies in American history. With the security—even the very survival—of the West at stake, it's time for Congress to talk turkey on the Turkish situation. And while Congress is at it, a determined effort should be made to reshape American foreign policy along more sensible and flexible lines. The post-Vietnam syndrome that has affected the thinking of so many congressional leaders has produced a tunnel vision that is taking America in the wrong direction. In attempting to tread a path of self-righteousness, Congress is unkindly of the many pitfalls along the way.

WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware of the great institution of which we are a part and of the people we represent. America is a great Nation because of its people and the values they uphold. It is these values and principles that are passed on to our young.

Accordingly, I would like to share with my colleagues the following articles on, "What's Right About America", written by the three top winners in the Miss South Dakota National Teenage Pageant.

In order, they are follows: First place, Laurie Schenecker, Watertown; second place, Robin Gauger, Clear Lake; third place, Kay Hall, Fulton.

WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

(By Laurie Schenecker)

What's right about America? The right of its people to say what's wrong about America. History traces our advance through criticism.

In 1775 Patrick Henry criticized the colonies for submitting to England's tyrannical rule. He motivated the colonies to fight for independence. The follow through is evident. We are the United States of America.

In 1863, Abraham Lincoln criticized slavery. He motivated our country through the emancipation proclamation. The battle was a bloody one, but the follow through is evident. We are the United States of America.

We have criticized, motivated, and followed through to become the United States of Americans. It's like Lyman Abbott once said, "America was a great land when Columbus discovered it. Americans have made it a great nation."

WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

(By Robin D. Gauger)

People often tell the negative side of life in America. How often do we boast about its positive character? In contrast with the rest of the industrialized world, our economy seems to be positively thriving. In 1977, American church membership swelled while donations to charitable causes rose by 9.4 percent.

What other nation has welcomed immigrants from battered countries or given food and medicine unquestioningly? American volunteers have educated those in need spiritually and physically. Where else do common men become president? Where else is there freedom to worship and express individual beliefs?

Because of its positive image America is viewed as a dream to be achieved.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By Kay Hall)

After the Constitution was adopted the Bill of Rights was attached. These ten freedoms are guaranteed to us all. Without these civil rights America would not be the place it is today.

What would newspapermen do without freedom of the press, or an eloquent speaker who does not possess freedom of speech? What would happen if there was no freedom of religion? The other unmentioned privileges are just as important.

These civil liberties protect each of us every day of our lives. Without them our system of democracy would probably fail.

What is right with America? . . . The Bill of Rights. ●

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. AGRICULTURAL LANDS

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 20, 1978, the House Subcommittee on Family Farms and Rural Development, of which I am privileged to chair, held hearings on the impact of foreign investment in U.S. agricultural lands.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of George Rucker, research director for Rural America, Inc. which was presented before the subcommittee. Mr. Rucker's testimony clearly describes the affects and consequences of foreign ownership of U.S. farmland. Mr. Rucker stated that:

Foreign ownership of U.S. farmland increases the number of tenant farmers and hired laborers, and thus weakens rural communities, and that capital from the farms is being siphoned out of rural communities, by these foreign owners.

Although the current ownership of farmland by foreign owners is relatively small, the rising trend of foreign purchases has increasingly brought national attention. I believe the Congress must now examine the issue of foreign ownership of domestic farmland, and develop a mechanism to accurately collect data on the impact of foreign purchases on our small rural communities and family farming system.

Mr. Rucker's statement follows:

FOREIGN AND OTHER ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP OF AMERICAN FARMLAND: A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

(Testimony of George Rucker, Research Director of Rural America, Inc.)

Chairman Nolan and members of the Subcommittee, my name is George Rucker and I am the Research Director at Rural America, a national membership organization seeking to improve human opportunity in small town and rural America. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and comment on foreign investment in U.S. farmland. Mr. Chairman, we had hoped that a member of our Board of Directors could have been here today who would have been able to provide this committee with some first-hand knowledge about foreign investment in American farmland. Unfortunately our Board is at its annual meeting in Marshall, Minnesota today. They have expressed,

however, a real concern for this issue and we will be submitting a more comprehensive statement for the hearing record once we receive their input.

For years, we have been among those warning Congress and the American public that absentee-ownership of farmland is corroding the fabric of rural life. For the most part, our words have gone unheeded. Now, suddenly, there is a hue and cry about foreign ownership of U.S. farmland. Almost daily, newspapers and politicians express their concern that foreign investors are buying the land at inflated prices, thereby drying the land out of the purchasing range of small farmers. We are cautioned that foreign-ownership of farmland increases the number of tenant farmers and hired laborers, and thus weakens rural communities. We are warned that capital from the farms is being siphoned out of rural communities by these foreign owners. These are all very real problems and we are pleased that Congress and the public are finally paying them some attention.

All of these rural afflictions, however, are symptoms of absentee-ownership in general, not specifically of foreign ownership. To the small farmer who is forced to pay rent on his farmland because he can not afford the escalated real estate value of the land, or to the rural entrepreneur who goes out of business because nobody in the community has any money to spend, it matters very little whether the owner of the land resides in Saudi Arabia or on Madison Avenue. Moreover, when we deal with the huge agribusiness corporation which are generally multi-national, it becomes a moot point as to whether the land they own is foreign- or American-owned.

Unfortunately, it is currently impossible to determine how much U.S. farmland is actually absentee-owned. Not since 1945 has there been a national survey of land ownership in this country. The Department of Agriculture is preparing to carry out a sample survey of land ownership, but at best that sample will provide data on nominal rather than beneficial ownership. In the meantime we are forced to rely on indirect indicators and to argue about what the implications of those indicators are.

One indicator, of course, is the residence and other characteristics of farm operators. The Census of Agriculture is not as helpful as it might be on this point, though. In fact, its definition of a farm operator is so imprecise as to constitute an impediment rather than an aid to the understanding of the tenancy-ownership situation. The Census, for example, defines a "farm operator" as anyone who "operates the farm, either doing the work himself or directly supervising the work." The term, "directly supervising the work" is so loose that it could include almost anyone. A doctor in Connecticut, for instance, who decided what crops will be grown on his Kansas farm could be considered the farm operator. By the same token, a sharecropper in Mississippi is also a farm operator. What these two—the doctor and the sharecropper—have in common is hard to fathom. (It might be noted in passing that if we take the definition at face value, the 1974 data suggest that 14 percent of even the non-corporate farms were "operated" by someone who did not live on a farm—that one or even some other one.)

This imprecise definition of operator, which came into use with the 1969 Census of Agriculture, simply dropped from the available data the category of hired farm manager—a category that accounted for one-tenth of all farmland in 1964 and, we would guess, a significantly larger share today. As Professor Dick Rodefeld of Pennsylvania State University, has pointed out, the change eliminates "a key indicator of the status and trends . . . in family type farms." Dr. Rodefeld notes that the data through the 1964

Census of Agriculture showed a steady decline in the number of "full owner" farms—those in which the manager (defined in the old restrictive sense of the person directing farm production activities "on a daily basis" and "either doing the work himself or directly supervising the work"), was also the full owner of the farm being managed. The number of such family-type farms not only declined by 42 percent between 1910 and 1964, but their share of total farmland fell from more than half to less than 30 percent. (Thanks to the definitional change we do not know what has happened over the last decade and a half.)

Another indirect indicator is corporate ownership. (Again, it is only an indirect indicator since the data include family corporations as well as absentee firms.) In 1974 the share of U.S. farm acreage accounted for by corporate owners was almost 11%, up nearly 2 percentage points from the 1969 figure. (These figures refer only to farms with sales in excess of \$2,500.) The average size of the corporate farm was nearly 3,400 acres, compared with less than 500 acres for those owned by individuals, families and partnerships. This size disparity helps to underline the link between corporate ownership and concentration in farming.

There is also evidence suggesting that the Census of Agriculture data on corporate farming is an understatement of the situation. A number of states have taken the initiative in requiring farming corporations to file reports. The number of corporations identified in these states far exceeds the number reported in the Census. In the six states for which figures are available—South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Minnesota—the number of farm corporations which had filed reports as of January, 1977 is almost twice the number reported in the 1974 Ag Census. The Ag Census identified 4,919 corporate farms, but more than 9,000 have filed reports. Some of this difference is doubtless attributable to differences in time and definition. But the spread is so large as to make one uneasy with the Census figures.

In short, while we do not really know how much farmland is absentee-owned, the indicators we have suggest that it is a significant and growing share. It is safe to assume that some portion of this is controlled by foreign interests. It may be, as the recent GAO spot check indicated, that this portion is relatively small. Should this turn out to be the case, we hope that this committee will not then relax and turn its back on the broader and more important issue of absentee-ownership in general.

U.S. farmland offers foreigners an attractive investment due to the political stability of our country and the favorable exchange rate between the dollar and West European currencies. To Americans, farmland is an equally enticing investment due to preferential tax treatment and skyrocketing real estate values.

In the past six years, the value of farmland has increased by 133%. In Iowa, it has more than tripled. As if this were not enough, investors in real estate are granted lavish tax breaks. Profits from the sale of real estate are taxed at approximately half the rate of ordinary income. Moreover, investors in real estate are allowed to deduct from their taxable income—at an artificially accelerated rate—the annual depreciation of structures on their land.

Another tax benefit, especially popular among doctors, lawyers, and corporations, is the code which permits the deduction of farm losses from non-farm income. This has an especially harmful effect on small farmers who depend on their agricultural sales to survive. Since many of these tax-loss farmers actively pursue losses in their farming ventures, they can afford to undercut the prices charged by legitimate farmers. A 1968 study

by the USDA revealed that of the wealthiest 66,000 individuals filing farm income tax returns, more than two-thirds reported a net farm loss.

In addition to tax incentives, the Federal Government continues to act through the Department of Agriculture to promote absentee farming by encouraging large-scale farming. (Since large farms are capital-intensive and require large investments in land and machinery, they tend to attract investors rather than farmers.) Land grant colleges design more and more complicated and expensive machinery to harvest larger and larger acreages. And USDA-supported scientists continue to develop tasteless fruits and vegetables whose sole advantage is their suitability for machine-picking and large-scale processing and marketing techniques. There are even reports issued by USDA which foresee farming in the future as completely automated and computerized.

Again, Professor Rodefeld has warned of the consequences of a shift to the industrial-type farm in place of the family-type farm. Based on 1968 data for the State of Wisconsin, he estimated that "if all current State farms were replaced by industrial-type farms, the number of farms would be reduced by 94% . . . and the size of the work force (man year equivalents) would decline by 46%." This shift would have profound implications for such things as "community compositional characteristics (levels of education, income, stability, etc.), population structure and functioning (age distributions, fertility rates, dependency rates, rates of out-migration, etc.), and structure and functioning of community institutions and organizations."

Aside from Rodefeld's work, it is likely that the best treatment of this subject is still Walter Goldschmidt's classic study of two towns—Arvin and Dinuba—in California's San Joaquin Valley. Although the study was conducted in 1944, its conclusions are still pertinent. Goldschmidt found that the small-farm town of Dinuba had more business activities, better community facilities such as garbage and sewage disposal, more recreational facilities, more newspapers and churches, and more local autonomy, than did the corporate-farming town of Arvin. In short, Goldschmidt determined that "small farms provide the basis for a richer community life, and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type."

A revisit to Arvin and Dinuba last year found that the social and economic differences between the two towns are even more pronounced today than they were in 1944. In addition, a recent 5-year study of 130 communities in the San Joaquin Valley concluded that "there is a strong positive correlation between large-scale 'industrialized' farming and rural poverty."

While absentee-ownership of farmland is certainly not the sole cause of rural America's ills, it is a major component. It is clear that the health of rural America depends, in part, on land reforms. These reforms, moreover, should not be left to the individual States. A national land policy which promotes small farms owned by the farmers is needed.

Before anything can be done about absentee-ownership of farmland, foreign or otherwise, we must have reliable information. The Ag Census's section on farm tenure should be overhauled so that it acquires some meaning. We would be happy to provide specific recommendations on these changes at the request of the committee.

"The ownership of land," wrote Henry George, "is the great fundamental fact which ultimately determines the social, political, and consequently the intellectual and moral condition of a people." We hope that Congress and the public will not sit idly by while that determinant falls slowly but surely under the control of absentee owners—whatever their nationality. ●

NGO'S SPEAK OUT FOR DISARMAMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, I have included in the RECORD various speeches which were delivered by representatives of nongovernmental organizations on June 12 at the UN Special Session on Disarmament. Today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Philip Potter of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

The remarks follow:

COMMISSION OF THE CHURCHES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

(By Mr. Philip Potter)

It is a great privilege for me, on behalf of the World Council of Churches, to address this Committee. The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of 293 Orthodox and Protestant churches in over 100 countries. They comprise hundreds of millions of believers who live in east and west, north and south, people who find themselves caught up in all the ideological, political, economic, social, racial and cultural conflicts of our time. One of the main functions of the Council is to express the common concern of the churches in the service of human need, the breaking down of barriers between people, and the promotion of one human family in justice and peace.

The barriers caused by war and by the armaments race have been a major preoccupation of the Council from its inception 30 years ago. Through its Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, which has consultative status with various United Nations bodies, the Council has indefatigably represented the churches in the concern for disarmament and has constantly sought to rouse the conscience of Christians to throw their weight, with people of goodwill and Governments, in working for peace and justice. Christians expert in the field of disarmament have been mobilized and valuable contributions have been made. The Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, held at Nairobi in 1975, called for studies in depth on militarism and disarmament. Since then consultations have been held, and their findings have been shared with delegates at this special session of the United Nations. I should mention that on Sunday, 21 May, the eve of this special session, churches throughout the world remembered it in their prayers to the God of peace.

As Christians have grappled with the issues of disarmament, they have been painfully aware of the qualitatively new elements in the situation during this disarmament decade. The world has, in fact, become more insecure in these years.

First, considerably more material and human resources are being concentrated on the production of armaments. Science and technology, the preserve of an intellectual élite in both rich and poor countries, are now deployed by the alliance of those involved in the business, bureaucratic, political and military sectors to produce new and ever more lethal weapons at a prodigious rate. This is often done secretly, in the corridors of power and beyond social control. Moreover, the dramatic increase in the number, variety, destructive power and cost of these armaments frustrates disarmament negotiations more than ever before because they change the nature of the problems which have to be faced.

Secondly, arms production and sale have become part of the national economic policy of the rich developed world, and therefore dictate political and foreign policies. Weapons-producing national and transnational corporations have exacerbated this trend. This has meant a marked increase in the flow of arms to the poorer, developing countries, which in the process become dependent clients of the powerful States and potentially widen the scope of armed conflict. For example, it is known that of the over 130 armed conflicts which have taken place since the Second World War nearly all have been in the third world, and the powerful nations of the rich world have been involved in those conflicts. Disarmament has therefore become a truly global concern. Hence the necessity and timeliness of this special session of the United Nations.

Thirdly, national security should be the instrument for promoting the social, economic and political rights of all peoples within the nation State. However, in a growing number of countries it has become a doctrine which is used to justify military take-overs, the suppression of civilian political institutions, and the violation of basic human rights. In the defense of "law and order," sinister instruments of torture, police and prison hardware, and sophisticated means of intelligence gathering have been produced and sold to minority and undemocratic régimes, especially in the third world. We are witnessing the increasing militarization of many of our societies and the tendency to extend a country's military, ideological and economic frontiers far beyond its national borders, all of which leads to greater insecurity.

Moreover, in the name of national security, the mass media and educational institutions are frequently misused to foster a psychosis of fear and mistrust and to prevent any way of looking at resolution of conflicts, other than in military terms.

Fourthly, overshadowing all these dangerous tendencies is the development of new generations of even more destructive conventional and nuclear weapons. There is a growing danger of nuclear proliferation and of a lowering of the nuclear threshold. The deployment of weapons, through missiles, submarines and long-range bombers, has made possible a strike capability encompassing all nations and peoples. Furthermore, the superpowers are now seeking to create an atmosphere in which first-strike capability will sooner or later be turned to reality, and will thus hasten the annihilation of the human race.

In face of this catalogue of accelerated insecurity, the churches cannot remain inactive spectators. On the basis of their faith in a God who, in Jesus Christ, wills that we should have life, and have it in all its fullness, and in his purpose that the earth should be replenished and used for the well-being of all, Christians are called to bring new perspectives to bear on the issues of militarism and the arms race. I have time to mention only in a general way a few of these perspectives.

First, disarmament is an integral part of the struggle for a just, participatory and sustainable society. The threat to peace of the arms race is inextricably related to the other prevailing threats to human survival—poverty, and hunger, racial, political and economic oppression, the suppression of human rights, the despoiling of the environment and the wanton wastage of the resources of the earth. Disarmament and the search for a new international economic order are inseparable efforts towards peace with justice. Thus disarmament is not a technical but a political and moral concern. A global approach to disarmament is needed. Everything which is done to achieve a more just economic order, to share material and human resources in an equitable way and to facilitate the participation of all in the life of

society is bound to contribute to eliminating the arms race and the militarization of society.

Secondly, we must challenge the idol of a distorted concept of national security which is directed to encouraging fear and mistrust resulting in greater insecurity. The only security worthy of its name lies in enabling people to participate fully in the life of their nation and to establish relations of trust between peoples of different nations. It is only when there is a real dialogue—a sharing of life with life in mutual trust and respect—that there can be true security.

Thirdly, Christians are pledged to work for creating those structures and mechanisms by which disarmament can be sought boldly and imaginatively. The United Nations is the most effective forum for enabling the nations to work for that international security which will ensure national security, for the rule of law through covenants freely entered into and maintained by mutually agreed peaceful methods. Therefore, it is imperative that the role of the United Nations be extended and strengthened in the search for disarmament and for a new international economic order. One of the tragedies of our time is the way in which Member States and the mass media which support them ignore and denigrate the work of the United Nations. The World Council of Churches and its member churches stand pledged, as they always have done, to support the United Nations in all its efforts to promote peace and justice in our troubled, tortured world.

Fourthly, disarmament is not the affair of statesmen and experts only, but of every man and woman of every nation. We are dealing here with the issues of life and death for humankind. They are not technical, but human and therefore political issues. This means that every effort must be made to dispel the ignorance, complacency and fear which prevail. Political decisions can be made only when people are fully aware of the facts and are enabled to discern the options before them. This is a necessary function which non-governmental organizations can perform. The churches have a very distinctive role to play because they have the criterion of faith in a God of hope whose purpose is that all should be responsible for each other in justice and peace. Therefore, they will continue to rouse the conscience of people and encourage them to demonstrate by attitude, word and act that peace and justice are not ideals to be cherished but realities to be achieved. The arms race is the decision and creation of human beings; disarmament must also be willed and won by human beings.

The churches do not approach their task with any self-righteousness or naivety. They are well aware that throughout their history they have often been so allied to the forces of disorder and oppression that they have promoted or connived in wars and the war psychosis. They know that their own divisions are symptoms and signs of the divisions of the world. To be instruments of reconciliation they are in fact endeavouring to become reconciled to each other.

It is in humility and hope that the churches participate in the efforts towards disarmament and a just society. They do so with the vision of the prophet whose words are engraved on the Isaiah Wall just across the street from this building:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

It is this vision of the conversion of the tools of death into the tools of life which inspires and activates the churches today. Our prayer is that this vision will inspire the representatives in their deliberations and their people in the pursuit of peace and justice. ●

THE COSTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 28, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE COSTS OF ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION

In one public meeting after another this spring I have heard Ninth District residents express concern about the impact of environmental regulation on the economy.

The feeling is growing that the nation simply cannot afford the costs of strict environmental regulation at a time when inflation is the top economic priority. There is an increased appreciation of the conflict in our nation between the environmental considerations of clean air, pure water and prudent land management on the one hand, and the economic consideration of jobs, energy and inflation on the other. The conflict is apparent in many matters before the Congress, including oil and natural gas leasing on the outer continental shelf, preservation of the redwood forests in California and expansion of the Alaskan wilderness, to name just a few. At the heart of the debate is the fundamental problem of weighing the costs of environmental controls against the benefits.

The issue of cost versus benefit is being intensely examined by Washington policymakers. An attempt is being made to define more precisely the relationship between environmental regulation and performance of the economy. At the moment, the two cases that best illustrate the difficulty of the issue are the proposed limits on dust levels in cotton mills and the regulations to curb emissions from coal-fired power plants. In each instance pollution can be sharply reduced, but only at a very high cost. A cotton dust standard was recently presented as a model of regulatory effectiveness and economy, but as if to confirm the complexity of such cases the standard was immediately attacked by labor as ineffective and by industry as uneconomical. In anticipation of the problems that will arise in these and other areas, the President has established a new regulatory assessment group in the White House to provide much-needed advice and counsel.

It is apparent that the nation's environmental goals are important. There is agreement that some regulation is needed. Congress has committed the government to high environmental standards and has recognized the serious consequences of failing to meet them. But the cost of these standards is higher than had been imagined. No one expects the present environmental laws to be emasculated, but neither does anyone expect that environmental considerations will be given free rein. Policymakers must strive for a balance, seeking to sharpen regulation so that it will accomplish the same worthy goals without aggravating inflation. It is clear that more attention must be paid to all the results of regulation, including its effect on costs. The task of keeping the environment clean and workers safe has to be carried out more efficiently.

Since no one really knows precisely how environmental regulation affects the economy, controversy can be expected as we strive to strike a balance. The environmentalists claim that the regulation adds only four-tenths of a percent to the overall annual inflation rate. They argue that a million people are employed through environmental expenditures and that the expenditures raise

the GNP by \$1.5 billion. Many economists, however, think that these estimates are seriously flawed. They contend that anti-pollution requirements add more than one percent to the overall annual inflation rate, push up business costs by \$100 billion and reduce employment by slowing economic growth. They also point to recent studies which purport to show that the combination of pollution control, safety regulation and spending for crime prevention cuts gains in economic productivity by 20% to 25%.

All participants in this discussion concede that there has been no accurate measurement of the social benefits of environmental regulation. Better health, longer life expectancy and lower rates of worker absenteeism are slow in coming and quite hard to gauge. But the evidence is building that environmental factors cause birth defects, cancer and other illnesses, so the real question is not whether government should regulate business to protect the environment, but how it can do this in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

I do not welcome the prospect of having to choose between a clean environment and a healthy economy. I believe that environmental protection is consistent with a sound economy and that environmental concerns are totally compatible with economic needs. I would argue that if we neglect the environment the day will come when the economy will suffer. Every effort must be made to avoid a polarization of views, with the environmentalists on one side and the economists on the other. We must try to have it both ways. At stake is the quality of life in America.

It might help to change the basic way we think about environmental regulation. Indeed, more and more interest is being shown in the use of the marketplace as an effective regulator. By taking advantage of economic incentives to reduce pollution and cost-benefit analyses to show where sacrifice is necessary, business itself could become the most active advocate of a clean environment. ●

CONTROLLING PUBLIC SECTOR GROWTH AND REDUCING INDIVIDUAL TAX BURDENS

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with the cosponsorship of 13 of my distinguished colleagues, legislation which I originally proposed on March 7. This bill addresses vital issues which now confront the Nation's taxpayers and public servants. These important issues are: First, the need to control the promulgation of new Federal programs, second, the need to cut duplicative regulation, third, the need to weigh the costs and benefits of regulation at all levels of government, fourth, the need to contain Government spending, and fifth, the need to put an end to the unchecked growth of the public sector.

There are, of course, other actions which must be undertaken in concert with the measure which I am introducing. However, we must begin somewhere. And I believe that my bill initiates momentum in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, my proposal

addresses the issues outlined above by providing:

First, authorization time limits on current and new Federal programs;

Second, requiring CBO estimates of reported legislation mandating additional State or local government expenditures;

Third, requiring coordination of Federal and State programs; and

Fourth, requiring executive agencies and departments to publish estimated compliance costs which may be incurred by State and local governments in carrying out regulations.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my bill contains a provision which is intended to serve as a disincentive for overspending and unchecked growth of the public sector by requiring that federally mandated programs which must be carried out at State and local levels be funded by the U.S. Treasury.

A list of the Members who join me in introducing this legislation today follows:

1. Mr. Bedell,
2. Mr. Ellberg,
3. Mr. English,
4. Mr. Gephardt,
5. Mr. Jenrette,
6. Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania,
7. Mr. Ottinger,
8. Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas,
9. Mr. Young of Missouri,
10. Mr. Derwinski,
11. Mr. Hollenbeck,
12. Mr. Hyde, and
13. Mr. Whitehurst.●

WILBUR J. COHEN

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker. On June 30, the School of Education at the University of Michigan will be bidding farewell to its dean of 9 years—Wilbur J. Cohen. Dean Cohen's fine leadership has made the School of Education one of the finest in the country, with emphases in new areas such as early childhood development and multicultural education. The School of Education was one of the first schools on the Michigan campus to have an office of minority affairs and a women's commission. Also, Dean Cohen is happy to note that his successor as dean will be Joan S. Stark, the first woman dean in the school's history.

However, Dean Cohen's career spans far beyond his work at the University of Michigan. Thirty years were actually spent in Government service in Washington. In 1934, Cohen was hired as a research assistant on President Roosevelt's Cabinet Committee on Economic Security, helping to draft the original Social Security Act. Later, he became a staff member of the Social Security Board, and from 1953 to 1956, he directed its Division of Research and Statistics.

During the 1950's, Dean Cohen was a professor of public welfare administra-

tion at the university—a title he still holds. As chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Health and Social Security in 1960, his leadership directed recommendations such as medicare and other health, social security, unemployment insurance, and public welfare proposals.

In 1961, Dean Cohen became the Assistant Secretary for Legislation in HEW. In 1965, he became Under Secretary, and in 1968 President Johnson named him Secretary of HEW, a post he held until the Republican administration came in. His return to the school of education in 1969 marked the school's leadership role in involving students and alumni in policymaking and in meeting affirmative action goals.

Although he is leaving his post as dean of the school of education, Cohen will continue his active career by teaching courses at the university on social welfare policy, education and aging, and the Federal role in higher education. He will also remain active on the Government Relations Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. In addition, Cohen will chair a task force on prevention and investigation of abuse in institutions in Michigan, as well as serve as chairman of the National Commission on Unemployment Compensation.

Wilbur Cohen has certainly made his mark on American education and social welfare policy. The author of 4 books, and the recipient of 13 honorary degrees, he has served his country and mankind well over the years. Wilbur Cohen is a dynamic, optimistic man whose sense of duty and responsibility to his fellow citizens should be an inspiration to all of us.

While the school of education may be saying goodbye to its dean, Wilbur Cohen is not really retiring, he is simply going on to different things in life. It is good to know that his leadership will continue in education and other public welfare areas through his teaching and work on various task forces. Therefore, I will not wish Dean Cohen a happy retirement. Instead, I congratulate him on his many successes, and wish him every happiness in his new endeavors.●

THE ROAD TO PROSPERITY—PART X—THE FAT LADY HASN'T SUNG YET

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, I presume President Carter thought he would bring down the curtain on the Investment Incentive Act by his inaccurate and misleading attacks during his most recent press conference. Yet, this story is supposed to have a happy ending, and the villains routed. So, the drama proceeds.

The administration's assertion that H.R. 12111 is a millionaire's tax relief bill is absurd. The President's popularity is

sinking, and he feels that know-nothing "populism" will buoy his sagging administration. This is the same worn-out acting which was used to attack those who did not agree with the Carter energy program. That play folded, and this latest production will rapidly follow suit.

I should point out one misstatement by the President. He said that taxpayers in the \$15,000 to \$20,000 income bracket would only benefit on average by 25 cents if Steiger passes. The Joint Tax Committee analyzed the data, and discovered that the actual average benefit is \$278. I have attached the two tables for the Members' review.

The Wall Street Journal had an editorial today on the "boon to the wealthy" issue. Three examples are used which show the impact of capital gains on average taxpayers, and how Steiger-Hansen would benefit these average, not wealthy, taxpayers. The taxicab driver, by the way, drove Oscar Pollock to the Journal offices, and said he would support Steiger-Hansen. If we have the New York taxicab drivers on our side, then I know we are OK.

The material follows:

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL TAX REDUCTIONS UNDER S. 3065 (1978 INCOME LEVELS)

Expanded income class	Average tax benefit	Percentage distribution of tax benefit
Less than \$15,000	12c	0.4
\$15,000 to \$20,000	25c	.2
\$20,000 to \$30,000	\$1	.8
\$30,000 to \$50,000	11	4.0
\$50,000 to \$100,000	158	13.7
\$100,000 to \$200,000	783	14.2
\$200,000 to \$500,000	4,000	15.7
\$500,000 to \$1,000,000	21,540	11.3
\$1,000,000 and over	145,302	39.7
Total	19	100.0

TABLE 3.—CONGRESSMAN STEIGER'S CAPITAL GAINS PROPOSAL FOR INDIVIDUALS¹ 1978 INCOME LEVEL

Expanded income class ²	Tax reduction			
	Returns (thousands)	Average (actual)	Amount (millions)	Percentage distribution
Below \$5,000	3	\$2,350	\$6	0.4
\$5,000 to \$10,000	(?)	873	(?)	(?)
\$10,000 to \$15,000	1	694	(?)	(?)
\$15,000 to \$20,000	11	278	3	.2
\$20,000 to \$30,000	30	473	14	.9
\$30,000 to \$50,000	99	666	66	4.0
\$50,000 to \$100,000	131	1,730	226	13.7
\$100,000 to \$200,000	76	3,076	234	14.2
\$200,000 and over	34	32,337	1,102	66.8
Total	383	4,312	1,652	100.0

¹ Including removing capital gains as a preference item and granting an unlimited alternative tax.

² Expanded income equals adjusted gross income plus the minimum tax preferences less investment interest to the extent of investment income.

³ Less than 500 returns, \$500,000, or 0.05 percent.

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

TWO-BIT POLITICS

In a press conference reminiscent of the "war profiteering" attack on the oil companies last fall, President Carter Monday aimed his populist heavy cannons at the Steiger amendment, calling it a plan that provides "huge tax windfalls for millionaires and two bits for the average American."

When you consider that 60-odd Senators

and a sizable chunk of the House are backing the Steiger-Hansen capital gains rollback, the President's claim takes on a burden of political implausibility. Millionaires don't have that many friends in Congress in an election year.

Matters get worse for the President when you examine the numbers he used in support of his populist rhetoric. For example, he again trotted out the estimate that the Steiger cut would "add more than \$2 billion" to the federal budget deficit. This is based on the improbable assumption that cutting the maximum capital gains rate roughly in half would not encourage people to take more capital gains. Considering the beating that assumption has taken from tax analysts and economists, we thought it had been hidden away in a dark closet somewhere. As we have said here before, a good case can be made that revenues would rise, not fall, because of renewed investment incentives.

We are newly fascinated by the President's assertion that 80% of the tax benefits from the Steiger cut would go to taxpayers who "make" more than \$100,000 a year. We've learned what that \$100,000 figure really means, and you don't have to be a big shot to "make" that much under the President's definition.

The \$100,000 figure is what the Treasury has defined as "expanded income," a description developed by tax reformers some time ago for political purposes. Expanded income means ordinary income plus the full amount of any capital gain. Thus, it would be possible for a family with an ordinary income of \$25,000 and a capital gain of, say, \$75,000 on the sale of a long-term residence to be part of that illustrious group "making" \$100,000. We wonder why that point wasn't made clearer.

As to that "average" American who only gets two bits from Steiger, it is certainly true that you have to have a capital gain to benefit from a capital gains tax cut. And when you average all taxpayers the average benefit doesn't look very large. Indeed, the yield to the Treasury itself from the capital gains tax isn't very large, particularly in relation to the damage the tax does to capital formation.

But none of this means that the Steiger amendment would not yield major benefits to ordinary, nonrich Americans who have to cash a major asset and find themselves, mainly because of inflation, realizing a sizable capital gain.

By way of illustration, we asked accountants Price Waterhouse & Co. and Oscar Pollack of the Infalls and Snyder securities house in New York to work up some examples:

A New York cabbie paid \$24,000 for his licensing medallion five years ago and now sells it for \$58,000. His total long-term capital gain is \$34,000. His earned income was \$13,200, excluding the capital gain. He has a wife and two children. Under the present law his federal income tax liability would be \$8,850. With the Steiger amendment, it would be \$7,800, a saving of \$1,050.

A California construction project manager and his wife, in their early 60s with a taxable earned income of \$25,000, want to retire on a pension and Social Security. They sell their house and rent an apartment. They bought their house 20 years ago for \$24,000 and now sell it for \$100,000, for a long-term capital gain of \$76,000. They don't qualify for income averaging because of higher earned income in prior years. Their total tax liability under present provisions would be \$26,064. Under the Steiger amendment it would be \$22,014, for a saving of \$4,050.

An Iowan who helped build a successful hardware retailing business wants to sell his half-interest to his partner for \$100,000. His original capital contribution was \$10,000 and the full \$90,000 difference qualifies as a

capital gain. He will have investment income of \$15,000 in the year he sells. He does not qualify for income averaging because of higher income in prior years. His present liability would be \$25,650. His tax under Steiger would be \$20,400, a savings of \$5,250.

It will be noted that none of the above are millionaires. They are ordinary individuals forced by circumstances to take a capital gain in grossly inflated dollars, and who, under present law, would pay a heavy tax on inflation. Obviously, the Congress understands all this better than the President. Backers of the Steiger amendment might be forgiven if they categorized the statements at the Monday press conference as two-bit politics.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL PROBLEM

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the RECORD a series of excerpts from a statement by George B. DeBuchanan who is chief of the Office of Radio Hydrology of the U.S. Geological Survey. These excerpts are from his testimony before the Subcommittee on Nuclear Regulation of the Senate Committee on Public Works on April 4, 1978. In contrast to the confident assertions by Department of Energy officials that the radioactive waste disposal problem is virtually solved, Geological Expert DeBuchanan points to a number of unresolved problems. He notes that there are significant gaps in "current knowledge concern(ing) the chemical interaction between the host media and the (radioactive) waste." He notes that effects which could result in the transportation of radioactive waste away from the storage site "are imperfectly understood (and) are extremely difficult to predict for the intervals of geologic time required for the isolation of the waste." He further notes that one of the basic problems is that in determining whether the site is a sound site, the site itself is necessarily disturbed by drilling. He goes on to mention that earthquakes are a significant risk in radioactive waste disposal. He concludes that adequate methods for doing (risk evaluations for seismic activity) that are meaningful for long periods of time must be developed to avoid siting problems." In other words, we do not now have the tools to determine whether earthquakes are going to exist. He also notes that we are presently unable to predict future climatic changes which could affect the repositories' acceptability. We do not presently have the technology for understanding the impermeability or permeability of low-permeability sites; that models do not exist which are capable of understanding the ground water formations; and that the technology to seal up the drill holes, mine shafts and other excavations necessary to create a repository do not presently exist. In conclusion he notes that—

Radioactive waste problems are dynamic, complex and varied. Therefore, there can be no simple solution to all problems.

This fresh, honest assessment is welcome, especially for its sharp contrast to the glib assertions of DOE scientists that the problems are essentially already solved.

The material follows:

UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL

(By George D. DeBuchanan)

Presently, geologic containment appears to be the most reasonable alternative for radioactive waste isolation if an acceptable geologic repository can be constructed. Because there will always be some residual uncertainty about the basic process of groundwater migration, waste-rock interaction, tectonism, and climatic variability, a conservative approach to the development of these repositories is called for. This approach should involve the development of clear and detailed statements of geologic criteria, the development of adequate techniques for verifying that a particular site meets these criteria, and a plan for long-term monitoring of the repository to ensure that the natural processes that actually occur are those that were anticipated or are at least benign.

HIGH-LEVEL WASTE

One of the greatest gaps in current knowledge concerns the chemical interaction between the host media and the waste. A significant factor, for example, is related to the generation of heat by the wastes. The highest repository temperatures would occur during the first tens or hundreds of years. The release of thermal energy in the geologic media will result in a variety of mechanical, mineralogical, and hydrologic effects that may strongly influence transport of wastes away from a repository. These effects, some of which are imperfectly understood, are extremely difficult to predict for the intervals of geologic time required for the isolation of the wastes.

The problem of characterizing the environment of a potential repository is amplified by the necessity to minimize disruption of the integrity of the geologic containment media by excessive drilling of exploratory holes in the repository area. Geophysical techniques, particularly downhole techniques, need to be improved to adequately explore and describe the volumes or rock needed for a repository.

Most of the repository sites will be located within the stable part of the North American continent. However, because of the hazard of high-level waste, the risk of seismic activity exposing or releasing the wastes must be evaluated for every area considered for siting. Adequate methods for doing evaluations of this type that are meaningful for long time periods must be developed to avoid siting problems.

One of the major questions that will have to be asked about any proposed repository of radioactive waste will be the effect of future climate on the hydrologic regimen and geomorphic setting. Major climatic oscillations, with periods on the order of tens of thousands of years, have been a feature of global climate for at least the past million years and maybe expected to continue. Therefore, existing paleo-climatological data need to be reviewed to judge the likelihood of the wastes being exposed during a future erosion cycle and/or transported as a result of a change in the hydrologic regimen.

In order for a repository to be acceptable, the host rock must be essentially impermeable. This raises the question of how to measure permeability in a drill hole in rocks of very low permeability. The technology for doing this needs to be developed.

Because circulating ground water is a potential mechanism for transporting wastes to the biosphere, the existing flow pattern must be completely known and models for contaminant transport must be developed.

Mathematical models of fluid and solute transport in granular media are available, but flow in fractures, which is the principal avenue in crystalline rocks and shales, is not well understood. In general, further research is needed to develop methods of defining the spatial distribution of hydrologic parameters of rocks. In particular, the occurrence of fractures and the hydraulics of fracture flow should be investigated.

The assessment of containment properties of the rock at any potential high-level waste repository involves considering the potential movement of transuranium elements as well as other radioactive contaminants. There are several aspects of this assessment which need to be fully understood including the following: (1) chemical reactions between the radioactive contaminants, and the natural earth materials through which they are being transported, and (2) the effect of the high-level waste heat on the migration of waste via ground water.

Drill holes, mine shafts, and other rock excavations in the repository are potential pathways that will have to be evaluated in terms of the role they might play in releasing wastes to the biosphere. All repository openings, regardless of depth, will have to be sealed by some, as yet unknown, technology which will in effect return the site, as nearly as possible, to its original condition. In addition, work is needed on the problem of monitoring a repository and the surrounding area for an indefinite time period to detect changes which might signal a loss of containment.

LOW-LEVEL WASTE

The problem of designing engineered remedial action for the waste migration problem at the existing disposal sites is complicated by a lack of information on the detailed hydrology of the area. The selection of future disposal sites, that will be required as the expansion of nuclear energy continues, will be dependent upon detailed knowledge of the hydrology of the proposed area plus a better understanding of several hydrologic factors that are directly related to the migration of waste.

In the solute transport of waste through a porous media, no model has been developed that will predict the concentration of a solute prior to actual introduction of waste into the aquifer. The theory is well described but actual field tests are lacking. Several studies are presently underway which will help resolve the obstacle.

As noted earlier, the flow of solutes through fractured rocks is not yet adequately understood. All verified transport models assume intergranular flow in the aquifer. However, where flow occurs in a fractured media these models are not applicable. Sound theory relating flow in fractured media to that intergranular flow is presently lacking and must be developed before meaningful field tests can be made.

Theory for chemical reactions among water, waste, and earth materials in the unsaturated zone must be developed. Research on this subject is underway at the present time. After development of adequate theoretical concepts, the next step would be field testing and verification of the theory.

For simple chemical reactions of short duration under conditions of rapid flow, hydrologists have traditionally been able to ignore the kinetics of some major reactions. However, for predictions pertaining to radioactive waste disposal systems, involving tens of hundreds of years in systems where flow is slow, these reactions become important. Research is underway in the USGS to quantify them.

Characterizing the chemical and physical forms of plutonium, americium, and neptunium in contaminated natural waters is

critical to the understanding of transport of these elements. In ongoing research in this area there is an attempt to establish the interaction of these elements with solutes in natural waters and to determine their behavior in a ground-water environment where migration is likely to occur. The key questions are: (1) What is the valence of these nuclides, and (2) Do they occur as a colloidal suspension?

Radioactive waste problems are dynamic, complex, and varied. Therefore, there can be no one simple solution to all problems. The different solutions will have to be imaginative, working primarily within the constraints dictated by the hydrogeologic environment at each proposed disposal site. The major factor will be to determine what types of radioactive wastes can be contained by the proposed site for the period of time required to isolate them from the biosphere and hydrosphere. The form and handling of the waste should be tailored to the characteristics of the environment in the light of our understanding of the many natural processes that could affect waste containment. ●

RACING MEN URGE CONGRESS TO END TAX ON WINNINGS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD another excellent newspaper article which describes the devastating impact of section 3402 (q), requiring at-the-source withholding taxes on parimutuel racing winnings, enacted as a provision of the 1976 Tax Reform Act. This article, by Dale Austin, entitled "Racing Men Urge Congress to End Tax on Winnings," appeared in the Baltimore Sun on Friday, June 23.

Mr. Austin's report of the June 22 briefing session on racing should be of particular interest to my colleagues who have racetracks in their districts and have not, as yet, joined in cosponsorship of my bill, H.R. 6066, to repeal section 3402(q). Members in the 32 States where parimutuel wagering has been legalized, who are concerned over losses of revenue to their States, should also find the report enlightening.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, if the facts brought out in Mr. Austin's article are thoughtfully weighed, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the effects of the discriminatory at-the-source withholding provision should be further explored in hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. The text of the article follows:

RACING MEN URGE CONGRESS TO END TAX ON WINNINGS

(By Dale Austin)

WASHINGTON.—The fun of horse racing and the sport's importance as a revenue producer for the states have been imperiled by federal taxes on winnings, according to testimony heard yesterday on Capitol Hill.

In the event of a money crunch that might be triggered by the passage of Proposition 13 in California, racing revenue can loom larger than ever in importance as a tax source.

And the horseplayer always could use an even break.

Federal taxes on racing winnings, a relatively new venture, is being blamed for a 6 percent decline in business at the Meadowlands in New Jersey and a devastating 27 percent loss at the Charles Town (W. Va.) Turf Club.

That was the thrust yesterday of an hour-long presentation by the American Horse Council, which is gathering its forces—in the form of influential congressmen and senators in hopes of repealing a 13-month-old law that racetrack operators have determined is dangerous to their health.

The council was left at the gate last year when a strange and seemingly whimsical law slipped through along the rail and forced track owners to withhold 20 percent of winnings over \$1,000 provided the odds were at least 300 to 1.

Racing men have been unable to determine just why the law was passed. It apparently was aimed at taking the sting out of another tax law passed in 1964 that was thrust upon them just as mysteriously.

That law, which created Internal Revenue Service Form 1099, ordered tracks to report the identity of persons cashing bets at odds of 300 to 1 or higher. The law was a favorite project of the late Senator Robert Kennedy (D., N.Y.) back in the days when he battled the racketeers as the counsel of a Senate committee.

Testimony yesterday showed that many Form 1099 tax reports had been presented with phony identification and further, that when the IRS got them, it never bothered to check them against the horseplayers' tax forms, anyway.

"The United States is the only nation on earth to tax gambling winnings," said Jack Krumpe, president of Meadowlands. "The bettor already has paid a tax in order to make a wager and now he has to pay again. He pays going in and going out."

Krumpe and several others testified in a small room of the Capitol Building, secluded from the eyes of visitors walking a few feet away, gawking at the statues in the rotunda.

The object was to influence congressmen who might be swayed into co-sponsoring a tax-killing bill introduced by Representative James Florio (D., N.J.), who lives in the Camden area near Garden State Park.

A few congressmen were there, but the majority of the 34 guests were congressional aides, sent to take notes and report their views to the bosses.

For the presentation, there was little technical talk. It was aimed more at explaining how the average person would be affected.

Tad Davis, counsel for the Horse Council, said that the current law would "take all the fun out of going to the track. You would have to record all your bets—your wins and your losses [to avoid suffering unfair taxation]."

"The law was designed to take 20 per cent out of the winnings. If a person wants to offset that tax by itemizing his losses, then he must give up the standard deduction, which statistics say most Americans take."

Bill MacDonald, general manager of Charles Town and Shenandoah Downs tracks, described the impact in the West Virginia panhandle as "devastating."

He said, "We pioneered exotic betting, the kind that is most affected by this tax, in 1959 and we depend on it for much of our business. I'm almost sorry we started it, considering the situation now."

MacDonald noted that in many states, exotic bets such as the triple, or trizacta, are taxed as much as 25 per cent by the state.

"Add to that, 20 per cent by the IRS," he said, "and you see that the winner only gets 55 per cent of the money he should have gotten."

Jim Ritchie, who headed a federal gambling study four years ago, pointed out the natural tendency of a person to avoid taxation by calling his bookie and settling at the end of the week.

"There's not much of a danger of getting caught," he explained. "In a five-year study of New York State, 20,000 persons were arrested on gambling charges. Of that number, 1,500 were indicted and 100 were convicted. Nine went to jail."

BLIGHT OF THE TROPICS

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, last week Newsweek magazine carried an excellent article on the toll which tropical diseases inflict on people living in the developing nations. For example, it pointed out that malaria strikes 150 million people each year and kills more than 1 million children in Africa alone. Another 300 million people are disfigured or blinded by filariasis.

I mention these figures because the House will soon be asked to vote upon the foreign assistance appropriations bill. The bill recommends an appropriation of \$135 million in fiscal year 1979 for health and health-related development activities to be funded through the Agency for International Development. It also includes funding for the international financial institutions which are also deeply involved in funding health projects.

I hope that my colleagues will take this opportunity to review the Newsweek article which I am including in the RECORD at this point. I think that it provides a very effective answer to those who suggest that we are spending too much on foreign assistance.

The article follows:

BLIGHT OF THE TROPICS

(If you happen to be born and grow up in rural Africa you are liable to harbor four or more disease-producing organisms simultaneously. In your village every child at times suffers the paroxysms of malarial fever and you and your wife will mourn the death of one or two children from this disease. The snails in your village pond carry schistosomiasis and you do not consider it unusual when your children pass blood in their urine. You take for granted the disfigured faces and fingerless hands of the beggars in the village street suffering from leprosy. If you live near a river where black flies breed, one in ten of your friends and neighbors will be blind.)

Even this chilling picture, presented by Dr. David Rowe of the World Health Organization, fails to suggest the full magnitude of the suffering caused by tropical diseases in vast regions of the world. Americans reckon the toll of their worst afflictions—heart attacks, cancer and strokes—in the thousands. But the people of Africa, Asia and South America count their dead and disabled by the millions. "More people suffer and die from tropical diseases than all other diseases combined," says Dr. Ben Kean of New York's Cornell University Medical Center.

Malaria, the worst of the lot by far, strikes 150 million people each year and kills more than 1 million children in Africa alone. At

least 200 million are infected by schistosomiasis, or snail fever. The parasitic worms of filariasis disfigure or blind almost 300 million.

Tropical diseases work hand in hand with poverty and malnutrition, trapping their victims in a cycle of misery. Those who are sick can't till the soil or fish or hunt. Consequently, they and their children starve, lose their resistance and fall prey to yet other diseases. "The synergism between malnutrition and infection is the most important cause of death," says Dr. Carl Taylor of Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

In the era of the jumbo jet, Americans are hardly invulnerable to tropical infections. Of the 406 cases of malaria reported in the U.S. in 1976, all but four involved travelers who had contracted the disease abroad. Because of the speed of jet travel, moreover, a tourist may pick up an infection during his stay and return to the U.S. before the symptoms appear. At that point, his doctor may well misdiagnose the case because these diseases are so rare in industrial countries. The fever and chills of malaria can be confused with flu, and amebiasis, a parasitic intestinal disease, can be mistakenly diagnosed as ulcerative colitis. "There may be only ten doctors in the U.S. who are truly qualified to thoroughly handle parasitic diseases," says Kean.

Malaria is the most important threat, and many experts complain that physicians and travel agents are lax about warning tourists to take antimalarial medication. In one recent survey, it was found that only 15 per cent of American and Canadian travelers going to Belize in Central America had taken appropriate precautions against the disease. "The rest," says Dr. Myron G. Schultz of the Federal Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, "were playing Russian roulette with their lives."

Considering the enormous toll taken by tropical diseases, many medical experts are critical of the modest role the U.S. has played in stamping them out. Interest in tropical medicine runs high in wartime, when American troops may be exposed to the illnesses, but wanes rapidly when peace returns. "The U.S. is like an ostrich with its head in the sand when it comes to the world health community," says Prof. James Jensen of New York's Rockefeller University. "We only relate to our own problems." More than \$800 million is now spent for cancer research each year, but only \$40 million for tropical diseases.

Last month, Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Joseph A. Califano announced a pledge of \$20 million in U.S. funds over the next five years toward a major attack on tropical diseases now being mounted by the World Health Organization. The WHO program, expected to last for twenty years, has set its sights on six of the worst tropical afflictions:

MALARIA

It is caused by the *Plasmodium* parasite and transmitted to humans by the female *Anopheles* mosquito. The parasites multiply in the liver and then invade red blood cells, producing fever, chills, headache and weakness. Most forms of *Plasmodia* produce a long-term chronic illness, with recurrent attacks. But one species, *falciparum*, causes a single acute attack that can be fatal in 10 per cent of cases. Chloroquine is the standard drug for the treatment and prevention of the disease. However, it is impractical for the eradication of malaria because residents in endemic areas would have to take it continuously over their lifetimes. WHO made great strides in reducing malaria in the 1950s by the widespread eradication of mosquitoes with DDT. But the disease has made a frightening resurgence in recent years because mosquitoes in many areas develop a

resistance to the insecticide and the parasites acquire an immunity to chloroquine. An estimated 2 billion people now reside in malaria-infested regions, and one-fourth of the adult population of Africa suffers recurrent bouts of the disease.

SCHISTOSOMIASIS

An insidiously debilitating disease, this is caused by the *Schistosoma* flatworm and carried by certain species of freshwater snails. The snails release the flatworm larvae into rivers and ponds. When a human enters the water, the larvae penetrate the skin and develop into mature worms that lay thousands of eggs in such sites as the liver, bladder and intestines. The eggs produce an immune reaction which in severe cases can cause scarring of tissues that in turn leads to swelling of the liver and spleen and chronic heart disease. In areas of poor sanitation, flatworm eggs excreted by the victims find their way into water supplies where they start the cycle of infection anew. Ironically, irrigation projects, such as the construction of the Aswan Dam in Egypt, have increased the spread of schistosomiasis. Attempts to destroy *Schistosoma*-bearing snails with chemicals have proved largely unsuccessful. A drug, hycanthon, is considered promising by many experts because a single dose seems to destroy virtually all the worms. But some specialists fear that it may cause cancer.

TRYPANOSOMIASIS

One form of the *Trypanosoma* parasite causes the familiar African "sleeping sickness," while another causes Chagas' disease in South America. African trypanosomiasis is transmitted by the tsetse fly. In West Africa, the chronic form of the disease produces lethargy, loss of appetite and eventually coma. An acute form, most prevalent in East Africa, is usually fatal within a few weeks if it goes untreated. The drugs available to treat it are all unfortunately toxic to some degree. The best way to control the disease is to kill the tsetse flies with insecticides and clear away vegetation that has become infested with them.

Chagas' disease—which affects 10 million—is transmitted by the "kissing bug," so named because it tends to bite its victim on the corner of the mouth while they lie asleep. The disease begins with fever and malaise, subsides after several weeks and then flares up years later, after lurking parasites have damaged the intestinal tract and heart muscle. Drugs such as nifurtimox and nitroimidazole have been tested but seem impractical because they must be taken over long periods.

LEISHMANIASIS

A protozoal infection carried by sand flies, this usually causes ulcers and sores that may be grossly disfiguring. The disease is prevalent throughout the tropic, and its victims number in the millions. In one of the worst forms, called kala azar, the parasites invade the bone marrow, liver and lymph nodes. Without treatment it is usually fatal within two years. Again, existing drugs are unsatisfactory for dealing with large numbers of victims, because they must be given for long periods of time—sometimes intravenously—and are toxic.

FILARIASIS

This is caused by several species of parasitic worms that are carried by insects. The best-known form of the disease is elephantiasis, an often grotesque swelling and inflammation of the arms, legs and genitals caused by adult worms infiltrating a human's lymph nodes. An equally serious type is onchocerciasis, or liver blindness, caused by a worm whose larvae are transmitted by female black flies. The worms produce thousands of larvae that invade the eyes, causing gradual loss of vision. Black flies breed in fast-flowing streams, and in some tropical

African villages as many as 40 percent of men who fish or farm are blind as a result of filariasis. Because the flies can travel 180 miles a day, spread of the disease is virtually impossible to control. A drug, diethyl-carbamazine, destroys the worm larvae but causes intestinal side effects. However, Dr. Maurice Langham of Johns Hopkins has developed an ointment form that may simplify the treatment of river blindness and also act as a preventive.

LEPROSY

The ancient Biblical scourge is thought to be caused by a bacillus spread from person to person through years of close contact. Eleven million, mainly in Africa, have the disease. It is primarily a disease of the skin and peripheral nerves which can lead to paralysis and mutilation of the extremities, such as the loss of the nose or fingers. A drug called dapsone helps control the disease and is now being tested in areas of high prevalence as a means of prevention. But it may take three years or more for the drugs to check the illness, and doctors have recently reported an increasing number of cases that have become resistant to dapsone, usually because the patients didn't take enough of the drug. Some experts regard leprosy as more of a social problem than a tropical disease, because its victims are treated as pariahs even though they pose practically no threat to others.

Sanitation: Many experts in tropical medicine believe diarrheal illnesses—caused by a variety of intestinal germs and parasites—should be added to WHO's list. Each year, forms of diarrhea kill 150,000 people in Latin America alone, notes Kean, and in some countries they are the leading cause of death. For the most part, the problem is due to poor sanitation and can be quickly brought under control by improved sewage disposal. Tetanus in the newborn, contracted from contaminated knives used to sever the umbilical cord, is yet another major problem in Africa. It could be easily eliminated by the training of midwives.

One of the major research efforts being mounted against parasitic diseases is the development of vaccines. The work has gone slowly, however, because of the complexity of the life cycles of the organisms responsible. An important step toward an anti-malaria vaccine has been made by Profs. Jensen and William Trager of New York's Rockefeller University: They have devised a way to grow the "merozoite" stage of the *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite in the laboratory. This is the stage that develops in the human red blood cells, and now Dr. Sydney Cohen of London's Guy's Hospital is using these cultured merozoites to develop a vaccine against them.

Mutant Flies: Since many insecticides are no longer effective, researchers are devising some novel ways to eliminate the carriers of parasites. A team of entomologists at the University of California has rendered some mosquitoes immune to Western equine encephalitis viruses by altering their genes with X-rays. They hope that the mutant genes can be passed on to succeeding generations, establishing, in effect, a new species that would be unable to carry the disease. If the strategy works with this nontropical illness, the same principle could be applied to the insects that transmit malaria, sleeping sickness and other parasitic diseases.

But such sophisticated disease-fighting measures won't be available for years—if ever. In the meantime, the war against tropical diseases will have to be waged with the tried-and-true methods of improved sanitation and better living conditions. By the simple expedient of building showers and community swimming pools on the Caribbean island of St. Lucia, a team funded largely by the Rockefeller Foundation greatly reduced the population's exposure to snails—and the risk of schistosomiasis. ●

DILEMMAS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN INTERNATIONAL AIR COMMERCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the National Aviation Club on Thursday, June 22, Mr. Mordechai Ben Ari, Executive Chairman of the Board of El Al Israel Airlines, spoke on "Dilemmas and Opportunities in International Air Commerce." Mr. Ben Ari's speech deals with a number of pertinent issues and includes his proposals for international freedom of the skies, and for measures against air terrorism. I know that Mr. Ben Ari's remarks will be of interest to my colleagues since we in the Congress are heavily involved in these issues.

REMARKS OF MORDECHAI BEN ARI

President Reed, Honored Guests, Friends: At the outset, let me express my appreciation to the National Aviation Club for providing me with the forum for the ideas and views I intend to advance here, today. It was suggested that the theme of my talks should cover the subject of "dilemmas and opportunities in International Aviation in the Eighties" and that I should talk no more than 20 minutes.

When I think about the problems of international aviation, a limit of 20 minutes poses a dilemma, but I welcome the opportunities such a broad subject offers me to talk about whatever is on my mind.

We are, furthermore, struggling with the question of regulation or, as the case may be, deregulation. Is there too much of one or the other? Not enough? Should or can it be partial or total?

And, last but by any means not least, there remains the ever-present threat of terrorism in the air and on the ground, affecting our passengers, our pocket books and our peace of mind.

As far as the economy of international civil air transportation is concerned, it would take a dramatic technological breakthrough to give us an aircraft of greatly reduced production and operating costs. To my knowledge no such development is on the drawing board at the present time. In view of the fact that the future of International Civil Aviation seems to lie in mass transportation or the pleasure-motivated traveller at low fares, the solution to the economic problems of the airlines, especially on intercontinental routes, seems to point to a basic change in the service concept on scheduled carriers.

Let me be specific: the present first and economy class would have to be abolished. In their place we would introduce a three-tier service concept. This would consist of a deluxe class, superior to the current first class service standards; the current first class would become the business class, based on the 34" pitch seating configuration with service features identical to those of the present first class service. We would offer a third class service at drastically reduced fares, with a 32" pitch seating configuration, with no-frill, no free food service, which we might call something like the "Holiday Class".

A 747 aircraft, offering all three categories of service, can be equipped with 500 seats or more, resulting in per-unit cost savings of between twenty to thirty-three per cent, depending on the "Mix" of classes in the aircraft.

The concept of Holiday Class, which I first proposed five years ago, has been endorsed

by the Annual General Meeting of IATA at Madrid last October, upon recommendation of IATA's Director General, Mr. Knut Hammerskjold. It had been partly implemented a month before by the introduction of Laker's "Sky Train".

I believe that far-reaching changes of this kind will be introduced under different names and in different variations, on most intercontinental routes of the world and especially on the North Atlantic.

Many of these changes will undoubtedly come as a result of the growing desire for deregulation by domestic as well as international carriers. Chairman Kahn of the CAB of the United States Government has shown great courage and leadership in this regard and deserves our praise and gratitude. It now remains for the international carriers to follow suit.

If all this suggests that the time has come to dispense with IATA, this conclusion would be entirely wrong. IATA has become a world-wide international system of air transportation making it possible for every passenger, freight forwarder or postal authority to reach any point in the world on a single ticket or bill of lading or postal document.

This system does not represent merely a collection of independent competing airlines. In its role as a world-wide transportation system, the international air transport industry and its well being have become a matter of public as well as national and international interest and concern.

Under the wise and skillful stewardship of Knut Hammerskjold this international organization of airlines has gained remarkable achievements to its credit and the airlines could not exist without it.

IATA is much like a woman. It may be difficult to live with but it is essential to the survival of orderly world air commerce.

Think what aviation would be like if every airline issued a different type of ticket and observed sets of rules for the transport of passengers or freight!

We are faced with two clear cut alternatives, in response to the requirements for drastic changes in civil aviation in the Eighties from which the public as well as the airlines would benefit: we could opt for complete regulation on traffic rights, fares and rates on a bilateral or multilateral basis. This would, inevitably, lead to the complete elimination of charter flights on intercontinental routes. The alternative would be to create a deregulatory environment of "Open Skies" with unlimited freedom of competition, without government interference. Indeed, complete freedom of the air would mean that every airline can fly from and between any place in the world it chooses, without restriction and with the right to change any fare as it deems fit. In other words, the principle of Freedom of the Air would be identical to the principle of the Freedom of the Seas.

I firmly believe that adherence to this principle of "Open Skies" or Freedom of the Skies when adopted by nations and their airlines would constitute a revolutionary step toward assuring the long-range growth and development of a healthy and dynamic international air transport system based on the principles of free competition as the best safeguard of the interests of the consumer.

If this seems like a radical, perhaps too drastic, departure from the system adhered to now by the international airlines, I think it is high time we realized that our industry has reached maturity and that we can well afford to live in an environment of free competition and enterprise. Moreover, it is our obligation to ourselves and to the public we serve, to be bold enough and promote actively the adoption by governments of a policy of complete freedom of the air.

In this context I strongly support the far-reaching structural changes in the statutes of IATA, proposed by the executive commit-

tee of that organization. They would comprise a major step towards the goal of complete freedom of the air in a healthy worldwide aviation system.

Finally, let me say a few words about the clear and present danger of the problem of terrorism. If governments and airlines do not show greater determination to deal with the armed interference with commercial airliners and their passengers, this may pose a threat to the very existence of civil air transport.

Only a policy of "active defense" will deal effectively with this threat. I have submitted detailed proposals on this subject to IATA.

The same century, which has brought us intercontinental flight and has enabled us to leap forward into space has made possible the global brotherhood of Man and has facilitated human and commercial relationships but has also placed these treasured achievements of our civilization in mortal danger. It will be up to us to show our firm resolve that we are ready to defend them through affirmative action and without fear or hesitation.

Thank you very much. ●

**REV. JOHN A. WARD RETIRES
AFTER 46 YEARS OF SERVICE**

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my distinguished colleagues that on July 1, the Reverend John A. Ward of the parish of St. Jane de Chantal will retire from that church after serving as its pastor for 24 years. An ordained priest for the past 46 years, Father Ward has carried out his duties in exemplary fashion and has been commended for his efforts by his parishioners and many others who have come to know and love him.

John A. Ward was born in Chicago on August 2, 1908 to Patrick and Jane Ward, themselves natives of County Derry, Ireland. After attending Chicago's Holy Angels School, Father Ward entered Quigley Preparatory Seminary in 1921, attained academic honors, and graduated in 1926. That year, he entered the major seminary of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Mundelein, Ill., where he completed his philosophical and theological studies and ordained a priest on April 2, 1932 by the late George Cardinal Mundelein. Father Ward, who was the youngest member of his class, then celebrated his first Mass on April 3, 1932, at St. Bernard's Roman Catholic Church, his parish in Chicago.

Father Ward's 46-year theological career has included assignments at a variety of church parishes in the Chicago area, all of which have benefited immensely from his enthusiastic devotion to service. Reverend Ward's first assignment was to St. Cecelia's parish in south Chicago, where he served until 1933. He then served as associate pastor to St. James parish in Highwood, Ill. until 1945. Following St. James, Reverend Ward spent a year in north Chicago at Sebastian's before being transferred to St.

Mel's parish, then known as the largest parish in the United States. Father Ward remained at St. Mel's until 1950 when he left to serve at St. Richard's in Chicago's south side.

After leaving St. Richard's in 1954, the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch gave Father Ward the important responsibility of forming a new parish in the vicinity of 53d Street and McVicker Avenue in Chicago. Reverend Ward, as the founding pastor of the new parish, suggested that the new church bear the name of St. Jane de Chantal, after the French saint who founded the Visitation Order of Sisters. Cardinal Stritch concurred and Father Ward's suggestion was adopted.

Today, 24 years later, the parish of St. Jane de Chantal stands as an impressive monument to the priestly labors of Father Ward. The parish buildings include a church of beauty and striking design, a school which has residential facilities for the Dominican Sisters of the Province of Columbus, Ohio who teach there, a combination gymnasium and social center, and the parish rectory. These buildings extend for the greater part of a square block in a quiet residential area in southwest Chicago. Its school has provided excellent educations for thousands of boys and girls of the parish.

On April 2 of this year, the parishioners of St. Jane de Chantal, together with former associate pastors who had served with Father Ward, the sisters of the school, lay teachers, and Father Ward's family and friends celebrated a special Mass of Thanksgiving on the happy occasion of the 46th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Hundreds of the members of the parish and other friends, including Mayor and Mrs. Bilandic of Chicago, were present at the mass and reception.

Mr. Speaker, Father Ward recently announced that he has advised John Cardinal Cody of his intention to retire on July 1, 1978. So in honor of Reverend Ward's devoted service, a testimonial dinner and awards ceremony has been scheduled for June 30 at the Mayfield Banquet Hall in Chicago, of which I will have the pleasure of attending. Among others to be present will be Father Ward's brother, Illinois Supreme Court Chief Justice, Daniel P. Ward.

Therefore, on this happy occasion, I would like to join with the parishioners of St. Jane de Chantal in showing the deepest appreciation of this man's tireless efforts and dedicated service. The inspiration he instilled will continue to thrive in the hearts and minds of those whose lives he touched so dearly. ●

**GUN CONTROL—NECESSARY ACT
OF A DICTATOR**

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised to hear that Idi Amin, the

bloody dictator of Uganda, recently ordered all civilians to turn in the firearms to army headquarters. The right of private citizens to keep and bear arms, after all, is a right that belongs only to free men and women.

Dictators cannot allow guns to remain in the hands of the people. The risk is too great. A dictator must control all firearms if he is to keep himself in power.

The right of gun ownership is a measure of our freedom and a right incompatible with totalitarian forms of government. We must never allow this important freedom to be taken away from us.

Following is an article on the anti-firearms move in Uganda which appeared in Gun Week.

GUN CONTROL IN UGANDA

On April 28 President Idi Amin of Uganda ordered civilians to immediately surrender all firearms. He said that he personally was taking direct charge of the police and prison services.

Amin's number one hit man, Brig. Isaac Malyamungu, warned a gathering of 10,000 Ugandans that numerous suspects had been arrested for subversive activities (such as owning firearms) and were being interrogated. ●

**PROPOSITION 13: THE GUPPY-LAW
FACTOR**

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note today that the taxpayers of this country through increasing discontent with high taxes, are increasingly telling their representatives that they want less money spent by Government, they want less dominance of Government in their lives and they want to spend more of their money themselves. Too often in the past Congress, responding to needs, real and imagined have proposed setting up boards and commissions as a solution. As Groucho Marx said:

Politics is the art of looking for trouble, finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and applying the wrong remedies.

This article is a good satire of how spending programs are generated, and where the money keeps going. It was published in the Washington Post today.

PROPOSITION 13: THE GUPPY-LAW FACTOR

(By Fred Reed)

Probably the most tortured cry, the most entrail-wrenching plaint, and certainly the most delectable, is the shrill scream of a bureaucrat discovering that it is not his money. It is a sound to freeze one's very liver. Almost as hideous is the gasp of a taxpayer pondering how his money is spent. The two bid fair to rattle windowpanes in harrowing cacophony if states continue to vote constitutional limits to taxation. They may. By all appearances, California's Proposition 13 could have many ravenous children.

Commentators who specialize in misunderstanding politics, as distinct from misunderstanding other things, see the Proposition 13 battle as a liberal-versus-conservative dispute—the right raising its fanged head. It fig-

ures. The tendency to reduce questions to the irrelevant is overwhelming. Besides, as conservatives delight in saying, the best way to weary a liberal of liberalism is to make him pay for enough of it. But California is a liberal state. The rebellion is actually a taxpayers' insurrection against government in general—much more interesting.

The issue, really, is taxation without representation. Government is so complex, so tailored to the wily and knowledgeable, so many steps removed from the will of the people, that the public has little voice in spending. In a sort of camouflaged disenfranchisement, the electorate retains its vote while losing its shirt—the handiest advance in politics since the stuffed ballot box.

Of the techniques used to thwart representation, the most devastating is the guppy law—i.e., that when outrageous expenditures are divided finely enough, the public will not have enough stake in any one expenditure to squelch it.

Typically, a special interest stands to gain greatly from favorable legislation, and works energetically for it. For example, requiring a steamfitter's presence at the construction of federal sidewalks benefits the steamfitters enormously. Yet it costs the citizen only a few cents a day in taxes. Fat campaign contributions from the steamfitters (never say bribes) give the legislature reason to pass the bill. A fiscal guppy is born, nibbling its few pennies a day (not worth opposing). Enough guppies can eat a treasury. The citizen is not quite represented.

A tactic of the politically crafty is to phrase questions in terms of frightful virtue. "What? You oppose a mere \$40-million subsidy of codpiece manufacture by the Nez Percé? So! You are against Indians . . ." The thudding opprobrium of anti-Indianism outweighs the \$40-million guppy bite in the legislator's eyes. The public, probably sympathetic to Indians but transcendently uninterested in codpieces, has no real say. Diffuse public irritation does not equal the codpiece lobby's concentrated clout.

A favored technique here in Washington is the fossil agency. Suppose that 3,000 children fall from skateboards this year and land on their heads. Outrage arises. Sen. Thrust-factor rises to his feet and introduces a bill to create a Skateboard Regulatory Commission with a budget of \$5 million. Everyone applauds: No one can favor concussions for 11-year-olds, unless he has one.

Next year the agency, by now forgotten but firmly encysted in the federal block-houses of Southwest Washington, wants \$50 million. Not for anything, just \$50 million. The parent agency, always hungry for a snack, supports the request.

The country may no longer give the faintest damn about skateboard, but it has a skateboard commission for eternity.

Washington is full of such fossil agencies, embodied in ghastly acronyms: powdered English for minds traveling light. We have OSHA, CPSC and endless others, gnawing the bones of their appointed discontents and spending money.

The bureaucrats who inhabit the acronyms may or may not believe that they are doing a service beyond drawing their paychecks, but they will fight like rabid badgers to keep their jobs. Consequently the federal government simply prints money to pay them. When engaged in by private enterprise, this is called counterfeiting. The states lack this useful resource, but make do by raising the assessed value of property, and hence their revenues. Both approaches keep the electorate the vital arm's length from the reins—not quite represented.

But then the taxpayer realizes he is paying for institutionalized featherbedding government being a de facto union and many of

its activities serving only to employ government workers. He is paying for OSHA, which is a practical joke raised to godhead, and for the National Endowment for the Humanities, which keeps sociologists from being obviously unoccupied, and for CPSC which, practically speaking, consists of a budget and a flackery. And so on, and on. And he can't help it.

He can't decide how his money is spent, but he can decide not to spend it at all—and that is what Proposition 13 is all about. ●

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REPROCESS SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation strives to free itself from an ever increasing dependence on foreign petroleum sources, expanded use of nuclear power will be a major vehicle to reduce that dependence. In the next decade, my own State of South Carolina will become reliant on nuclear power plants for more than 50 percent of its energy.

Not only can nuclear energy become an increasingly important source of electrical energy, but reports on the operation of nuclear reactors in recent years have shown that these plants have saved electric ratepayers billions of dollars over comparable fossil fuel costs. Several utilities have experienced annual savings of \$50 to \$80 million per reactor per year.

Projected increases in nuclear power plant capacity can only occur, however, if the United States move expeditiously to resolve the handling of spent nuclear fuel from reactors and the subsequent storage of radioactive waste materials in a form that protects the public and the environment.

In my State of South Carolina, we have at hand a solution to both questions. I am talking about the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant, located near Barnwell, S.C.

The Barnwell facility is a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant, the only one in the United States available to meet civilian nuclear power needs. Reprocessing is essentially a complex chemical process whereby spent fuel rods from nuclear reactors are chopped up, processed chemically, and three liquid streams—uranium, plutonium, and waste—evolve. The liquid uranium is usually converted to uranium hexafluoride (UF₆), a gaseous form which is suitable for reuse by the Government-owned uranium enrichment facilities. The liquid waste stream can be solidified safely and packaged for ultimate storage. The plutonium stream can be solidified and recycled in today's light-water reactors and tomorrow's breeder reactors for fuel.

The economic savings we could gain from reprocessing are staggering. For example:

Each spent fuel assembly removed from a conventional light-water reactor

contains an amount of unburned uranium and plutonium that, if reprocessed and recycled back into fresh fuel, would provide the energy-equivalent of about 80,000 barrels of oil. At \$12 per barrel, that makes each spent fuel assembly "worth" approximately \$1 million.

Every nuclear reactor discharges about 70 spent fuel assemblies per year, with a total energy content equivalent to approximately 6 million barrels of oil.

The spent fuel from four reactors, if reprocessed and recycled, would provide sufficient fuel to meet the needs of a fifth reactor.

A reprocessing plant such as that which has been built at Barnwell can handle the spent fuel discharged from 50 reactors per year, and therefore could provide the equivalent of about 300 million barrels of oil per year in the form of fresh nuclear fuel.

Over the long term, our savings would be:

The oil equivalent in fresh fuel produced by one reprocessing plant through the year 2000 would save \$40 billion on our balance of payments—which otherwise would be spent for imported oil.

The energy content in all spent U.S. fuel through the year 2000 will be equivalent to 19 billion barrels of oil, worth more than \$300 billion at a price of \$16/barrel.

The total energy content of the free world's spent fuel will be about 97 billion barrels of oil by the year 2000, equal to six times the free world's oil production in 1975.

In spite of the very significant potential contributions to our national energy situation, the Barnwell plant cannot operate because President Carter has indefinitely deferred commercial reprocessing in the United States. Why? The primary reason is the President's desire to control nuclear weapons proliferation, a goal which we all support. Yet, other nations are moving ahead full speed to develop nuclear fuel reprocessing capability while we stand on the sidelines and Barnwell stands idle. President Carter's call for an international pause in the development of nuclear fuel reprocessing while adequate safeguards are put in place worldwide has gone unheeded. The reason is simple. Other nations such as Japan are not endowed with the energy resources as the United States is and they simply must reprocess at the earliest date. A pause could mean economic disaster. Other nations simply cannot throw away the vast energy contained in spent fuel, as President Carter has proposed as a deterrent to nuclear proliferation.

Congress has responded to this situation under the leadership of our colleagues WALTER FLOWERS and TOM BEVILL to keep Barnwell alive in a research and development mode in the hopes that the United States can keep the reprocessing option open. A fiscal year 1978 research and development program is now underway at Barnwell to evaluate more proliferation-resistant nuclear fuel cycles and to improve nuclear facility safeguards.

I am happy to say that Congress is also supporting a fiscal year 1979 program at Barnwell. Continuing support for Government supported programs at Barnwell has been forthcoming, I believe, for two major reasons. First, as I already mentioned, other nations are moving ahead on reprocessing, irrespective of the U.S. position of indefinite deferral. The majority of the Members of Congress continue to believe that the United States needs to have some recognizable activity in reprocessing to keep abreast of foreign reprocessing developments. Second, there is great concern in Congress over the "throwaway" fuel cycle for resource conservation, proliferation, and political reasons. Congress clearly views funding of Barnwell programs as a means of keeping the nuclear fuel reprocessing option open.

The owners of Barnwell, Allied-General Nuclear Services (AGNS), have stated publicly its purpose in pursuing further Federal funding. The Department of Energy (DOE), as part of the fiscal year 1978 program, studied optional uses of Barnwell and reported to Congress that no decisions could be made in the fate of the facility until completion of the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE), a 40-nation, 2-year study of proliferation-resistant nuclear fuel cycles. AGNS believes, therefore, that it makes sense to keep Barnwell alive in a R. & D. mode until the INFCE is completed to see if some use might be made of the facility.

AGNS continues to believe that the Government may need to use Barnwell for a variety of reasons, including verification of promising proliferation-resistant fuel cycles, reprocessing of Government spent nuclear fuels or even spent fuel storage on a limited basis to meet near-term needs.

One of the largest obstacles in achieving our national need to increase nuclear capacity is the backlog of spent fuel at operating reactors and the uncertainty in the utility industry over how the Government will address all of the problems facing the "backend" of the nuclear fuel cycle in a timely fashion.

If we look closely at each option, reprocessing or throwing spent fuel away, the choice seems clear. We must move ahead on nuclear fuel reprocessing. Lack of needed decisions will be disastrous. Under a worse case situation, reactors could be forced to shut down because of filled on-site storage basins while we attempt to resolve national policy.

The fact that a fuel resource equivalent to billions of barrels of oil might be permanently lost through a "throwaway" fuel cycle is going against our national commitment to conserve all fuel resources. The President needs to recognize this and modify his policy of indefinite deferral of reprocessing at the earliest date.

Wise economic and natural resource planning dictates that we move ahead to commit to nuclear fuel reprocessing as a means of insuring that today's reactors can continue to operate and tomorrow's reactors will have the fuel resources available to meet the Nation's needs. ●

THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF DETERIORATED BUILDINGS AND COMMUNITIES

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12433, a bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and H.R. 12536, a bill to increase appropriations ceilings, development ceilings, land acquisition, and boundary changes in certain Federal park and recreation areas, and for other purposes, are both key legislative efforts to restore and revitalize America's hard pressed urban areas. In addressing this growing urban problem these bills also provide intrinsic and economic boosts to these deteriorated communities. And, most importantly, represent an effort to capitalize on the empirical economic advantage of urban preservation and revitalization.

The recent history of America's urban areas is not bright. A massive exodus of businesses and neighborhoods, deteriorating health and safety conditions, abandonment of buildings by landlords, rising rental costs, high unemployment, rising crime, arson, and declining tax bases are all the failure of local, State, and Federal governments in caring for their urban communities. The decline in the once elite inner city areas has led to the trapping of poor and ethnic minorities. This pattern demonstrates an immediate need for renewal and revitalization. The difficulties suffered by urban areas are a burden on all of America, and represent a challenge to government's sensibility and economic know-how.

In addition to increasing the battle against urban decline, H.R. 12433, and H.R. 12536 are far more sound than most previous urban legislation because many of the current problems are a product of Federal legislation, policies, and programs. And, because previous Federal legislation contributed to the flight from urban areas to the suburbs, these bills also represent a sensible shift in urban policy.

Federal laws have encouraged the urban decline by presenting more attractive tax incentives for suburban ownership. Far more attractive than those available for urban renewal. Furthermore, the failure of the past "urban removal" policy was that it augmented little or no neighborhood preservation or housing rehabilitation. In fact, only 1.5 percent of FHA's many insurance and subsidy programs have been used for rehabilitation, totaling 134,000 units in 40 years. The only housing program aimed specifically at rehabilitation, section 312, has been used to improve just 60,000 to 80,000 units in its 12-year history. The subsequent housing and community development act of 1974 first appeared to be the answer, but it too has failed to address itself to urban revitalization needs. Only 13.7 percent of community development block grants have been expended. This figure is particularly inadequate when it is currently es-

timated that well over 4.8 million houses need help.

The inefficiency of the block grant program has been facilitated particularly at the State and local level. Cities have simply been too slow in spending obligated funds on rehabilitation. In New York, for example, 63 percent of all moneys allocated for housing rehabilitation from 1955 to 1977 still remains unspent. In Chicago, only 11 percent of its first and second year goals of 2,960 units of housing rehabilitation have been accomplished. In Wilmington, Del., only 2 percent of the funds allocated for rehabilitation was spent as of June 1977. In Oklahoma City, Okla., none of its 1975 grant of \$8,183,000 has been disbursed for rehabilitation. Statistics from virtually every major city in the country illustrate this same fundamental failure of State and local governments to address seriously the need and value of restoring America's urban communities.

In particular, H.R. 12433, the Housing and Community Development Act amendments, addresses the greatest failure of America's urban policy, displacement. Section 101 of H.R. 12433 amends this difficulty by providing loans to applicants in principally low- and moderate-income persons who own the property being rehabilitated, and who will occupy the said unit at the completion of the rehabilitation.

With this background in mind, H.R. 12433, and H.R. 12536 become increasingly attractive. Both bills adopt a philosophy of revitalization and understand the importance of uplifting the living conditions of an area without destroying its architectural style and heritage. These bills attempt to restore the resources we already have without yielding to the capital intensive downtown apartment complexes and parking garages.

Furthermore, urban renewal projects are a more effective means of bettering the hard-pressed communities' economy. These renewal projects, are as high as 75 percent labor intensive—compared with 50 percent for new construction projects—and create two to five times as many jobs as new construction for a given expenditure of money. This, according to testimony of the General Services Administration, is enhanced by the fact that the highest concentration of the structurally unemployed tend to reside in those areas with the highest concentration of old structures.

Thomas D. Bever, economist for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, clearly defines several additional economic benefits of urban revitalization:

EMPLOYMENT

Urban renewal projects provide a training ground for structurally unemployed. In Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant area previous long-term unemployed individuals were taught welding, masonry, and painting skills. Furthermore, Bever estimates that it is more costly to fund 60 people on welfare than it is to employ the same 60 people in jobs related to renewal and preservation.

PRIVATE SECTOR STIMULATION

The rehabilitation and adaptive use of old buildings has been shown to be a wise investment by the private sector. First, in recent years, the costs of building materials have increased more than labor costs, causing rehabilitation and adaptive use work to be less influenced by inflation than new construction. Second, reusing an old building saves on demolition costs, which in dense city areas can run as high as 10 percent of total construction costs. Provisions of the 1976 Tax Reform Act disallow the tax deduction previously available for demolishing buildings listed on the National Register. Third, whereas new construction takes up to 2 or more years on the average to complete, rehabilitation oftentimes takes less than a year. Fourth, renovation can take place throughout the year, because the construction work is already shielded from the weather. Portions of a rehabilitated structure can be completed and rented out while work is being done to complete others, whereas new construction projects have to be virtually finished before space is rented. Fifth, dramatic increases in the price of land on the urban fringe is diminishing the previous cost advantage of new construction on undeveloped land. Finally, the new Tax Reform Act allows all rehabilitation costs on historic structures to be written in 5-year depreciation schedules.

The old Faneuil Hall in my own city of Boston is a fine example. Few would argue that razing this historic building and constructing a new and typically boring structure in its place would have been a wise decision. Instead, Faneuil Hall has been rehabilitated into a shopping mall attracting thousands of tourists and shoppers daily. Several other revitalization projects around the country have recorded this type of success. In fact, it was recently reported in the Harvard Business Review that a great majority of these renewed projects have grossed considerably more revenue per square foot than similar newly constructed buildings.

RESOURCE EFFICIENCY

The Energy Research and Development Commission, now a division of the Department of Energy conducted a study that determined rehabilitation consumes 23 percent less energy than new construction. In addition to this, urban renewal is resource efficient in that it responds to the contemporary demands of natural resource scarcity. That is, since rehabilitation is 75 percent labor intensive, fewer natural resources are utilized in the renovation of hard-pressed areas.

AVAILABLE FINANCING

Funds for historic preservation and urban rehabilitation from private and local sources have been readily available to match Federal funding. Vermont, and the city of Philadelphia are prime examples of private response to rehabilitation investment.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Because most structural systems and building materials are already in place before rehabilitative construction be-

gins, rehabilitation consumes less energy. Older buildings were designed to use natural light and ventilation, have thicker walls, windows that open, higher ceilings, and rely less on expensive heavy machinery and costly structural materials. Furthermore, when one considers that almost one-third of the total amount of energy used in this country is to operate residential and commercial buildings, any effort to conserve such energy use will certainly have a direct impact on lowering energy consumption for the entire country.

In concluding, the success of such rehabilitative efforts deserves mention. In Massachusetts alone, the rehabilitation of the Chickering Piano Factory, Old Boston City Hall, Winthrop Square Merchants Row, Simons Rock Art Center, Southbridge Credit Union, Exeter Street Theater, and the Garage in Cambridge, all maintain or surpass the 80-percent occupancy rate for the city of Boston without sacrificing their architectural and esthetic value.

Thus, H.R. 12433 and H.R. 12536, both represent efforts to compensate for the weaknesses of previous revitalization policy and a wise attempt to capitalize on the economic benefits of historic preservation and urban revitalization. Previous legislation has failed to adapt properly to the significant changes in the American economy, and hence failed to realize the available economic growth achievable through such revitalization. Furthermore, H.R. 12433 and H.R. 12536, utilize already existent built environments and provide for visual and esthetic improvement in realizing this national growth. It is with these intentions in mind that I seek the support of my colleagues in the House and my friends in the Senate in the passage of this legislation. ●

FEDERAL POLICY TO DEAL WITH FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. FARMLAND

HON. MAX BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, foreign investment in American farm and ranchland is a matter for serious concern. Farmland is this Nation's most valuable natural resource. We in Congress need to make sure that foreign investments do not threaten the ability of our family farm system to supply essential food and fiber supplies.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to monitor foreign investments to insure that they do not lead to national problems. Foreign acquisition of U.S. real estate brings up important economic, social, and political questions.

Farmland purchases by foreign investors may limit opportunities for American farmers to buy land. Agricultural land is a limited resource, with only 3 percent of the total coming onto the market every year. Foreign buyers, as-

sisted by tax breaks and attracted by relatively high rates of return on secure investments, are willing to pay prices above market rates.

These prices reduce the ability of young farmers to purchase farmland and existing family farm operations to expand. Foreign investments will replace the traditional owner-operator relationship which has been an integral part of our family farm system with a system of absentee ownership and tenant farming.

Foreign purchases bring up the possibility that U.S. land might be exploited for foreign benefit. Foreign control of resources eventually could influence U.S. Government policy. Certainly there is the possibility that foreign firms will be unresponsive to employment, community development, and national security needs of the United States.

We clearly need to increase our knowledge of foreign investment. Only when we know for sure the extent of foreign investment can we devise intelligent policies to deal with this investment. A recent GAO study of foreign ownership of U.S. farmland sums up current information with the words, "Reliable data is difficult to obtain." Current and planned efforts to monitor foreign investments in the United States are simply not sufficient.

Iowa's reporting procedure on foreign investment, an economic research report done as part of the Foreign Investment Study Act of 1974, and pending efforts by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce provide only fragmentary data on foreign investments in U.S. farmland.

I have joined Congressman NOLAN GRASSLEY and others in cosponsoring the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978. Essentially the bill requires that all nonresident aliens or foreign interests who hold, acquire or transfer interests in American farmland file a report with the Secretary of Agriculture within 90 days of purchase, sale, or transfer. Foreign interests would include foreign individuals, governments and corporations, as well as American corporations which are substantially controlled by foreign interests. Also, any foreign investor holding an interest in agricultural land on the day before the date of enactment of the legislation would have 6 months to submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture. Consequently, we would have data on all foreign land ownership from the date the legislation is enacted and into the future.

Failure of foreign interests to report land ownership would result in stiff penalties of up to 25 percent of the fair market value of the interest held in the property. These penalties would provide a strong incentive for both small and large foreign landholders to register.

The recent GAO investigation concluded with the advice that such a national reporting system would be the most feasible and simplest approach in obtaining much needed data on foreign investments in agricultural land.

To the extent possible, efforts to restrict foreign investments should be the prerogative of individual States. States

have established various laws regarding foreign investment in farmland. These laws are in response to the particular needs and desires of each State. For instance, in Iowa, aliens, corporations, and limited partnerships are required to register landholdings and make certain annual disclosures. In addition, non-resident aliens may hold a maximum of 640 acres outside of municipal limits. In Oklahoma no alien may hold land unless he is a bona fide resident of the State. Many States have no restrictions at all on foreign investment in real estate.

Several of our current tax policies operate to the benefit of foreign investors. We in Congress should make overhaul of these tax laws a major priority.

Foreign corporations share an advantage with outside domestic investors in that they can write off farm losses against nonfarm income. Some types of farm operations require several years of large investments before returns start coming in; examples are cow-calf livestock operations and groves of fruit and nut trees. Investors can write off losses they incur in developing these enterprises, then sell the operation and treat their profits as capital gains. Thus, they convert ordinary nonfarm income into capital gains on their farming operations. I introduced H.R. 11641 several months ago to limit these tax advantages available to nonfarm interests operating in agriculture. My bill would reduce the amount of farm losses that could be deducted from nonfarm income to \$15,000 annually.

A tax treaty the United States recently signed with the Netherlands Antilles grants investors there a special tax treatment when they invest money in this country. Currently the Senate is considering a tax treaty with England that could attract further foreign investment in farmland. That treaty would throw major legal roadblocks into State government authority to tax foreign investors. I would urge my colleagues in the Senate to closely examine article 9(4) of the U.S.-U.K. Tax Treaty before they approve this limitation upon the State's power to tax.

Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, foreign investment in U.S. farmland threatens to become an extremely serious problem. We in Congress should act now to establish procedures for monitoring this investment, and to insure that Federal policy does not favor foreign investors at the expense of our established family farmers. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committees scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 29, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Compensation and Pension Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 379 and H.R. 6501, to provide increased awards of service-connected compensation to certain veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of paired extremities; S. 2828, the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act; and S. 1929, to establish, for purposes of paying dependency and indemnity compensation, a presumption of death from service-connected disability in the case of certain blinded veterans.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 10

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on DOE's administration of the crude oil entitlements program and its impact on the domestic refining industry.

JULY 11

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 3209, the State Community Conservation and Development Act; S. 3210, the Livable Cities Act; and S. 3211, the National Self-Help Development Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on mid-west railroad bankruptcies and on the operation of the Railroad Revitalization Regulation Reform Act (P.L. 94-210).

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To receive testimony from Treasury Secretary Blumenthal on the Administration's request to increase the limit on the public debt.

2221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

6626 Dirksen Building

JULY 12

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings at S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear power reactors.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 3209, the State Community's Conservation and Development Act; S. 3210, the Livable Cities Act; and S. 3211, the National Self-Help Development Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on railroad freight car utilization.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed extension of Presidential authority to maintain most-favored-nation trade treatment with Romania under the Trade Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-618).

2221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2775, to improve the siting and licensing process for nuclear reactors.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

2168 Rayburn Building

JULY 17

10:00 a.m.

Special on Aging

To hold oversight hearings on P.L. 95-256, to increase from 65 to 70 years the age limit for retirement under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 18

10:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume mark up of S. 2775, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.

4232 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

2168 Rayburn Building

Special on Aging

To continue oversight hearings on P.L. 95-256, to increase from 65 to 70 years the age limit for retirement under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 19

10:00 a.m.

Joint Economic

To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 25

Special on Aging
To continue oversight hearings on P.L. 95-256, to increase from 65 to 70 years the age limit for retirement under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.
2168 Rayburn Building

10:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume markup of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

10:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue markup of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To resume hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.
2220 Rayburn Building

JULY 26

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up H.R. 10899, proposed International Banking Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To receive testimony on S.J.Res. 142, authorize the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to proceed with construction of the FDR Memorial, and other legislative and administrative business.
301 Russell Building

JULY 27

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue markup of H.R. 10899, proposed International Banking Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 2

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.
3302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 3

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.
3302 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 30

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 6503, to provide for a just and reasonable rate of return or profit for common carriers by water used in intercoastal commerce.
235 Russell Building

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 29, 1978

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m. Rev. Father John M. Nagele, St. Anthony Catholic Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, as we approach again the commemoration of our origins, may we be conscious of the need for Your presence among us. We pray that our lives may always be shaped in justice, liberty, and truth.

Like all nations we seek security, but we confess that our ultimate security must rest in our relationship with You, personally and collectively.

We acknowledge the responsibility for the power we exercise in the world. May we employ that power for the welfare of all mankind.

Sustained by our trust in Your providence, we pray that the bond of confidence between our Government and our people may be strengthened as we celebrate another year of our history. May You continue to abide with us as You did with our ancestors two centuries ago. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The question is on the approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 338, nays 11, answered "present" 4, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—338

- | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abdnor | Bennett | Cederberg |
| Addabbo | Bevill | Chappell |
| Akaka | Blaggi | Clausen, |
| Alexander | Blanchard | Don H. |
| Ammerman | Blouin | Clawson, Del |
| Anderson, | Boland | Cleveland |
| Calif. | Bonior | Cohen |
| Andrews, N.C. | Bonker | Coleman |
| Andrews, | Bowen | Collins, Ill. |
| N. Dak. | Breaux | Conable |
| Annunzio | Brooks | Conte |
| Applegate | Broomfield | Corman |
| Archer | Brown, Calif. | Cornell |
| Ashbrook | Buchanan | Cotter |
| Ashley | Burgener | Cunningham |
| Aspin | Burke, Fla. | D'Amours |
| AuCoin | Burke, Mass. | Daniel, Dan |
| Badham | Burleson, Tex. | Daniel, R.W. |
| Bafalis | Burlison, Mo. | Davis |
| Baldus | Burton, Phillip | de la Garza |
| Barnard | Byron | Delaney |
| Baucus | Caputo | Dellums |
| Bauman | Carnay | Derrick |
| Beard, R.I. | Carr | Derwinski |
| Beard, Tenn. | Carter | Devine |
| Benjamin | Cavanaugh | Dickinson |

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Dicks | Green | Lehman |
| Dodd | Guyer | Lent |
| Dornan | Hall | Levitas |
| Downey | Hamilton | Livingston |
| Drinan | Hammer- | Lloyd, Tenn. |
| Duncan, Oreg. | schmidt | Long, La. |
| Duncan, Tenn. | Hanley | Long, Md. |
| Early | Hannaford | Lott |
| Edgar | Hansen | Lujan |
| Edwards, Ala. | Harkin | Luken |
| Edwards, Calif. | Harris | Lundine |
| Edwards, Okla. | Harsha | McClory |
| Eilberg | Hawkins | McCormack |
| Emery | Hefner | McDade |
| English | Heftel | McFall |
| Erlenborn | Hightower | McKay |
| Ertel | Hillis | McKinney |
| Evans, Colo. | Holland | Madigan |
| Evans, Del. | Hollenbeck | Maguire |
| Evans, Ind. | Holt | Mahon |
| Fary | Holtzman | Mann |
| Fascell | Horton | Markey |
| Fenwick | Howard | Marks |
| Findley | Hubbard | Marlenee |
| Fish | Huckaby | Marriott |
| Fisher | Hughes | Martin |
| Fithian | Hyde | Mazzoli |
| Flippo | Ireland | Meeds |
| Flood | Jacobs | Metcalfe |
| Flynt | Jeffords | Michel |
| Foley | Johnson, Calif. | Mikulski |
| Ford, Tenn. | Jones, N.C. | Mikva |
| Fountain | Jones, Okla. | Miller, Calif. |
| Fowler | Jones, Tenn. | Miller, Ohio |
| Frenzel | Jordan | Mineta |
| Frey | Kasten | Minish |
| Fuqua | Kastenmeier | Mitchell, N.Y. |
| Gammage | Kazen | Moakley |
| Gaydos | Kelly | Moffett |
| Gephardt | Kemp | Mollohan |
| Gialmo | Keys | Montgomery |
| Gibbons | Kildee | Moore |
| Gilman | Kindness | Moorhead, |
| Ginn | Kostmayer | Calif. |
| Glickman | Krebs | Moorhead, Pa. |
| Goldwater | LaFalce | Mottl |
| Gonzalez | Lagomarsino | Murphy, Ill. |
| Gore | Latta | Murphy, N.Y. |
| Gradison | Leach | Murphy, Pa. |
| Grassley | Lederer | Murtha |

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