EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONVICTION OF VLADIMIR SLEPAK AND IDA NUDEL

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel on June 21 is the latest Soviet outrage in its campaign to utterly destroy the Soviet Jewish refusenik movement. Vladimir Slepak, a chemical engineer, and his wife, Maria, had waited longer—8 years—than any other Soviet citizens to emigrate. Ida Nudel's application had been pending for 7 years. Maria, who is seriously ill with bleeding ulcers, will be placed on trial in the very near future. There is little doubt that she, too, will be sentenced to several years in internal exile in Siberia.

The Slepaks and Ida Nudel were arrested on June 1 when, out of desperation after having been refused permission to leave for so many years, they hung banners out of their windows demanding the right to emigrate. For this they were charged with "malicious hooliganism."

As with the trial of Yuri Orlov, the Slepak and Nudel trials were travesties of justice. They were conducted in complete secrecy. The courtrooms were closed to relatives and friends. Ida Nudel had to be forcibly carried inside. Vladimir Slepak was not permitted to either testify or present witnesses in his defense. The authorities turned a fire-hose on associates gathered outside. The sentences were unbelievably harsh: 5 years in Siberia for Slepak, 4 for Nudel.

The message from the courtrooms could not be clearer for those in the Soviet Union who wish to emigrate. The state is saying: "Your cause is hopeless; we will smash you."

The Soviet Government must not be permitted to act with impunity. Every fiber of our Government, all citizens who are concerned about freedom, must let the Soviets know that their conduct is barbarous and intolerable, that we view it with revulsion, and that we condemn it completely.

Although press accounts of the trial, by virtue of its secrecy, are sketchy, they graphically relate the nightmare in Moscow. They are attached for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1978]

DISSIDENT GOT CARTER'S BACKING IN 1976—SLEPAK SENTENCED TO 5-YEAR EXILE

(By Kevin Klose)

Moscow—Vladimir Slepak, who for eight years sought to emigrate to Israel, was convicted of malicious hooliganism in a closed trial yesterday and sentenced to five years' exile in a remote region of the Soviet Union.

His struggle to obtain an exit visa has attracted wide attention abroad, including the first personal message of support Jimmy Carter sent to a Soviet dissident. Partly as a result of the notoriety, Slepak has emerged as a focal point of much of the Jewish activism both here and in the West.

The 50-year-old Slepak also was one of the founding members of the unofficial Helsinki committee in Moscow, a group attempting to monitor Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki accord.

The prolonged plight of the Slepak family was publicly singled out by Carter as an example of human rights violations in the Soviet Union. On Oct. 21, 1976, Carter sent the following telegram to Slepak:

"I have read with great interest about the treatment you and some of your colleagues suffered recently. As you know, I have spoken out on this matter as governor and during this campaign and have referred to your case by name. I want you to know of my deep personal interest in the treatment that you and your colleagues receive."

But last week, when President Carter was asked at a news conference about his reaction to the June 1 arrest of Slepak and his wife, the president restated his general position without mentioning Slepak by name or addressing the specific issue of his arrest.

Another Jewish activist, Ida Nudel, was also tried and convicted yesterday in a separate court on charges of malicious hooliganism and sentenced to four years' internal exile.

It was not announced where the Slepaks and Nudel would be sent. Normally those convicted are sent to small, isolated hamlets in Siberia.

[In Washington, the State Department termed the sentences "unduly harsh and clearly incompatible with the letter and spirit of" the Helsinki accord and President Carter called it "a matter of serious concern."]

Observers here noted that both Slepak and Nudel could have received up to five years in prison on the charge. Hence yesterday's sentences, while not signaling any change in the Kremlin's crackdown on dissent, may nevertheless be seen as reflecting Moscow's intention to soften its image on the issue. Last month there was considerable international outcry over the maximum sentence of seven years in prison and five of internal exile handed down last month against Yuri Orlov, another key dissident figure.

Slepak and his wife, Maria, were arrested when they held up a large placard on the balcony of their apartment overlooking busy Gorky Street, the city's most fashionable shopping area a few blocks from the Kremlin. It took police more than an hour to break into the apartment and arrest the two.

Since the jailing last year of such key dissidents as Orlov, Alexander Ginzburg and Anatoli Scharansky, Slepak, an electronics engineer, has moved to the forefront of the struggling human rights movement here, contacting Western journalists about activists' press conferences and sometimes acting as an interpreter.

He himself is the son of an ardent Bolshevik who returned to Russia from the United States to fight for the Reds, in the Civil War after the revolution. Angered by his son's criticism of the regime, the father has disowned the son whom he named for Vladimir Lenin.

The trials of Ginzburg and Scharansky are expected to be held this summer. Arina Ginzburg said yesterday her husband is ill and she presumes this is the reason his trial in Kaluga on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda has not yet begun. Scharansky reportedly faces the capital crime of treason. The Soviets have accused him of having connections with the Central Intelligence Agency, a charge which Carter has personally denied.

Nudel, a 47-year-old economist, held a demonstration similar to the Slepaks' at her apartment in another part of Moscow the same day. She, too, was arrested but not held in pretrial detention. Mrs. Slepak, a 51-year-old physician, was arrested with her husband but later released and sent to a hospital for treatment of pancreatitis. She is still hospitalized and is to be tried later.

One of the couple's sons, Alexander, 26, emigrated to Israel last year. Another, Leonid, who also has applied to emigrate to Israel, has been in hiding since last November when he received a draft notice.

Yesterday's trials were barred to Western correspondents and a representative of the U.S. Embassy, First Secretary Raymond Smith, as well as to friends of the two defendants.

Nudel, being tried in a court in the Volgogradsky district of the city, refused to enter the courtroom without her friends. But she was eventually taken forcibly by police and plainclothesmen into the courtroom at the order of the presiding judge.

As Slepak was taken away by police following the trial, someone on the courthouse grounds turned a high-pressure hose on reporters and dissidents talking outside the building. The group was soaked but no one was hurt.

The official Soviet news agency Tass said after Slepak's arrest that he had "zealously" violated public order during the placard protest, which was witnessed by several hundred Russians and some tourists who gathered below.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1978]

SOVIET SENTENCES TWO JEWISH ACTIVISTS TO EXILE IN SIBERIA

Moscow, June 21.—Soviet courts sentenced two Jewish dissidents today to long terms of exile in Siberia for hanging banners from their Moscow apartments pleading for permission to emigrate to Israel.

Vladimir Slepak, a 50-year-old engineer who was active in the small dissident human rights movement here, was convicted after a short trial at which no defense witnesses were allowed to appear and sentenced to spend five years in exile in a remote area. His brother-in-law, Zinovy Rashkovsky, was allowed into the courtroom only to hear the verdict.

Ida Nudel, a 47-year-old economist, was convicted on the same charge, "malicious hooliganism," in a separate trial and sentenced to four years in exile.

Mr. Slepak's wife, Mariya, was charged with her husband after they locked themselves into their downtown Moscow apartment on June 1 and briefly hung a banner from the balcony saying "Let us join our son in Israel" Mrs. Slepak is in a hospital with a bleeding ulcer and her case was severed from her husband's.

SON IS IN ISRAEL

Mr. Slepak has been trying to emigrate since 1970, and has been without work since he applied. One son did emigrate to Israel; the other is now a fugitive from the draft and is in hiding in the Soviet Union. "And so that is how they plan to finish off the Slepak family," Mrs. Slepak said just before she was hospitalized a week ago.

Miss Nudel, who hung a sign from her balcony, also on June 1, saying, "K.G.B., give me my visa," was tried in another court today. She has been seeking permission to leave for Israel since 1971.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

At both trials, plainclothes police agents or informers kept friends and relatives of the defendants and reporters under surveillance. All were barred from attendance, as were representatives sent by the American Embassy.

Jewish friends and reporters whom Miss Nudel tried to invite into the courtroom were forcibly ejected by the police, who then literally carried her off to face trial.

Outside the court where Mr. Slepak was tried, a water hose was briefly turned on the small crowd that gathered on the sidewalk after Mr. Rashkovsky was summoned to hear the vedict. There were 10 prosecution witnesses. Mr. Slepak was not permitted to call any in his defense and he refused the services of a court-appointed lawyer.

BLOW TO DISSIDENT GROUP

The exile of Mr. Slepak will deal a heavy blow to the small and fragmented group of Jewish "refuseniks" here. "We're afraid that now the K.B.G. thinks that they can do this to every one of us," said one, Irina Brailovsky. "Vladimir was active for all the last eight years," she said, "and only now they have done what they wanted to do. 'Human rights' are just words now."

Despite the tension it causes in relations with the United States, Moscow seems determined to show no clemency in its treatment of those who have sought to expose what they see as violations of human rights here.

After the trial and harsh seven-year prison term imposed on Yuri F. Orlov last month for "anti-Soviet agitation," the authorities seem about to begin a second major trial of a dissident. Aleksandr I. Ginzburg. According to his wife, Mr. Ginzburg, who was imprisoned in February 1977 for administering an illegal fund for Soviet political prisoners with foreign currency, is now ill with tuberculosis in a prison in Kaluga, 110 miles south of Moscow. But she expects his case to be heard any day.

The case most damaging to Soviet-American relations is expected to be that of Anatoly F. Shcharansky, a dissident who has been accused of spying for the Central Intelligence Agency, a charge President Carter has personally denied.

RELATIVE OF SLEPAKS GETS WORD AT WAILING WALL

(By Christopher S. Wren)

JERUSALEM, June 21.—Genrietta Orlovsky unsteadily observed her fourth day of an outdoor hunger strike today near the Wailing Wall in east Jerusalem. A hand-lettered sign pinned to her makeshift tent pleaded: "Save the Slepak family—my sister Mariya, her husband Vladimir and their son Leonid—from a Soviet prison."

A friend pushed through a sympathetic cluster of Soviet Jewish immigrants to break the news that had been announced on the radio. Vladimir Slepak had just been sentenced in Moscow to five years of internal exile on charges of malicious hooliganism.

The frail Mrs. Orlovsky, supporting herself on a blanket-covered cot, hid her haggard face and burst into sobs. "He wasn't a hooligan," she cried out in Russian. "It was concocted by the K.G.B."

The small crowd pressed forward, but no one spoke. As if reading their minds, Mrs. Orlovsky said, "If we weren't able to do anything before, I don't know what can happen now."

IT IS A NEW POLICY

A young woman with a small child in her arms remarked: "Slepak was Slepak. They didn't touch him for nine years, and now this. It's a new policy they have adopted for Jewish refuseniks."

Mr. Slepak, who has been trying to get permission to move to Israel with his family for eight years, was arrested on June 1 after he hung a banner from his central Moscow apartment demanding that he be allowed to leave. His wife, Mariya, who is Mrs. Orlovsky's sister, also faces trial on the charge of malicious hooliganism. She is now hospitalized in Moscow with a bleeding ulcer.

A VERY BAD SIGN

Though Mr. Slepak will not go to prison, his supporters here found the sentence of internal exile excessively severe. An older man said that the sentence dashed any hopes for the Slepaks' emigrating. Others blamed the United States and Israel for not being tougher with the Soviet Union.

A woman remarked softly that the sentence was "a very bad sign" for Mr. Slepak's friend, Anatoly F. Shcharansky, who has been in jail for 15 months awaiting trial on charges of spying for the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

The crowd, as if at a wake, turned to reminiscences of the Slepaks. One woman, Rivka Aleksandrovich, who moved to Israel from Latvia in 1971, told the others: "When we used to come to Moscow for our demonstrations, we had no place to stay, but their doors were always open. You knew that the Slepaks would give you something to eat or find you a place to sleep. Why should they be punished so severely?"

Passers-by gathered around the tent as Mrs. Orlovsky explained in Hebrew what internal exile meant in the Soviet Union. "They usually send them very, very far away," she said.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE DEBATED

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the future course of American foreign policy has been a matter of much discussion. I think that a broad debate on this subject is very important.

I would like to, at this time, insert the following letter of a constituent of mine to the editors of the Washington Post that expresses a concern that deserves the attention of my colleagues.

THE EDITOR,
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a strong Carter supporter, I find it extremely troubling to hear the same strident anti-communist hysteria that led us into Vietnam sounding once again from the White House. It has been said again and again of Vietnam that the American people permitted their leaders to coerce them down a path they would not knowingly have chosen. Can we prevent this from happening again?

When a Brzezinski casts verbal thunderbolts and rattles sabres, one would hope there would be a public outpouring of questioning and opposition. These charges he and the President (unconscionably) are hurling about are from the rhetoric of the old global chess game that infatuated Kissinger. The Soviet communists are not devil-figures requiring feuds to the death and holy wars. The Cuban state contains much that is worthy of study before we decide to drum it out of the international body politic. The most dismaying allegations are that the winds of change in Africa and the tragic attendant violence could have been largely generated by machiavelian outside communist powers.

We must keep our sense of balance. We must recall our own covert (and very destabilizing) initiatives in Angola. Our intervention in the ongoing controversy in Rhodesia and South Africa is becoming more and more extensive. Do we for some reason need a whipping boy, so we ourselves can have an excuse to militarize the Indian Ocean or become covert partners in destabilizing certain chosen African regimes as we did in South America?

In an administration that started out forswearing the cold war ideology, it is doubly dismaying to hear these simplistic and dangerous allegations. If some of our leaders have succumbed to the heady aura of power in the "war games" rooms, it is incumbent upon us as individuals, and through our legislators, to raise our voices against this. We in the United States have the wisdom and the societal strength to pursue a much more constructive and self-respecting path in international affairs than this.

Respectfully yours,

ANNE KNIGHT.●

WEST NEEDS YOUR HELP

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider a piece of legislation designed to make an important change in our Nation's public lands policy. H.R. 10587 would, for the first time since the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act, commit the Federal Government to a program which will improve the quality of our Nation's range resources. This kind of program will not only benefit those livestock grazers who are economically dependent on those resources. It will also enhance our national commitment to wildlife preservation. It will provide the tools which the Bureau of Land Management needs in order to meet the goals Congress gave in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

I think that the following list of groups who have indicated their support for this legislation demonstrates the support this bill has. In addition to various industry groups from throughout the Nation, this list includes groups from the West who are concerned with wildlife, wilderness, and other natural values. I hope that the Members of Congress will join with these organizations in support of this significant piece of legislation:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING H.R. 10587

Wyoming Outdoor Council.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
Wyoming Sierra Club.
Northern Great Plains Regional Sierra Club.
Western Environmental Trade Association.
Society for Range Management.
Montana Stockgrowers Association.
National Association of Conservation Districts.

National Cattlemen's Association.
Public Lands Council.
Oregon Rangeland Committee.
California Farm Bureau Federation.
Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.
New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau.
Wyoming Fish and Game Commission.
National Environmental Development Association.
National Woolgrowers' Association.
Louisiana Cattlemen's Association.
Mississippi Cattlemen's Association.
Arkansas Cattlemen's Association.
New York Cattlemen's Association.
Florida Cattlemen's Association.
Wisconsin Cattlemen's Association.
Minnesota Cattlemen's Association.
Montana Women in Farm Economics.
Wyoming Wilderness Society.
All western states cattlemen's associations.

PHILADELPHIA IS FIRST ON HOMEOWNERS' PROGRAM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that the city of Philadelphia is the first in the Nation to launch a program designed to give advice to moderate-income persons planning to buy a home for the first time.

This federally funded project—called HOME, for home ownership made easier—will provide home buying guidebooks and voluntary group and individual counseling services at no charge. Counseling will be provided to eligible households by the Philadelphia Housing Development Corp.

Irene Goodwin, director of counseling for PHDC, reports that the principal purpose of the program is to test the effectiveness of prepurchase counseling in assisting home buyers in the $8,000 to $20,000 income range to find, purchase and retain their first homes. This research is being funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Philadelphia's experience, together with that of Atlanta and Phoenix, will be used as a basis to determine the value of prepurchase counseling in other cities, according to Ms. Goodwin.

The program will provide important information to first-time homeseekers on topics that will better prepare them for successful homeownership. Covered in the materials and counseling that participants will receive are such topics as:

How much you can afford to pay for a house; things to consider in choosing a neighborhood; how to use the services of real estate brokers; how to inspect a house and be sure you're getting what you paid for; what steps are involved in actually buying a house; how to go about getting a mortgage; what you need to know about home maintenance and repair; and where to get help if you run into problems.

The HOME program has been endorsed by the Philadelphia Board of Realtors, the Philadelphia Mortgage Bankers Association, the Philadelphia Mortgage Plan, the Delaware Valley Savings and Loan Association, and the HUD/FHA Philadelphia area office.

A BILL AMENDING THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would amend Public Law 93-205, the Endangered Species Act.

The intent of the act as it was enacted in 1973 was to provide protection for species in danger of extinction. Since its enactment, several hundred species have been classified as either endangered or threatened and were protected by the act, thus preventing their extinction. The act has been effective in 'his sense.

However, the act has not been effective in solving the problems that arise when the needs and activities of man endanger or threaten the existence of another species. The act addresses only one aspect of the conflict—protection of the endangered species. In rushing to protect a species endangered by man, the act fails to recognize that the needs of man are as legitimate as those of the endangered species, and that the needs of both species must be satisfied if they are to exist and thrive. The act lacks a mechanism that would balance enforcement of the act in such a way that an endangered species can be protected while man is allowed to satisfy his needs—and, where necessary, that would help determine whether protection of the endangered species or satisfaction of man's needs is of the greater importance. Consequently, when man's activities endanger another species, that species is fully and immediately protected regardless of the fact that by doing so man is often prohibited from satisfying his needs.

My bill seeks to establish this balancing mechanism. It states that if the construction or operation of any dam, any industrial facility used in the production or processing of goods such as energy, or any tract used in farming or ranching has a potentially harmful effect on an endangered species, the Secretary of the Interior must determine whether the affected wild species is of such importance to the Nation that the detrimental effects of halting the project are justified by the benefit derived from the species. Suspension of any project must be approved by concurrent resolution of the House and Senate. However, the Secretary is allowed, if he so desires, to relocate the species affected by the project to another habitat suitable for the continued healthy existence of that species.

My bill also provides for an annual review and revision where necessary of the endangered species list. The lack of such a provision has resulted in an unnatural overabundance of some formerly "endangered" species due to continued protection is no longer necessary.

I am as concerned as anyone with the protection of endangered species. No one, least of all myself, feels that more species should follow the dodo bird and the carrier pigeon into oblivion. However, I am equally concerned that man's needs are being denied at present through enforcement of the act. Man is one of many species that share this planet; we are not, as some would have us believe, alien intruders bent on the destruction of the environment and the slaughter of wildlife. If man is to survive and thrive, he needs to use the resources of the land and the environment around him—as must all species. We must attempt to protect endangered species rationally, so that neither man or an endangered species will be denied the opportunity to fulfill its needs. Man can, and must, live side by side with wildlife. I feel that these amendments will help insure that we can continue to do so.

I include the bill to be printed in the RECORD:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for an annual review of species listed as endangered species or threatened species, to provide for the relocation of endangered or threatened species in certain cases, to provide a method for determining in certain cases whether the operation or construction of certain projects affecting endangered or threatened species should be suspended or halted, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Endangered Species Act Amendments of 1977".

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532; 87 Stat. 885) is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting instead: "; *Provided:* that any member of an endangered species born in captivity in the United States or held in captivity in the United States on the date of enactment of this Act shall be considered a threatened species.";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (17) respectively; and

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

"(10) The term 'project' means—

"(A) any factory or industrial facility used in the production of energy, or in the production or processing of goods, including any material used in the production of energy;

"(B) any man-made dam, storage facility, or tract of land used in the management, distribution, or conservation of water;

"(C) any tract of land used in agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, or the raising of livestock; or

"(D) any highway, including Federal-aid highways, as defined under 23 USC 101."

SEC. 3. Section 4(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c); 87 Stat. 887) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Secretary shall—

"(A) conduct an annual review of all species determined by him to be endangered species or threatened species and listed in any list published pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection; and

"(B) determine on the basis of such review whether any such species should—

"(i) be removed from such list; or

"(ii) be changed in status from an endangered species to a threatened species.

Each determination required by this paragraph shall be made in the manner prescribed by subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 5 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1534; 87 Stat. 889) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking out "To carry out" and all that follows down through "vested in him.";

(2) in subsection (b), by redesignating such subsection as subsection (d) and by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b)"; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsections:

"(b) Relocation.—If the continued existence within any geographical area, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of any species which is listed as an endangered species or a threatened species pursuant to section 4 of this Act is or will be jeopardized by the operation or construction of a project, the Secretary of the Interior may, to the extent he considers necessary, relocate members of any such species to another geographical area, as determined by him, which he considers conducive to the continued healthy existence of such species. Such action will not be considered a major Federal action as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4321 et. seq.).

"(c) Authority to Acquire Land.—To carry out the program under subsection (a) of this section or any relocation under subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary of the Interior—

"(1) shall utilize the land acquisition and other authority under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, and the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, as appropriate; and

"(2) is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise, lands, waters, or interest therein, and such authority shall be in addition to any other land acquisition authority vested in him."

SEC. 5. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536; 87 Stat. 892) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) General.—" before "The Secretary";

(2) by inserting ", subject to subsection (b)," before "by taking such action"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Special Rules.—(1) If any Federal department or agency authorizes, funds, or carries out the construction or operation of any project which jeopardizes the continued existence of an endangered or threatened resident species listed pursuant to section 4 of this Act or which may result in the destruction of habitat of such species determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be critical, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine whether the continued existence of such species is of such benefit to the United States or to any geographical area affected by the project, as determined by the Secretary, that the economic and social costs to the United States and to such geographical area of suspending or halting the operation or construction of such project, which would result from ceasing such authorization, funding, or carrying out of such project, are justified. Any such authorization, funding, or carrying out of the construction or operation of any project by a Federal department or agency shall be prohibited under this section only if—

"(A) the Secretary of the Interior determines, pursuant to this subsection, that such social and economic costs of suspending or halting the operation or construction of such project by such Federal department or agency are so justified and transmits such determination, together with the reasons in writing for such determination, to both Houses of the Congress; and

"(B) the cessation of such authorization, funding or carrying out of the construction or operation of such project by such Federal department or agency is approved by both Houses of the Congress by concurrent resolution.

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior shall make determinations required by this subsection on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available to him and after consultation, as appropriate, with the affected States, interested persons and organization, and other interested Federal departments and agencies.

"(3) Any such determination may be made only after the Secretary of the Interior has—

"(A) published notice in the Federal Register and notified the Governor of each affected State that such determination is contemplated;

"(B) allowed each affected State 90 days after notification to submit its comments and recommendations, except to the extent that such period may be shortened by agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor or Governors concerned; and

"(C) published in the Federal Register a summary of all comments and recommendations received by the Secretary of the Interior which relate to such proposed determination."

"(c) Major Federal Actions.—Any action taken pursuant to this section shall not be deemed a major Federal action as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC 4321 et. seq.)."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this Act shall take effect on date of enactment.●

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1978

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to record my support for Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978.

Although I have some concerns, which I will discuss below, I favor Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 as prepared by the President and transmitted to the Congress on June 19, 1978, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 which pertains exclusively to Federal Emergency Preparedness, is, in my opinion, badly needed. It would merge five agencies from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, HUD, and GSA into one new agency to be called Federal Emergency Management Agency. It is my opinion that merger is necessary before the proper unification between the various emergency agencies can be accomplished. I am told by Civil Defense officials from my home district as well as officials from here in Washington that the present agencies are not consolidated and the Nation's emergency preparedness system must be coordinated. Right now, according to information given me by Civil Defense Officials, it is splintered. There is also much duplication of services.

However, there is one concern that I have. It deals with the Federal Disaster Assistance Agency. I would not like to see this agency become absorbed by the proposed Federal Emergency Management Agency so much so that it loses its compactness and ability to act quickly when called upon during emergencies. My home district was struck by tornadoes and floods last year that did millions of dollars worth of damage. However, because of the high degree of efficiency of the FDAA regional offices in Kansas City, the suffering of many people in my district was considerably lessened.

In conclusion, I feel Reorganization Plan No. 3 is not only good, but I believe it is necessary. Right now, the various emergency preparedness agencies are too often going in different directions and working against each other. If they are combined into the proposed Federal Emergency Management Agency, I believe there will be the necessary coordination.●

PHILADELPHIA AIMS TO CUT ENERGY WASTE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, as part of its ongoing effort to help residents conserve energy, the city of Philadelphia has embarked on a program of free home surveys to identify cool-air loss this summer.

The city's Department of Licenses and Inspection is offering this service to homeowners in an effort to identify energy waste and give advice on how to correct problem spots in the home.

I commend this program to the attention of my colleagues, because it is an outstanding example of how local government can work with its residents to save energy.

Mayor Frank L. Rizzo has launched the program following this past winter's successful winter-proofing project, which aided more than 1,000 homeowners with suggestions on how to save on heating bills.

By calling the city, residents can arrange for a trained energy surveyor to visit their home by appointment. The surveyor will provide the homeowner with a free analysis and a cool-air-saving profile, and will propose ways to stop energy losses.

Philadelphia's Licenses and Inspections Commissioner Dominic Sabatini reports that the most recommended energy tip deals with installation or upgrading of insulation.

Mr. Sabatini notes that the L & I energy surveyors have been given training by the Federal Energy Administration regarding practical suggestions to make homes comfortable during the summer months and to save energy costs at the same time.

A home-profile checklist will be left with the homeowner showing the summer energy survey recommendations and instructions. Additional assistance will be provided by telephone if questions arise following the survey visit.

A free set of instructions showing how to do various energy-saving projects on a do-it-yourself basis is also available from the Licenses and Inspection Department.●

ABORTIONS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, George F. Will, who I regard as one of the more incisive analysts in journalism today, had a commentary in the Sunday, June 25, 1978, edition of the Washington Post which I think deserves reprinting in the RECORD.

In all of the debates that we have had on the abortion issue, the perceptions reflected in George Will's column have been missing. Before my colleagues vote again on this matter, I hope that they will take the opportunity to read Mr. Will's column, which I include at this point in the RECORD.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ABORTIONS AS COMMODITY, NOT MEDICINE

(By George F. Will)

A few years ago a woman had a healthy breast removed surgically because it interfered with her golf swing. The interesting question is not whether what she did was censurable, but whether what the surgeon did was medicine. The distinction between true and false ends of medicine is germane to the annual debate about public funding (primarily through Medicaid) of abortions.

Opponents of funding for most abortions have a decisive argument that is logically independent of views about the general morality of abortion. The argument is that few abortions are, properly speaking, medical procedures, and so should not be subsidized by funds appropriated for medical programs.

Dr. Leon Kass of the University of Chicago argues for what he calls "the old-fashioned view" that health is the true goal of the physician's art. If his argument is correct (and it is not easily assailed), most abortions are not acts of medicine, properly understood. The vast majority of abortions are non-therapeutic, in that they are not performed to ensure the health of the woman (who surely should not be called a "patient"). Although they are performed by persons licensed to practice medicine, they serve not the pursuit of health, but rather the woman's desire for convenience, absence of distress—in a word, happiness.

Kass gives other examples less bizarre than that of the woman golfer, of physicians' skills put to non-medical purposes. Amniocentesis, a diagnostic technique that reveals many feal disorders, also reveals the sex of the fetus, and abortions have been performed because the fetus was not of the desired sex. Some doctors specialize in pharmacologically induced "peace of mind," and dispense amphetamines to physically healthy but discontented people seeking mood "elevations."

Such doctors are not practicing medicine—the pursuit of health—any more than are narcotics peddlers. Doctors who perform artificial insemination may be doing good; they are not doing medicine, any more than are practitioners of the "cosmetic surgery" that corrects other than inborn or acquired abnormalities.

Such practices, says Kass, "the worthy and the unworthy alike, aim *not* at the patient's health but rather at satisfying his, albeit in some cases reasonable, wishes." They are acts not of medicine but of gratification: for consumers, not patients.

Another false goal of medicine is "behavior modification," using physicians' skills to produce "social adjustment." Kass warns that biological manipulation (such as psychosurgery or sophisticated drugging for violent people) is apt to increase as more is learned about the biological contribution to behavior. But even if such manipulation by "biobehavioral conditioners" has "socially useful" outcomes it is not medicine

Kass notes that when medicine's powers were fewer, its goal—health—was clearer. And the World Health Organization has muddied things by defining "health" as "a state of complete [sic] physical, mental and social [sic] well-being." That means that happiness is a medical commodity; happiness is the doctor's business. That, in turn, means almost everything is the doctor's business, so "medicine" becomes a classification that excludes nothing, and hence does not classify.

What Kass calls "creeping medical imperialism" is encouraged by a definition of medicine that is not properly related to health or, more precisely, is related to an overbroad definition of health that includes "happiness" and "contentment" and "good citizenship."

From the fact that physicians have a monopoly on the right to perform surgery, it does not follow that surgery is always medicine. Non-therapeutic abortion is the second most common surgical procedure, after circumsion. Most abortions are "birth control of last resort" or, more accurately, of first resort.

Most women seeking abortions are unmarried and neither they nor the man attempted contraception. According to one study, 1.7 million of the "sexually active" teen-age women do not use any contraceptives. Most abortions are measures of relief from the consequences of pleasure pursued irresponsibly.

Supporters of subsidized abortions argue that such relief is not only a social good, but also is an individual right that must, as a matter of equity, be subsidized for those who cannot afford it. But no such argument can establish the propriety of using funds appropriated for medical services to promote such a goal, which, whether defensible or indefensible, is not a true goal of medicine. Most abortions have no more to do with medicine than did the golfer's mastectomy.●

THE EVILS OF REDLINING

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a major problem that continues to afflict this Nation's urban centers, and that is the practice of redlining.

For those of you who are unfamiliar with redlining, it is the practice by which urban financial institutions freeze entire communities out of the mortgage market. These banking institutions refuse to grant housing loans in certain neighborhoods they consider to be unstable or risky for investment purposes. Community residents deposit money in their neighborhood banks, but these funds are reinvested elsewhere, outside of the area.

These institutions do not even consider individual applications on their own merit, but make a "blanket" assessment by rejecting all loan applications in that area. This method of freezing out entire communities has also been termed "zip code redlining."

This refusal to grant mortgage loans often signals the death knell for our urban neighborhoods. It is the initial step in a cycle of events that ultimately leads to the deterioration and decay of the community. The lack of mortgage capital leads to structure deterioration, building abandonment and a middle-class exodus, ultimately resulting in the decay of the community.

Fortunately, a group of concerned citizens in Brooklyn have initiated community action against these institutions, making the practice of redlining a well-publicized issue. Their involvement has resulted in a greater sensitivity on the part of bank officials to the needs of the area, and I applaud this community-based effort. However, the redlining epidemic is a nationwide problem, and the Federal Government must take the proper steps to curtail the practice.

The Federal Government provides many benefits to these financial institutions, including deposit insurance, access to low-cost credit, limited competition and a limited rate of interest. In return for these benefits, these banks and savings institutions are required to serve the "convenience and needs" of their communities. I interpret the "needs" of the community to include credit services as well as deposit services. The Federal deposit facility approval process can and should be used to reward those institutions with a good record of community services. Those that do not should be penalized.

In addition, urban dwellers are the victims of another form of discrimination through the redlining policies of insurance companies. Insurance companies practicing redlining base their decisions on arbitrary factors, such as the racial composition of the area, the economic class of the neighborhood's residents or merely the geographic location of the area within the city.

These property owners, denied insurance coverage by the companies, are forced to turn to the State FAIR plans for insurance, which were originally designed to provide insurance at rates comparable to those of the private sector. However, the cost of insurance in the FAIR plans of many States is substantially higher than would normally be available from insurance companies. In fact, the New York State FAIR plan rates are many times higher than insurance rates for other properties.

Fortunately, we will have the opportunity to correct this inequity during consideration of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, H.R. 12433, which is scheduled to come to the House floor today. Section 307(b) would require that insurance premium

rates in FAIR plans be no higher than rates in the regular insurance market. This provision would aid both urban and rural areas, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it and vote against any attempt to delete this section of the bill.

It is time that the Federal Government realize the important role our older existing buildings play in our urban revitalization efforts. Too often in the past, urban planners have placed far too much emphasis on the razing of our neighborhoods to make room for urban renewal projects. While their intentions were certainly well-meaning, the end result has been less than successful in preserving the character and spirit of our communities. Our urban property owners should be encouraged to maintain and upgrade their structures, but this can only be achieved if they are offered reasonable mortgage loans and affordable insurance policies.

Redlining is perhaps the single most important factor contributing to the deterioration and decay of our urban communities, and I urge my colleagues to keep this fact in mind during consideration of the bill before us today and in future legislation.●

TAXES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the overwhelming support that the property-tax-limiting proposition 13 received earlier this month in California, the notion of Government-sponsored tax cuts has received increasingly widespread attention and support. But long before the recent notoriety and new-found popularity of tax cuts were discovered by the press and many of our colleagues across the aisle, Republicans were pressing for substantial tax revisions for American wage-earners. The two prominent leaders of this GOP initiative have been Congressman JACK KEMP and Senator WILLIAM ROTH. Their proposal—the Roth-Kemp bill—is aimed at promoting employment, encouraging production, and spurring economic growth by reducing individual taxes an average of 30 percent over 3 years, reducing the corporate tax from 48 percent to 45 percent over a 3-year period, and immediately increasing the corporate surtax exemption for small businesses from $50,000 to $100,000.

The need for a tax cut is immediate and demonstrable. As Congressman KEMP has eloquently pointed out before, "when one takes into consideration the effects of inflation and the tax increases proposed by President Carter for Social Security and energy conservation, the income tax buden on the American people will almost triple by 1982."

Mr. Speaker, the July 3, 1978 issue of U.S. News and World Report features a highly informative interview with Congressman KEMP. At this point, I would like to include the article in the RECORD, so that it can be shared with my distinguished colleagues:

SLASH EVERYONE'S TAX 30 PERCENT—A HOTLY DEBATED IDEA

Q. Representative Kemp, what is the purpose of your plan for big, automatic cuts in federal income taxes?

A. The whole purpose of reducing all tax rates across the board is to help restore incentive to every taxpayer in the American economy, to bring about job creation and economic growth—and without inflation.

Inflation produces economic stagnation in the United States and the world today by moving people into higher and higher tax brackets as their nominal income increases, and by taxing business on nonexistent profits. The reward declines for work, saving, investment and production. And as reward after taxes declines, you get the type of stagnation that we see today. Our tax-rate cuts are a modest—but I think dramatic—step in finding an answer to the dilemma of the trade-off between inflation and unemployment.

Q. Your proposal calls for a 10 percent decrease for three consecutive years. Is this for rich and poor alike?

A. It is for everyone—across the board. It reduces all individual tax rates by about 30 percent over three years, lowers the corporate rate from 48 percent to 45 percent and doubles the surtax exemption for small businesses to generate capital—raising it from $50,000 to $100,000.

Q. Would your plan give relief to people with low incomes?

A. For sure. We lower all the rates, bringing the top rate down from 70 to 50 percent and reducing the 14 percent rate down to 8. So we do get a sharper percentage cut in the lower rates. But we get the top rates down enough so that you get a tremendous increase in the after-tax reward for non-tax-sheltered investing and saving.

That's the key: Expand saving and investment as well as lower the bottom rates to reduce the tax wedge between salary paid by the firm and the after-tax take-home pay. Today, there's a tremendous gap between the two. By lowering the tax wedge on the employes' income, you can raise the employes' take-home pay while lowering the cost of hiring to the firm.

And our plan is not just a straight 30 percent across-the-board rate cut. It is a little more at the bottom, because the inner-city poor have a tremendous tax on their first dollar of earned income if they are on welfare. There is now a disincentive to go off welfare. We create an incentive to get off welfare by reducing the tax rate at the low-income level.

Q. The Carter administration's tax-cut plan would offer even more relief to the lower brackets—

A. The Carter tax-reform package, which has been in large part gutted by the House Ways and Means Committee, wasn't really a tax-rate reduction but a redistribution of income. President Carter wants to increase the progressivity of the tax code by lowering taxes for people under $17,000 income and raising them for people over $17,000. This is then worsened by inflation operating on progressivity. This will, in fact, hurt a lot of people below $17,000 because they will soon be earning above $17,000—either because of real pay raises or inflation.

I contend, as do other people who are involved in this effort, that the President's tax reform would contribute to a more steeply progressive tax schedule that already has operated disastrously on the economy of our nation. The same progressivity has led to terrible consequences in Sweden and in Britain.

Q Wouldn't indexing the tax brackets accomplish the same thing as your proposal?

A. I have been a longtime supporter of indexing the tax rates. But I don't think that's enough. We've got to get the tax rates down to a point at which we'll get a better investment and work climate in the economy, and then index them. The Kemp-Roth plan is designed to increase the output of the economy and create jobs that produce tax revenues instead of consuming them. It worked in this country in the 1920s, and it worked under President Kennedy in the early 1960s; it worked in Germany and Japan after World War II, and it can work again today.

Q. In terms of revenue loss, how much money are you talking about over the three-year period?

A. By 1981, there would be a gross tax reduction of 80 billion dollars if you take the static effects. If you don't consider any change in behavior or any incentive, there would be a loss of 80 billion dollars.

But we're not going to lose 80 billion. By lowering the tax rate on work, saving and investment, we encourage expansion of revenues with lower tax rates on higher production. Today we have high tax rates and low production.

I think it would generate enough growth to offset the revenue loss. Economists from left to right are debating how much feedback there would be. Some say it is dangerously inflationary. Others say it is going to gut government.

Let me say I have no desire to gut government, although some cutbacks are clearly in order. I'm not out to hurt social programs, social services or to harm national defense. I think there's reason for spending money in our nation by government—but not wasting it. The greatest threat today to social programs is the slow growth of our economy, the stagnation of our tax base, the outrage of taxpayers.

Q. How much economic growth do you project that your tax-cut plan would bring?

A. That's like trying to say how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. There isn't an econometric model in America to project all the incentive effects.

However, Dr. Norman Ture and Chase Econometrics estimate that national saving would so expand that we could more than finance any short-term deficit without money creation or inflation or crowding out. The question I'm often asked is: "Isn't it risky?" I believe it is a risk worth taking because it is obvious the Keynesian stop-and-go economics are not working. The idea of trying to stop inflation by slowing down the economy or fighting unemployment with inflation has caused this country and the world to go through disastrous economic consequences in the past 10 years.

The purpose of this proposal is not to simply throw money into the economy so more television sets and automobiles can be purchased, although I believe that letting people spend their own money is a fundamental right. But as you increase the reward for investment and saving, according to Prof. Michael Boskin at Stanford, investment and saving increase. So what we're trying to do is affect behavior on the supply side of the economy. I consider this to be sound economics as well as good politics.

Q. If automatic tax cuts work as you say they do, why not keep right on cutting and generating more revenue?

A. We should do that. I want to start a movement in this country to get tax rates down to about 25 percent at the top and 5 percent at the bottom, get the capital-gains tax down to 25 percent as Representative Steiger is trying to do—or abolish it even—and get the estate taxes down.

I think we're only operating today at about 50 percent of our national potential. If we get the tax rates down, we encourage not just quantity growth but quality growth in

our economy. I'm talking about technological and quality improvements in energy and all other areas of our economy.

Q. Doesn't your plan fly in the face of all the economic theories the government has been following for years?

A. Absolutely. Look where those theories have brought us. The Keynesians keep telling us we can never have inflation and recession at the same time. Well, we've got it. The experts have spent all their time working on the demand side of the economy without considering the incentive or supply side.

Q. What about the traditional Republican cry for balancing the federal budget?

A. My constructive criticism of my party is that we've put the balanced budget ahead of the type of economic growth that leads to a balanced budget. We've always said we were the party of lower tax rates, but we added that we couldn't lower them until we balanced the budget. So we've become, in effect, the tax collectors for Democratic spending programs. We came across as being negative, as more interested in dollars and budgets than people.

The Democrats offer the voters a banquet menu of soup, salad, nuts, wine and beef—and you know you're going to pay for it through the nose interms of inflation and taxes. But the Republicans have said: "Come to our table, and we'll tighten your belt. You can have a bone and crumbs, but someday we'll have a good meal for you if you can just hold on." That is not a very appetizing menu—and I want to change it.

Q. What are the realistic chances for your tax plan, with a Democratic Congress and Democratic President?

A. Better than you might think. When I offered it as an amendment to the Humphrey-Hawkins bill earlier this year, we got 196 votes. A switch of 11 votes would have carried it. We got 20 percent of the Democrats.

Since Proposition 13 in California and Jeff Bell's victory in New Jersey, I've had a good many Democratic friends tell me they'd like to take another look at what President Kennedy did in 1963 with his 30 percent tax-rate cut, and what we're trying to do today. Momentum is slowly and gradually building in the Senate, too.

One of the things that is holding up a tax bill in Congress right now is fear that Jack Kemp and Bill Roth and Bill Steiger are going to get a bill passed through the Democratically controlled House and Senate to lower the tax rates.

Q. Is the current tax revolt restricted to property taxes, or is it a protest against all taxes?

A. It is against all taxes, but it is directed more at the rise in taxes coming from inflation—moving property and incomes into higher and higher tax brackets. Some people in California wouldn't even paint their front doors for fear it would increase their assessed valuation and taxes.

All this has created a tremendous barrier between effort and reward in this country—and the barrier keeps growing daily. I'm convinced that our plan for automatic tax-rate cuts will turn things around.

Q. Will you describe the "Laffer curve" that stimulated your tax-cut idea?

A. Arthur Laffer teaches business economics at the University of Southern California, and his curve amounts to a chart illustrating that tax revenue obeys the law of diminishing returns. There are two points on the curve at which taxes do not gain any revenues: zero and 100 percent tax rates. At 100 percent, production ceases. This is nearly what's happening to some people and businesses in some countries in Europe, where the No. 1 sport is not soccer but escaping the tax collectors.

Of course, at zero taxes you get zero revenue. As you raise taxes from zero, you gain revenue because production and industry are only slightly discouraged and taxes will be paid. And as you lower taxes from 100 percent to 99 or 85 or whatever, you get a pickup in production. Increased revenues are then fed into the treasuries of government at the federal, state and local levels.

The thrust of the Laffer curve is to help find the equilibrium point between zero and 100 percent tax rates where people are willing to maximize their output and still pay their taxes. I think that is somewhere around 25 percent in peacetime. When tax rates go beyond 25 percent—as they have in America and particularly in New York State—revenues are lost, since production diminishes and people are laid off. Layoffs lead to more government spending for assistance payments, and so you have more spending and thus even higher taxes in the future.

In America, we tax work, savings, thrift, investment and enterpreneurship—and we subsidize nonwork, unemployment, leisure, debt, spending and mediocrity.●

EDUCATION DAY, U.S.A.

HON BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 of this year Congress passed and sent to the President House Joint Resolution 770, authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating April 18, 1978, as "Education Day, U.S.A." On April 17 President Carter issued the proclamation called for by House Joint Resolution 770.

House Joint Resolution 770 was cosponsored by 220 Members of the House, and I was pleased to be among them. In addition to honoring the importance of education to America and its citizens, this resolution marked the 76th birthday of a world leader of Jewry and a force for education throughout the world, Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson. Rabbi Schneerson heads the worldwide Lubavitch Hasidic Movement which has its headquarters in Brooklyn, N.Y., and which also conducts educational activities at more than 60 centers in 28 States and 20 foreign countries.

More than 100 representatives of the Lubavitch movement from all over the United States came to Washington April 17 for a joyous reception with Members of the House and Senate in the House Caucus Room to celebrate passage of House Joint Resolution 770. Vice President Mondale served as chairman of this memorable gathering and celebration. The Vice President opened his remarks to the gathering by saying:

I am delighted to join in the two joyous occasions which bring us together today, the Lubavitcher Rebbe's 76th birthday and the resolution proclaimed officially by the Congress proclaiming Education Day, U.S.A. It is fitting that Education Day be proclaimed on the birthday of Rabbi Schneerson, who is a great Talmudic scholar dedicated to the education of Jewish people throughout the world.

The Honorable Robert J. Lipshutz, Counsel to the President, brought the good wishes of President Carter to the gathering.

Following are the text of House Joint Resolution 770 and excerpts from an address of Rabbi Schneerson in which he responded to the passage of House Joint Resolution 770 by the Congress and the proclamation issued by the President:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 18, 1978, as "Education Day, U.S.A.".

Whereas the Congress recognizes a need for the Nation to set aside on the calendar a day devoted to the importance of education to the lives of its citizens and to the general well-being of the Nation; and

Whereas the Lubavitch Movement, which conducts educational activities at more than sixty centers in twenty-eight States as well as around the world, is especially committed to the advancement of education and has proposed the establishment of an "Education Day, U.S.A."; and

Whereas world Jewry marked in 1977 the seventy-fifth birthday of the revered and renowned Jewish leader, the head of the worldwide Lubavitch Movement, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, who proclaimed on that occasion a "Year of Education"; and

Whereas the seventy-sixth birthday of this celebrated spiritual leader will occur on April 18, 1978, thus concluding the year of Lubavitch Movement activities dedicated to the "Year of Education" and the Lubavitcher Rebbe's milestone birthday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating April 18, 1978, as "Education Day, U.S.A.".

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY RABBI MENACHEM M. SCHNEERSON

On this auspicious occasion, in the month of Nissan and on the eve of the Festival of Pesach, the Festival of Liberation, it is particularly pertinent to begin with an expression of gratitude to the Almighty for His infinite kindnesses to each and all of us gathered here, and elsewhere in many places in various parts of the world.

Indeed, *Hakoras ha-tov*—recognition and appreciation of any kindness or benevolence, whether it is received directly from G-d or through the agency of a fellow human being—is one of the basic teachings of the Torah. It is also the underlying basis of many of the Divine precepts of the Torah, beginning with the first of the Ten Commandments ("I am the L-rd, thy G-d, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage"), and including such an elementary obligation as "Honor thy father and thy mother."

In honoring one's parents, one must remember to honor also, and especially the third "partner," namely, our Heavenly Father, who not only gives life to the newborn child, but also to the other two partners, the child's parents. And if honoring one's parents means gratifying their wishes and making them justly proud of their offspring, how much more so it is incumbent upon everyone to order one's daily life and conduct in accord with the Divine Will. Hence the rule, "Know Him in all your ways" (Prov. 3:6), meaning that awareness of G-d must pervade every aspect and detail of the everyday life. (Maimonides, Code, Section De'ot 3:3)

All our festivals, beginning with Pesach, commemorating the liberation of our people from bondage to Pharoah, and the prelude to our receiving the Torah at Sinai, giving us also true freedom spiritually, are occasions for expressing out gratitude to

G-d. So are many precepts in the Torah—such as *Bikkurim*, the offering of the First Fruits, as well as tithes and gifts to the poor, etc.—expressions of our gratitude to G-d for His benevolence and bounties.

In keeping with the principle of *Hakoras ha-tov* I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to all the wellwishers who came to participate in this gathering and in similar gatherings in various parts of the United States, especially in the Nation's Capital, as well as overseas; no less also to all those who were kind enough to send me messages of greeting and blessing on the occasion of my birthday.

I gratefully acknowledge all these felicitations as expressions of affinity with the movement which I am privileged to head, and as tributes to it in recognition of its services to the lands and peoples hosting its educational, cultural and philanthropic institutions.

Mindful of the exhortation, "Seek the peace of the city (and land) whither I have caused you to be exiled, and pray unto the L-rd for it; for in the peace thereof shall you have peace" (Jer. 29:7), we are particularly grateful for the freedom and conducive atmosphere prevailing in these great and blessed United States, where my revered predecessor, my father-in-law of saintly memory, transplanted the headquarters of our movement in 1940, under whose leadership, in the last decade of his dedicated life, the movement took root and flourished, and has borne fruits and fruits of fruits, "like a spring flowing with ever-growing vigor."

I heartily reciprocate all the good wishes in the words of our Sages, "He who blesses others is blessed by G-d Himself in a most generous measure" (Talmud B. Sotah 38b; Yerushalmi, Ber. 8:5)—in accordance with the Divine blessing of our Patriarch Abraham, "I will bless them that bless thee" (Gen. 12:3)

* * * * *

EDUCATION DAY, U.S.A.

Most deserving of our very profound appreciation is one of the most meaningful actions by the U.S. Congress who, in a joint resolution, carried by a two-thirds majority in the House of Representatives and by unanimous vote in the Senate, authorized and requested the President of the United States to proclaim this day as "EDUCATION DAY, USA," which the President graciously signed into law.

While the timing of this action was conceived as a tribute to our movement, which sees in education the cornerstone not only of Jewish life, but of humanity at large, and has been dedicated to this vital cause ever since its inception more than two hundred years ago—it is a fitting and timely tribute to the cause of education in general, focusing attention on what is surely one of the Nation's top priorities.

Moreover, this enactment by the U.S. Congress and after that by the President of the United States gives it the force of *dina d'malchusa*, "Law of the Government," which, according to the Halacha (Jewish Law), becomes part of the Jewish Law. [Shulchan Aruch (Code of Jewish Law) Part 4, chapter 369, Para. 2, 7, 8, 9].

It is fitting indeed that the U.S.A. has shown, through a forceful example, to the world that it places education among its foremost priorities. It is also to be hoped that "Education Day" will become a permanent institution, especially since, by reason of the pervasive nature of education, it would lend further significance to other "Days" such as Father's Day and Mother's Day and similar institutions which have become part of American life.

The proclamation of "Education Day, USA" is of extraordinary significance in impressing upon all citizens the importance of education, both in their own lives as well as, and even more so, for the young generation in the formative years—particularly in the present day and age.

* * * * *

IN RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

We have now concluded the "Year of Education" proclaimed last year on this day. This calls for review and introspection. In all humility we can say that with G-d's help it has been a very successful year for education, with the addition of numerous educational facilities on all levels in the U.S.A. and in many parts of the world; a substantially increased enrollment; and upgrading the quality of education. However, needless to say, as long as there is still one child that does not receive an adequate education, we can neither be satisfied nor slacken our efforts. On the contrary, the successful "Education Campaign" should spur us to even greater efforts in the ensuing year. It is human nature that ambition grows with achievement. If this is so in regard to material riches, how much more so in regard to real and eternal values. Moreover, since this trait of the human nature to strive for ever greater spiritual advancement has been given to every human being by the Creator, as a commendable factor, it is self understood that the Creator provides, at the same time, the capability and opportunities to translate it into tangible results, for "G-d requests of people only according to their powers (that He has given them)" (Midrash Bamidbar 13:3). Thus, in the final analysis, it is mainly a matter of one's own will and determination. And let no one be satisfied with just a little greater effort for the cause of education, but—in keeping fully with human nature as cited above—double and redouble one's efforts for so vital a cause.

Education, in general, should not be limited to the acquisition of knowledge and preparation for a career, or, in common parlance "to make a better living." And we must think in terms of a "better living" not only for the individual, but also for the society as a whole. The educational system must, therefore, pay more attention, indeed the main attention, to the building of character, with emphasis on moral and ethical values. (Need one be reminded of what happened in our own lifetime in a country that ranked among the foremost in science, technology, philosophy, etc.?)

Education must put greater emphasis on the promotion of fundamental human rights and obligations of justice and morality, which are the basis of any human society, if it is to be truly human and not turn into a jungle.

* * * * *

FOREIGN AID TO EDUCATION

The United States of America has a long-standing policy of foreign aid to developing countries, through direct grants and through U.N. agencies. Economic aid to foreign countries includes also cultural aid for the promotion and support of cultural programs, etc.

It is generally recognized—at any rate among the free and democratic nations—that each nation is a member of the Family of nations, and all must live together in "one world"—which is like one organism. When any part of an organism ails, it affects the whole body; strengthening any part of the body, strengthens the whole.

The record of this Nation's foreign aid is unexcelled in the annals of history—which is as it should be for a Nation so generously blessed by the Almighty. One would wish, however, for more affirmative action in the area of cultural, particularly educational, programs.

Economic aid given to a developing country is meant to be used most efficiently and productively. While the conditions attached to such aid must necessarily be limited and circumspect, there are certain conditions which are considered prerequisites. To cite a recent example, President Carter has taken a courageous stand on Human Rights, dismissing the notion that it is an "internal matter," and he has made it also a condition of Foreign Aid. It is to the President's credit that he has not only raised this issue, but has succeeded in arousing the world's "interest" in behalf of this cause. "Unofficially," however, there is a great deal more that the U.S. government can do to make foreign aid even more productive.

This Nation, with a healthy intuition, indeed, conviction, recognizes that its economic system must not be based on crass materialism. Nothing expresses this idea more eloquently and forcefully than the motto on the American Dollar—"In G-d We Trust."

In giving out billions of dollars in foreign aid, many discreet ways can be found to have the beneficiaries take a look and ponder on this inscription, with a view to encouraging them to recognize the importance of Trust in G-d, of appropriate education, with particular emphasis on moral values and general humanitarian principles, as mentioned above.

Carrying this train of thought further brings us also to the question of military aid.

Ideally, education should lead to a world state where "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they train for war" (Isaias 2:4). Until such an ideal state is reached, there will be a need—in the Nation's own interest—to provide friendly, democratic nations with military aid for self-defense, but not to provide military aid to nations that will use it to start war. It would surely be in the best interests of those countries themselves, as well as of the United States and the world at large, if, instead, goodwill and benevolence towards them were expressed in terms of economic and cultural aid, to help them raise a new generation free from hatred and violence and bent on channelling their youthful energies and ambitions towards all that is good, good for them and for their countries, and for the common good of humanity, both materially and spiritually.

* * * * *

In light of all that has been said above, it is most gratifying indeed that President Carter, Vice-President Mondale, and the eminent members of the United States Congress, G-d bless each and all of them, have thoughtfully and graciously initiate and associated themselves with the Proclamation of "EDUCATION DAY, U.S.A." It augurs well for the vital cause of education in the United States. It will, we hope and pray, also have a beneficial impact on education in all countries which look up to the United States of America for leadership and inspiration in all vital matters that transcend national boundaries, and conduce to a better human society and a better world.●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS—X

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Americans incarcerated in Turkish jails continues to receive attention from a wide range of concerned individuals. In recent days I have suggested a prisoner exchange treaty between the United States and Turkey should precede lifting of the Turkish arms embargo. The latest information I have reviewed describing the abhorent condition of pris-

ons in Turkey, makes it absolutely necessary that the U.S. Department of State take firm and deliberate steps to expedite a prisoner exchange treaty similar to the "European Convention on the Validity of Criminal Judgments," to which Turkey is already a party.

For the information of my colleagues, I include a chilling article by columnist Jack Anderson entitled "Turkey's Prisons: Heartbreak Houses", from the Washington Post of June 27, 1978. I urge your sympathetic consideration of this tragic episode.

The article follows:

TURKEY'S PRISONS: HEARTBREAK HOUSES

(By Jack Anderson)

President Carter's move to lift the U.S. arms embargo against Turkey has a special urgency for five Americans now interned in Turkish prisons. If Congress can be persuaded to end the embargo, the five might be sent home to finish their sentences in the United States.

For several months, American and Turkish diplomats have been discussing a prisoner exchange treaty, similar to the pacts recently negotiated with Mexico and Canada. The Turks have been acutely sensitive about the idea, because it implies that their treatment of prisoners is less than humane. Given the strain in Turkish-American relations over the arms embargo, there is little chance the Turks would give up the five Americans.

Over four months ago, U.S. officials gave the Turks a draft of the proposed prisoner exchange treaty with Bolivia and suggested it be studied as a model for an American-Turkish pact. But a confidential source said: "There has been little feedback. They are really dragging their feet." Added another insider: "If the embargo is lifted, things could get better."

At the urging of the Turkish government, I sent my associate Joe Spear to Turkey. The Turks promised that Spear would be permitted to visit a Turkish prison.

The penal institutions in Turkey, Spear determined, fully deserve their notorius reputations. The food is barely edible; sanitation conditions would fail flophouse standards in the United States; brutality by prison guards is an accepted, if unofficial, way of life. A favored form of punishment, said confidential sources, is flailing recalcitrant prisoners mercilessly on the soles of their bare feet with long sticks.

Even worse than the guards are the surly, ruthless Turkish hoods who belong to the "Turkish mafia." Armed with guns and knives smuggled in, and aided by informers, they control the prison population and run the rackets behind prison walls.

The mafia also trafficks in hashish and heroin. "The stuff comes over the walls at night," said one former prisoner. "The authorities try to control it, but they just can't do it."

In fairness to the Turkish authorities, they give preferential treatment to foreign prisoners, especially Americans. In each institution, the foreigners are assigned to a special area called the "tourist section." The Turks also take pains to locate American prisoners in prisons where U.S. consular officers can visit them conveniently.

In Ankara, Spear interviewed the director of Turkish prisons, Dr. Mustafa Yucel, who earned his Ph.D. in law at New York University. The gruff but likable Yucel apparently had done his homework before the meeting. He began by pointing a finger at Separ and declaring: "I know all about you!"

He then launched into a tirade about the negative stories that have been published about Turkish prisons. He pulled a book from a shelf and slammed it down on his desk, "Lies! All lies!" he shouted.

The book was "Midnight Express," written by Billy Hayes, a young American who spent five years in Turkish prisons and finally made a daring dash for freedom. Snorted Yucel: "They say the prisons are schools for criminals. But this book," he said, stabbing it with his finger, "is proof that Turkish prisons are schools for writers."

With Yucel's permission, Spear flew to Istanbul and drove out to Sagmalcilar prison, whose grey stone eminence looms over a grimy industrial suburb known as Bayrampasa. The institution holds about 3,000 inmates, some 150 of whom are "political prisoners" detained for shooting or bombing people who don't share their ideologies.

His institution, said the director, was built in 1968 and was "the most modern prison in the Middle East." Prisoners are served two meals a day, he said, but can purchase extra food in a canteen if they have the money. There are also "common rooms," he said, containing TV sets, refrigerators, foreign newspapers and books.

Spear visited with Michael Ray, a native of Little Rock, Ark., who has spent five years in Turkish prisons. A wiry, dark-complexioned man in his mid-30s, Ray looked Turkish and, indeed, spoke the language fluently.

He had been arrested near the Syrian border in 1973, he said, with a half-ton of hashish in his possession. "I am a capitalist," he shrugged. "I was trying to make some money." He took the rap for his girlfriend, who accompanied him. His sentence: 101 years.

This has now been reduced to 24 years—leaving him, he said, with a wry smile, "only 18 years to go." He served time in several Turkish prisons, "from the worst to the best. The worst are awful. This is the best."●

AN OLD WASHINGTON HAND RETIRES

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the retirement from the Washington scene of a former resident of my home town, Pueblo, Colo., who in the finest sense of the term can truly be called "an old Washington hand."

Clifford Guest, a vice president of Hill & Knowlton, the public relations firm has been serving his clients as a monitoring and listening post on Washington for the past 29 years. During that time he has earned the respect and admiration of not only his colleagues and business relations, but from those who have served in Congress, Government agencies and the journalism profession as well. To all, he has been an open, honest and effective communicator.

Prior to joining Hill & Knowlton, Inc., Mr. Guest was managing editor for American Aviation Daily in Washington—1943–1949—and before that he was the administrative assistant to former Representative J. Edgar Chenoweth (R-Colo.).

It is, however, his roots in Colorado that bring pride to our State for the rich and rewarding experiences that he carried with him to Washington. In 1912, at the age of 12, Cliff Guest crossed the prairie from Phoenix to Rocky Ford, Colo., in a covered wagon with his family. There he received his high school education while he helped his family run a farm. Through high school he worked as a stringer for the Pueblo Chieftain and following graduation became a reporter and subscription salesman to outlying towns at $10 a week. Thus, Cliff Guest began a career with the Chieftain that lasted from 1928 until 1939, and ended with an editorship.

Those who know Cliff Guest, I am sure join me in wishing him and his wife Marge the most pleasant retirement and thank him for his many years of professional service both in and out of Washington.●

TURKEY ARMS EMBARGO

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, soon after the House returns from the Fourth of July recess, Members will be considering legislation authorizing international security assistance for fiscal year 1979. An important feature of the bill, H.R. 12514, is a provision to remove the embargo on military assistance and sales to our NATO ally, Turkey.

Because of the interest of Members in this matter, I am placing in the RECORD the following letter received from Gen. Alexander Haig, Jr., Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

SHAPE, BELGIUM,
June 24, 1978.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to the request of the members of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, it is a pleasure to furnish to the Committee my views as Supreme Allied Commander Europe and US Commander-in-Chief Europe concerning the importance of Turkey's full and active participation in the Atlantic Alliance.

Since the Second World War, Turkey has served as the West's strong democratic bastion on the Southern flank of Europe. In its key location Turkey guards the strategic chokepoints of the Dardanelles and Bosporus, constraining Soviet naval movements from warm water ports in the Black Sea to the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean. As a land buffer to the Soviet Union, Turkey serves also as the northern guardian of the Middle East and Africa to restrict Soviet access by air and land to these strategically significant areas. Turkey also provides for the United States intelligence sites of unique, irreplaceable value.

Equally significant to me as Supreme Allied Commander is Turkey's central role in the complex and demanding task of defending the Southern Region, where there are four interrelated but separate security challenges which must be solved; they are the defense of (1) the Italian peninsula, (2) Greek and Turkish Thrace, (3) Eastern Turkey, and (4) the maritime area of the Mediterranean. The key to the defense of three of these four areas rests ultimately on Turkey's geostrategic contributions.

Of particular relevance in the context of the current debate is the importance of Turkey to the defense of Greece and Grecian Thrace. So long as Turkey remains within the Alliance, any Warsaw Pact attack on Greece would be a highly risky adventure,

while without Turkey's support the defense of Greece is vastly more difficult.

Nor is the significance of Turkey to NATO limited to its key position on the Southern flank, for if the flanks of the Alliance are neutralized by political or military action, the center must bear the full weight of the adversary's efforts.

Thus, whole-hearted participation of this proudly democratic nation in the affairs of the Alliance is indispensable to our own security as well as that of Greece and other NATO allies.

From the perspective of their vital security interests, the impact of the arms embargo has been grievous. The disruption of military supplies, on which Turkey was totally dependent, has converged with the wall of obsolescence resultant from Turkey's World War II vintage equipment to render Turkish forces less than capable of meeting potential Soviet aggression in the area; at the same time the embargo has disrupted the broader aspects of Turkey's relationships with the West.

Prompt action designed to normalize an increasingly estranged military relationship and assure for the West the full contribution of this valued ally is essential. Time has run out.

Warm regards,

ALEXANDER M. HAIG, Jr.,
General, United States Army
Supreme Allied Commander.

CONGRESSIONAL PUBLIC FINANCING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, public financing of congressional campaigns is both a topical and much-discussed subject. In the May 24, 1978 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 15,378, I attempted to clarify some of the statements made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a memo sent to individuals in my district. Since many may be confused when public financing is described as a "taxpayer subsidy" or using "public funds," I have, in several instances, sought to make clear that the matching money used to finance campaigns comes from the voluntary checkoff. It should be stressed that the entire system is based on freedom of choice. Candidates are free to participate or refrain from participating in the system. Taxpayers are free to check off or to refrain. At this point, I insert Mr. Davis' reply to my earlier letter.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1978.

Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: This is in response to your letter of May 24, concerning my memorandum of May 5 to certain National Chamber members about the expected effort in the House to pass legislation that would provide taxpayer subsidies for congressional election campaigns.

Incidentally, I appreciate your placing my memo in the Congressional Record. Although it was intended for our members, I welcome the opportunity for more Members of Congress to learn of our opposition to the scheme for using tax dollars to subsidize their election campaigns. Many, of course, already share our distaste for this scheme. Unfortunately, you and some others do not.

You say my memo contains "several misstatements and misunderstandings," and so you thought I would "appreciate learning more about the amendment from one of its authors." Well, I always appreciate hearing from authors, because I figure I need all the help I can get to understand some of the things proposed in Congress. But, I've read and reread both your letter and my memo, and I still don't recognize the "misstatements and misunderstandings" you mentioned.

Obviously, we're looking at the same thing—but seeing it in an entirely different way. And I guess that isn't too surprising. More and more, there seem to be sharp differences in the attitudes of those who are *in* government and those who are *out*. The so-called "tax revolt" is the most recent example. That, by the way, should help make clear to you and your allies that the American people are more than a little disturbed by their increasing tax burdens, and hardly in a frame of mind that would tolerate your plan for still another way to spend their taxes.

Although we are probably locked in disagreement over this issue, let me take this opportunity to emphasize some of our views on the subject.

The National Chamber and its over 74,000 members are in complete agreement with the laudable goals of perfecting the American electoral process through encouraging greater public participation in campaigns, raising the level of political competition, and enhancing the integrity of our democratic system of government and private enterprise—with the concomitant increase of greater public confidence in American institutions.

However, we are convinced that these goals would not be achieved by limiting the private system of campaign finance and launching a plan for government collection and disbursement of campaign dollars. That is nothing more than increased government control and regulation of the political process. We have confidence in the American people to support viable and attractive candidates, and in a public policy predicated upon the time-honored and tested tradition of private financing of election campaigns.

The American people are opposed to changing the present system. In the most recent public opinion poll on the question, over 67 percent of respondents disapproved of a proposal to use public funds to pay the costs of congressional campaigns. Academic review by professors from highly regarded universities ensured the validity of this measurement of public sentiment. This poll could be cross referenced with the results of the tax checkoff for Presidential races. No more than 27 percent of federal taxpayers have ever checked off, whereas 40 percent or more have actively opposed it by checking the "no" box on the tax form. If you add the negatives to those checking neither box, nearly three-fourths of the taxpayers have demonstrated they do not want campaign subsidies. Clearly, most Americans want to continue to make up their own minds about whose campaign to support.

In a democratic system, the incentive to contribute arises from the desire of voters to assist in the election of candidates in whom they believe. Americans would have no respect for a system in which they would have to finance, even indirectly, the barnstorming of a proliferation of non-serious candidates, or candidates whose stand on issues is contrary to theirs.

Public finance is not only an unacceptable goverment intrusion into American political life; it is potentially a very expensive one. With minimum competition of two qualifying candidates per House seat, it could cost the treasury $43.5 million per election. Assuming subsidies for Senate candidates as well, the total would be far greater than that. We can find no excuse for diverting such sums from general revenues intended to fund the federal government—which faces a debt that is already $700 billion and growing larger each day.

Yet, these huge estimates of the cost of "partial" public financing do not represent the total cost to the taxpayer. A large addition to the staff of the Federal Election Commission would be required to administer the program. Consider the 1976 Presidential campaign experience: Fifteen Presidential candidates submitted voluminous paperwork that occupied 15 percent of the Commission staff and budget in 1976 and 1977. If only two candidates run for each House seat, the FEC would have to administer matching funds for 870 contestants. FEC Commissioner Stabler has estimated that at least 200 more auditors would have to be hired. The increase in the size of this bureaucracy would be staggering.

This expensive financing plan which most Americans resist is illusory as a reform of the election sytem. In fact, it would be destructive of our democratic process because it would probably translate into less real competition for House seats. The campaign expenditures ceiling would make it very difficult for a successful challenge to be mounted against an incumbent.

From 1968 to 1974, 89.6 percent of incumbents seeking reelection were successful. In 1976, 96 percent were reelected. The advantage of incumbency—office space, staff, the frank, etc.—worth well over a half million dollars in an election year, is a clear reason why it is difficult to mount a successful challenge. To offset this advantage virtually requires that a challenger out-spend the incumbent. But under your proposal, both challenger and incumbent are held to the same expenditure limitation. That's about as fair as a contest between the New York Yankees and the Bad News Bears. It's no wonder that those who have really thought through your plan consider it an "Incumbents Protection Act."

For such reasons as these, we cannot support the proposal for subsidizing congressional election campaigns. And I continue to be disappointed that you do.

Inasmuch as you placed your letter to me in the Congressional Record, I would appreciate your doing the same with this reply.

Cordially,

HILTON DAVIS,
Vice President, Legislative Action.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK J. GRIMES—LEADER OF IRISH-AMERICAN COMMUNITY IN NEW YORK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound personal loss that I pay tribute to a giant of the New York Irish American community, Patrick J. Grimes who passed away on June 19 at the age of 88.

Mr. Grimes was involved in Irish American affairs for some 75 years. His career began in 1911 the very first year he arrived in America after emigrating from Knockbarron, Kinnitty County Offaly in Ireland. In that year Patrick

Grimes joined the first of many organizations he would lend his talents and energies to, the Clan- na Gael of New York where he was able to continue his interest in hurling. Patrick Grimes excelled in the sport of hurling and he achieved his best fame as a member of the renowned Offaly teams of the 1920's which competed both nationally and abroad.

Patrick Grimes served his Nation with distinction as a member of the U.S. Army during World War I. He served with an Army unit which was attached to the French Army. During his Army career he was the recipient of nine battle stars.

One of Patrick Grimes' greatest contributions to the Irish American community was his instrumental role as one of the founding members of the New York Association of the Gaelic Athletic Association which was established in 1914. From 1927 to 1940 Pat Grimes operated Innisfail Park in the Bronx which was the site where many GAA games were played. He was active in the New York GAA all his life. He served as president of the association in 1923, 1924, 1929, and 1956. He made countless other contributions to the success of the New York association which enjoys a good reputation around the Nation and in Ireland.

In 1920, Patrick Grimes entered the business world with a flourish when he founded what was to become the world famous Grimes Travel Agency located at Columbus Circle in Manhattan. In his more than half century in the travel business Pat Grimes gained a reputation as a dedicated and innovative businessman. In 1947 he instituted the Flight of the Gaels in which thousands of Americans were able to travel by air to Ireland for the first time. His business was always successful and constantly expanding and by 1961, Pat Grimes had to open a second Grimes travel agency in White Plains.

In 1956, Patrick Grimes acquired the Irish Echo newspaper. Here again providing leadership, energy, and initiative techniques, he transformed the Echo into the leading Irish American newspaper. As publisher, Pat Grimes converted the paper from standard to tabloid size, increased advertising and presented a wide variety of features ranging from news and commentary to entertainment to sports. Some of the best writers from Ireland were constant contributors to the Irish Echo. The famous Green Irish Echo masthead was known to millions of Irish Americans across the Nation.

As one who has been actively involved with the Northern Ireland problem throughout my 10 years in the Congress, I have always admired the objectivity and fairness of the Irish Echo. I also recognize how influential it is to the Irish American community as well as members of the government in Ireland. The leadership, the inspirations and the dynamism of the Irish Echo was provided by Patrick Grimes.

A number of Irish-American organizations boasted Patrick Grimes as a member. He was a founding member of the Offaly Social and Athletic Club. He was a member of the American Irish Historical Society and Bronx Division 7 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. He was also a member of the Westchester Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

It seems logical that a man of the caliber of Patrick Grimes would be the recipient of many awards. In addition to serving as president of the New York Association of the GAA, Pat Grimes also served as president of the United Irish Counties Association in 1945 and 1946.

The highest honor accorded this outstanding man came in 1971 when he was elected grand marshal of the New York St. Patrick's Day parade. Many consider this the highest and most visible honor given to an Irish American, for on St. Patrick's Day the grand marshal is the leader for the millions of Irish real or adopted who come to participate in this world famous event. The date March 17, 1971, was one of Patrick Grimes' finest hours.

Pat Grimes was an immigrant but like so many others, he came and contributed to a better America. He was a tireless worker, a man of innovation, dedication, and compassion. He prided himself on his values. Within the large Irish-American community, Pat Grimes was a leader of the highest order. He championed the unique Irish spirit in all his endeavors and was a hero to many Irish Americans.

Patrick Grimes was a totally dedicated family man. He was married to the late Beatrice Cassidy of Blacklion, County Cavan. He is survived by two sons, Patrick H. and John as well as a daughter Mary (Mrs. Thomas F.) Farrell, a sister Kate in Ireland and eight grandchildren. To all the Grimes' family I extend my sincere condolences on their loss and assure them it is shared by many thousands.

Champion athlete, successful businessman, respected publisher, active civil and ethnic leader, this was Patrick J. Grimes. These attributes, combined with his strong personal stature and compassion for his fellow man, made Patrick Grimes an exemplary human being. He will be missed but his legacy will endure for many years to come.

I now wish to insert into the RECORD the lead editorial in his beloved Irish Echo entitled "Patrick J. Grimes 1889–1978":

PATRICK J. GRIMES 1889–1978

Publisher, Businessman, Soldier, Athlete, Irish Community Leader.

Founding member New York Gaelic Athletic Association, 1914.

Member U.S. Army forces in Europe, World War I, 1917–1919.

President, New York Gaelic Athletic Association, 1923, 24, 29 and 56.

President, United Irish Counties Association, 1945 and 46.

Founder-President, Grimes Travel Agency, 1920–1978.

Publisher-President, Irish Echo Newspaper Corporation, 1956–1978.

Grand Marshal, New York St. Patrick's Day Parade, 1971.

Friend, Advisor, supporter to scores of Irish American organizations.●

A REPORT ON THE ECONOMY OF SPAIN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a most interesting article concerning the economic development of Spain.

The article was written by Mr. W. R. Morrish, Editor and Publisher of the LaPorte (Indiana) Herald-Argus.

The article follows:

SPAIN SEEKS BALANCE GROWTH

(By W. R. Morrish)

MADRID.—Long treasured by artist, historian and tourist alike for her rich cultural heritage, Spain has recently fascinated the whole world with a new and paradoxical spectacle: a return, after 40 years of authoritarian rule, to parliamentary democracy under a Bourbon king.

But Spain means more to us than the elegant Goyas and El Grecos in the Escorial and the Prado, more than the Oriental splendor of the Alhambra, certainly more than her playgrounds for the rich along the Costa del Sol and the Costa Bravo. More even than the drastic political reorientation, the "reforma sin ruptura," reform without a break with the past, currently being undertaken by her handsome young monarch, Juan Carlos I, and her equally telegenic young premier, Adolpho Suarez.

To Hoosiers and other Americans Spain means soybeans and shoes and other items of import and export. And U.S. investments, not just in an overseas naval base and air bases, but in automobile and farm implement plants.

And as part of the world's economic community, Spain—how she prospers or fails to prosper—holds significance for all men and women everywhere on this shrinking planet. For Spain is the world's tenth, or eleventh, national economy, depending upon how calculated. Population: 40 million. With a gross national product (GNP) of 118 billion dollars. Compared to the U.S. GNP of two thousand billion this may not sound like much. But it remains a sizable piece in the mosaic of the western European economy. And it has potential for growth.

To examine that potential the writer interviewed two knowledgable young people here in Spain's capital. They were Mark J. Platt, first secretary and financial economist for the American embassy, and Srta. Pilar Garcia Donoro, of the Spanish Economics Ministry, first assistant to Anselmo Calleja, Director-General of Economic Forecasting.

BOOM IN THE 1960'S

Spain in the 1960s enjoyed an economic boom, unprecedented since the gilded days of her American empire, moving dramatically toward a modern consumer economy as her chronic unemployment was temporarily relieved by the short-term exodus of a million-plus Spaniards to work in the burgeoning industries of northern Europe.

Then came the worldwide recession, triggered by the Arab oil embargo and the fourfold increase in the price of crude. And with the recession the return of hundreds of thousands of the temporary emigrants whose fat paychecks translated into remittances home, along with tourism, had built for Spain an extraordinarily favorable balance of payments.

Added to these burdens was the long final illness and death in 1975 of "El Caudillo,"

Gen. Francisco Franco, and the political uncertainty which the resultant national trauma implied—discouraging business investment from abroad and at home alike.

The formal accession of Juan Carlos as king, and the election in June 1977, of the first freely chosen Cortes (parliament) in more than half a century, did not solve the economic problem. In fact, the heady experience of political freedom distracted from its growing seriousness as the balance of payments turned negative, industry languished, jobs vanished and inflation soared to a debilitating annual rate (in 1977) of 26.5 percent.

But it is a tribute to the resilience and realism seemingly built into the Spanish character over the centuries that all major elements of Spanish society boldly addressed themselves to the economic problem at an historic series of meetings in mid-1977. And at a time when Spaniards' energies were still absorbed in the second phase of the delicate political transition leading to the drafting of a new constitution!

SIGNING OF THE PACTS

The result: the so-called "Moncloa Pacts," in October, 1977, named for the little palace which is Premier Suarez's official residence—a kind of combination social contract and master economic plan, including short-term austerity measures and long-term reforms aimed at restoring market competition and redistributing job opportunities throughout Spain's several regions.

While Franco's corporate state (modeled after Mussolini's) actually pre-empted the private sector less than the takeovers instigated by many so-called social-democratic western European governments, it was nonetheless stultifying in that it dominated key industries. And manufacturing was heavily concentrated in Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia and the northwest at the expense of underdeveloped agricultural Andalusia to the south.

All this is to change under Moncloa. Paralleling the political bow to home rule for restive regions like Catalonia, the national economy is to be decentralized as much as feasible. Manufacturing is to be encouraged wherever it is logical as a means of generating employment.

And agriculture is not to be neglected. In 1960 42 percent of the Spanish labor force was on the farms and in the vineyards producing 24 percent of the national GNP. In 1977 20 percent was engaged in agriculture turning out 10 percent of the GNP. Spain, which should, like France, be able to feed itself, remains a net importer of foodstuffs. Under Moncloa, Spanish farming is to be modernized. Although other European Economic Community (EEC) nations profess to fear competition of cheap Spanish agricultural exports if Spain comes into the Common Market, as she aspires to—EEC economists have told Spain she must increase her production of cereals and dairy products if she is to successfully participate in the Common Market. This means farm implements which Spain can ill afford to import but must probably manufacture at home.

A sidelight on Spain's agricultural dilemma involves soybeans (an Indiana export), which she insisted be exempted from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) for fear of competing with her vital olive oil processing industry. As protectionist sentiment against importing relatively inexpensive but quality Spanish-made shoes mounts in the U.S., the soybean exemption from GATT is increasingly cited.

DEVALUATION OF THE PESETA

Facing up to her balance of payments deficit, Spain's first act in July, 1977, even before Moncloa, was to devalue the peseta. Even so this was done in moderation and the peseta stands in today's currency markets as neither particularly "hard" nor particularly "soft." Tourism is still a prime source of foreign exchange and is being promoted vigorously (although, from the writer's personal observation, a little more emphasis on logistics and maintenance in the hotels might help).

Although Spain has coal in the northwest, fuelling her well-established steel industry, coal, they say, is not the key to energy self-sufficiency. Three nuclear-powered electricity generating plants are in operation. Five are under construction. Moncloa calls for ten within the next decade. For the time being though Spain is painfully dependent on imported oil. Gasoline sells in Spain for $1.80 per gallon. (In neighboring Portugal it is $3.00 a gallon!)

What then have the sophisticated managers of Spain's New Economic Policy, aided by the Moncloa Pacts, accomplished to date?

First and foremost, they have reduced the inflation rate to an annual rate of 15 to 17 percent. And 17 percent was their modest goal. Remember, it was 26.5 percent in 1977.

The unemployment rate remains at seven to eight percent—a formidable figure for Spain because of the "ripple effect" it has for underemployment here and in view of the fact that Spanish unemployment insurance remains in its infancy.

But there is hope.

Foreign exchange reserves are up again—at an all-time high in fact—giving promise of means to import vitally needed capital goods, modern technology to generate jobs.

FOREIGN INVESTORS CONFIDENT

Caterpillar and John Deere are already in Spain, ready to expand production as the market may require.

Citroen is here and the Fiat-built Spanish-model SEATS are rolling off the production lines and onto the highways in impressive numbers. Chrysler has been making cars here for some time. And Ford is coming into Valencia with a $500,000,000 assembly plant to build the popular Fiesta. There are hard-headed businessmen who predict that Spain will soon become one of the major automobile manufacturing centers in Europe.

The Spanish government expects to finance its modest deficit through foreign borrowing—not through the World Bank or other such lending sources smacking of "foreign aid," but through Triple-A bonds. (Spain has never defaulted on its bonds, the proud Spaniards point out.) The prestigious First Boston Corporation is here now, preparing a detailed economic analysis which the Spanish hope will gain the coveted Moody's and Standard & Poor's rating for their bonds.

Spain hopes to go first class into the future. Let us hope she can.

Meanwhile, Spain projects a GNP growth this year of one to two percent.

This would mean, as Mr. Platt and Srta. Donoro point out, Spain had definitely "turned the corner."

All things considered, that in itself would be a considerable achievement.●

SAUDI ARABIA CONTRIBUTES $200,000 TO THE UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia delivered to me a check in the sum of $200,000 representing that nation's contribution to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC). The check, which has now been submitted to our State Department for transmittal to UNFDAC, constitutes the largest cash contribution made by the Arab community since the fund was established in 1971 and it represents one of the largest cash contributions to the fund by any nation. Only the United States, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, Japan (including a substantial private donation), and the Federal Republic of Germany have equaled or surpassed the Saudi contribution.

In February of 1977, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), on behalf of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I participated in the 27th session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs held in Geneva, Switzerland, and argued in the plenary session that "too many nations, including some of the world's largest nations, are conspicuous by their absence from the list of contributors" to UNFDAC's budget, that too many nations, including nations from the Arab community, contributed only token amounts to the fund, and that "a more equitable assumption of the fiscal responsibilities of the world's narcotic problems" is urgently needed if mankind is going to win the "war" on narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

Subsequent to the Geneva conference, I discussed the problems of drug abuse prevention and control with many leaders throughout the world. In January of 1978, along with the Committee on International Relations, I visited the Middle East and had the opportunity to personnally discuss with the Saudi Arabian Crown Prince and First Deputy Prime Minister Fahd ibn Abd al-Aziz Al Saud and other Saudi officials the problems of narcotic trafficking and abuse. From our discussions, it became obvious that Saudi Arabia desired to intensify its efforts in waging "war" on drug abuse.

According to Mathea Falco, senior adviser to the Secretary of State and Coordinator of International Narcotics Matters, Saudi Arabia's recent contribution is "a dramatic demonstration to support for UNFDAC and for increased international cooperation in combating drug abuse." The contribution is also a substantive departure from its previous sparing financial commitment to the fund. In 1971, the year that UNFDAC was established, Saudi Arabia contributed $2,000; in 1974, it contributed $5,000; in 1975, $25,000; and in 1976, $50,000. The Saudi contribution of $200,000, which is more than twice the $82,000 contributed during the 7-year period from 1971–77, is a fourfold increase from its 1976 contribution to the fund. Hopefully, this outstanding example set by Saudi Arabia will be an inspiration to other nations, especially within the Arab community, to follow the Saudi leadership by contributing to UNFDAC or by increasing their contributions.

To date, for its 1978 budget, UNFDAC has received pledges or receipts amounting to only $6,361,000, with the United

States pledging $3 million, Norway $2.4 million, Sweden $511,000, Saudi Arabia $200,000, and the rest of the international community, including nations from Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America, a paltry $250,000.

From January 1 through December 7, 1977, 38 nations contributed a total of $8,051,000 to UNFDAC, of which the United States contributed nearly 50 percent to the fund's total budget. Norway contributed $1,448,000; the Netherlands, $500,000; Sweden, $496,000; Denmark, $428,778; Japan, $365,176 (including $160,000 from the Japanese Shipbuilding Industry Foundation); and the Federal Republic of Germany, $215,376. Thirty-three nations contributed only $962,000 or an average of $29,153 per nations, with many nations making miniscule contributions or no contributions at all.

Mr. Speaker, if the "war" on drugs is to be won, then clearly it requires the money, manpower, equipment, and the awareness that preventing and controling drug abuse is a global problem affecting all of mankind. And if leaders throughout the world truly mean what they say, then they will join with the nations who have committed themselves to providing the vital resources for combating the sophisticated criminal organizations engaged in narcotics trafficking and whose operations reach into every corner of the world, profiting from the human misery of drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Saudi Arabia for its significant contribution to UNFDAC and hope that other nations will soon follow its lead by increasing their support of this international effort to stamp out drug trafficking.●

HIS EXPERIENCE IN BOY SCOUTING IS JUST GOLDEN

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to a recent newspaper article in the Flint Journal of Flint, Mich., about a close friend and constituent of mine who has been honored for a half century in scouting. For 50 years Edward R. Kapp, Jr., has given unselfishly of himself for the benefit of generations of boys in the Flint area. He is one of scouting's very few 50-year veterans. The newspaper article gives a summary background of Mr. Kapp's accomplishments that I wish to have printed here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HIS EXPERIENCE IN BOY SCOUTING IS JUST GOLDEN

The richest account of the Tall Pine Council's history may rest in the head of Edward R. Kapp Jr., one of Boy Scouting's few 50-year veterans.

A council spokesman calls Kapp an inspiration to other adult leaders.

Kapp's Scouting history goes back to 1924, when at the age of 12 he joined Troop 33, sponsored by the Flint Masonic Temple.

Except for an interruption of about three years to serve in the Navy during World War II, Kapp has been in Scouting ever since.

He says the highlight of it all was in 1930, when he served as an aide to the late great march composer, John Philip Sousa. Sousa was in Flint to judge a national band contest. Kapp keeps a note that Sousa wrote to him afterwards.

"It gave me such feeling of importance, of belonging," Kapp said.

He calls Scouting "a wonderful organization in what it does for boys."

In 1929, he got a Life award, the second highest available to a Boy Scout. The Eagle award, a Boy Scout's highest, was not to come until 30 years later. Kapp made sure of that.

He wanted to get his Eagle when he had a son get one, so he put off getting the last badge. He and his son, Roger, became Eagles together in 1959. Roger is now a Scouting executive in the Chicago area.

Kapp's Eagle was presented by his first scoutmaster, Dr. Benjamin F. Miller, a Flint dentist who died in 1969.

Kapp has provided leadership to three Flint troops. During the 1930s, he was assistant scoutmaster of Troop 14 at Whittier Junior High School. During the 1950s, he was master of Troop 186 at Pierce School, and during the 1960s master of Troop 29 at First Presbyterian Church.

He received the Silver Beaver award, the highest a Scout council can give for volunteer service, in 1965.

Kapp has been merit-badge councelor for six badges; swimming, lifesaving, boating, canoeing, sailing and first aid. They are all focused on the great interest of his life: safety.

He spent much of his career as full-time director of safety programs for the local Red Cross chapter. Kapp was the second person to hold that post, and he developed a broad local Red Cross first-aid and water-safety program. He had been volunteer chairman of the chapter's disaster preparedness committee.

He left the post in 1965 to work for the Michigan Heart Association. He still does volunteer work for the association, teaching cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

Kapp is a descendant of auto pioneers. His father, who died in 1961, had an industrial career that included jobs with the old Weston-Mott Co., Buick, AC Spark Plug Division and General Motors Institute.

His mother, Cornelia Bassett Kapp, was the sister of a president of Buick. She died in 1968.

Kapp, approaching his 66th birthday, looks back on a life of community service with no regrets, he said.

He is still with the Tall Pine Council, as a member at large. He describes himself as a veteran Scout "who just won't give up the ghost."

At the council's appreciation banquet this spring Kapp was given his 50-year award, and the council believes that it has only two others who have received that.

Kapp said that a Scout leader should have these qualifications:

The love of working with young people.

Many skills.

The ability to motivate boys.●

ESTONIAN SCOUTING JAMBOREE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable events to be held in our country this year is about to occur next month in Jackson Township, N.J. The worldwide Estonian Scouting Jamboree "Koguja II" will take place July 6 to 17, bringing together from all over the world young scouts of Estonian descent.

Just 28 years ago, Soviet Russia occupied Estonia, and has yet to relinquish its control. Among other tragic consequences of this occupation was the end of Estonian scouting. In 1940, the Estonian scouting organization was liquidated by the Soviet authorities and many scout leaders were among the tens-of-thousands of Estonians arrested, imprisoned, and sent to Siberian labor camps. Scouting in Estonia continues to be outlawed today by the Soviets.

The strong determination and pride of the Estonians exiled from their homeland provides inspiration for all of us. A particularly important manifestation of this strength is the Koguja jamboree. The name "Koguja" means "one who gathers," an appropriate name for a Scouting jamboree which brings together Estonian youths from all over the globe in a testament to the strength and permanence of the Estonian culture.

Activities planned for the week include hikes, skills competitions, sporting events, and campfires. Among the special events are a day dedicated to the celebration and appreciation of Estonian culture, a day commemorating Estonian Youth Year, and numerous field trips. A Visitors' Day will end with the "Suurloke" (Great Campfire).

During the week, representatives will visit the Veterans' Memorial in Jackson Township, the All Wars Memorial, and the Legion of Estonian Liberation Memorial in Lakewood, N.J. During these visits, wreaths will be placed at these sites to honor those who sacrificed their lives in the fight for freedom.

I am particularly proud that this gathring of Estonian Scouts will be located in Ocean County. The Estonian Scouts, in carrying on the traditions both of international scouting and of a distinguished and enduring culture, will provide a stirring example to the rest of us observing their celebration.●

PUBLIC RANGE LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1978

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the House will consider H.R. 10587, the Public Range Lands Improvement Act of 1978. This bill is vital to the interests of the Western States, and I urge my colleagues to vote for passage. Of particular interest is the broad based support which has emerged for the bill in Wyoming—especially the important cooperation and alliance formed between Wyoming environmental and ranching interests. This new formed alliance was evidenced in an April 25 telegram which I ask be reprinted here:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RONCALIO: Representatives of the major Wyoming agricul-

tural and environmental groups met in Casper, Wyoming on April 11 to discuss H.R. 10587, at that time called the Public Grazing Lands Improvement Act. At the meeting we were in general support of its provisions but unanimously agreed that sections of the bill which tried to differentiate between "environmental impact improvements" and "non-environmental impact improvements" did not provide an adequate solution for a serious problem. Subsequent language changes and amendments to H.R. 10587, presently called the Public Range Lands Improvement Act, have clarified the legislative intent of how to deal with certain complex and important issues of public range land managegment.

We wish to express our support of H.R. 10587 and its provisions, and offer a suggestion for its improvement.

We approve of the section which deals with "environmental impact improvements" but feel that existing language pertaining to "non-environmental impact improvement" is still not adequate from an environmental and range land ecosystem management point of view.

We recommend, on page 13, line 18–22, striking the words "such non-environmental impact improvements shall not be considered a major federal action requiring a detail statement pursuant to section 4332(c) of title 42 of the United States Code:"

We recommend insertion of the following language in lieu thereof: "Such non-environmental impact improvements shall not require completion of the documents required by subparts (1 through 4) of subsection (F) of this section, unless the Secretary determines through the environmental analysis review (EAR) process that they will have a significant environmental impact, or, if the Secretary determines they are of such a minor nature as to not require an environmental analysis review (EAR):"

We hope this expression of our unified support for H.R. 10587 will contribute to its acceptances as a means to improve the quantity and quality of proper multiple use range land management practices on our public lands.

Wyoming Environmental-Agricultural Coalition, Wyoming Sierra Club, Laney Hicks; Wyoming Outdoor Council, Colleen Kelly; Northern Great Plains Regional Sierra Club, Bruce Hamilton; Wyoming Wilderness Society, Bart Koehler; Wyoming Public Lands Council, Tye Moore; Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Walt Reynolds; and Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Jim Magagna.

The changes requested by the signers of the telegram have been made, and H.R. 10587 now represents a truly balanced approach to the problems of improving the western range. I hope my colleagues will consider this in casting a strong "yea" vote for H.R. 10587 on Thursday.●

ERA RATIFICATION PERIOD

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over extension of the time period for ratification of the equal rights amendment, it has been assumed by both sides that the House joint resolution which accompanied the equal rights amendment, and which specified the ratification period, was easily severable from the proposed amendment itself.

An extremely interesting study done by a Washington University (St. Louis) law professor, Jules B. Gerard, has recently concluded that this is simply not the case. In a majority of States that have thus far ratified the amendment, the resolution specifying the time limit was a "material consideration," according to Professor Gerard. In my own State of Minnesota, for example, where I served as a State legislator at the time of ratification, the provisions of the joint resolution became an explicit part of what was being ratified.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Professor Gerard's findings contained in a letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee (Mr. RODINO). Although I have no illusions that they will do this, these findings should permanently lay to rest the case for extending the ERA's ratification period.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY,
St. Louis, Mo., June 14, 1978.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RODINO: Before your committee votes on H.J. Res. 638, I believe it is crucial to call to the attention of you and the other committee members that extending the period for ratification of ERA is likely to invalidate the ratifications of at least 24 states. The reasons are discussed in this letter.

At the hearings on H.J. Res. 638 before the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, everyone assumed that states had ratified only the proposed amendment, not the time limit under which it was submitted, and further that the time limit had played no major role in the ratification decisions. Both of these assumptions, it turns out, are demonstrably incorrect. Since submitting a short letter to Congressman Edwards' subcommittee, I have looked into the matter in some detail, with the following results.

(1) Many of the states stated explicitly in ratification documents that their ratifications are conditioned upon the time limit. For instance, Ohio's ratification reads, "whereas, Both Houses of the Ninety-second Congress . . . made a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit: [reciting the journal resolution]." Other states that ratified in identical, or substantially identical, terms are: Connecticut, Maine, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. This is a total of 10 states. If one adds Idaho and Nebraska, which since have rescinded their ratifications, the total is 12.

(2) Eight other states ratified as follows, quoting from the California document: "whereas, the 92nd Congress . . . has adopted House Joint Resolution No. 208 . . . proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit: [reciting the joint resolution]." Besides California, these states are: Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Washington, and West Virginia. It is perfectly obvious that these eight states acted on the basis that the language of the joint resolution was an essential part of what they were ratifying. The joint resolution, of course, included the seven-year limitation.

(3) Two states explicitly recite the time limit as a separate inducement persuading them to ratify. They are Oregon and Vermont.

(4) Two other states explicitly state that what was submitted to them for a vote was the joint resolution containing ERA, *not* ERA independent of the joint resolution. They are Iowa and South Dakota.

As with all enrolled legislation, these documents speak for themselves. It is unthinkable to suggest that Congress may alter the wording of a ratification, or pick what it chooses to accept and ignore the rest.

Any fair reading of these 24 ratification documents will lead one inevitably to the conclusion that the time limit was a material consideration to all of these states and that it is impermissible to presume that they would have ratified without it. The correctness of this conclusion is bolstered substantially by the fact that four states—Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island—clearly ratified ERA without adverting in any way to the time limit contained in the joint resolution. In other words, since a state obviously is capable of ratifying without mentioning the time limitation, it must be presumed that those who did mention it did so deliberately. In any event, the language of the 24 ratifications plainly includes the time limit.

If one adds to the 24 states that clearly conditioned their ratifications on the time limit those 4 states—Delaware, Hawaii, New York, and Texas—which mention the time limit without indicating a reason for doing so, the number of ratfications that would be placed in jeopardy by extending the time limit increases to 28.

To summarize: if the time limit is extended, (a) it is clear that only four ratifications will be incontestably valid; (b) it is equally clear that twenty (paragraphs (1) and (2)) will be incontestably invalid, and four more (paragraphs (3) and (4)) will be probably invalid; and (c) the ratifications of the other four are in jeopardy. (I was unable to locate the documents from Kentucky and Tennessee in preparing this statement.)

I have taken the liberty of sending copies of this letter, with the attachments, to all members of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JULES B. GERARD,
Professor of Law.

PROTECTING FARMERS AGAINST NATURAL HAZARDS

HON. MAX BAUCUS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, during the coming months Congress will consider proposals to protect farmers and ranchers from crop losses beyond their control. The Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee intends to hold hearings on various crop insurance and disaster protection proposals in late July. At this time I would like to submit information explaining the need for crop insurance and other financial protection, describing current programs, and explaining possible new options, including the one proposed by the administration.

NEED FOR FINANCIAL PROTECTION

Farming and ranching have always been high-risk occupations. Many of the factors involved in successful crop and livestock production are beyond the direct control of producers. Farmers are at the mercy of weather which can aid or ruin crop production. Extemes of heat and cold, hail, violent windstorms, and other unpredictable natural hazards

such as insect invasion and crippling diseases can seriously damage or wipe out crops and livestock. In fact, about 1 out of 12 acres planted each year never reach harvest.

Some farmers and ranchers prefer to bear their own risks. But because of the complexity of modern agriculture, crop insurance and other forms of financial protection have become accepted necessities.

Modern farming and ranching requires large investments of capital and land, buildings, machinery, livestock, and annual production inputs. Fixed costs are high and risks, too, are high every year when the farmer puts in his crops. Many farmers have to borrow money to plant their crops. The loss of that investment can mean the inability to pay not only that loan, but carrying charges on fixed assets.

CURRENT PROGRAMS TO PROTECT FARMERS

Presently production protection is offered by four Federal programs: Crop insurance; low-yield disaster payments from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; emergency loans from USDA's Farmers Home Administration; and emergency loans from the Small Business Administration.

First. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) is an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that administers a program of actuarially sound, all-risk crop insurance. The program has gradually been expanded since 1938 and now covers 26 crops in 1,522 counties in the United States. Administrative costs of the program are absorbed by the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, half of the counties in the United States and numerous crops are not included in this program. The coverage offered is below the cost of production—50 to 60 percent of total costs, including land, for producers of major crops with maximum coverage—As a result, only 14 percent of the eligible corp acreage is insured annually.

Second. The disaster payments program (DPP) was first implemented in 1974. The program is administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) of the USDA. The 1977 Farm Act modified the disaster payments program and extended it through 1970 to allow a new program to be developed.

The disaster program provides about $450 million annually to producers. However, only producers of six major crops—wheat, corn, barley, sorghum, rice, and cotton—are eligible for benefits. Losses must be greater than 25 percent of normal production for cotton and rice and 40 percent for other crops. Level of protection is only 30 percent of total production costs.

Third. The emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration is available to producers who suffer losses in designated disaster areas. This program has been continuously modified by legislation since its conception in 1918. FmHA's emergency loan program generally offers subsidized interest rates, and, at times, grants. Currently, loans of up to $250,000 are provided at 3 percent interest; interest is 5 percent for loans above that amount.

Emergency loan volume has varied greatly from year to year. As a result of widespread drought in the United States last summer, loans for 1978 are expected to be between $2 billion and $3 billion. Protection ranges up to 100 percent of production losses, and average repayment period is 7 years.

Loans have helped keep some producers out of bankruptcy. But many producers are ineligible because they cannot meet the required tests that credit be unavailable elsewhere. Other producers have suffered losses but could not apply for loans because their areas were not designated.

Fourth. The emergency loan program of the Small Business Administration is a new program for farmers, offered only since 1976. It is more liberal than the FmHA program in many ways. However, lack of SBA experience and capability for making and evaluating agricultural loans has resulted in confusion and discontent in recent months.

In addition to these four types of Federal Government programs, each year the private insurance industry offers about $8 billion of hail insurance to farmers for about $325 million in premiums. Because of the random nature of hail losses, private insurers can sell protection at rates that are both attractive to crop producers and profitable to themselves. About 25 percent of eligible acreage is covered by hail insurance.

POLICY OPTIONS

We in Congress might consider a wide range of options for new legislation to protect farmers from natural disasters. We can simply extend current programs. Or, we might eliminate the disaster program and expand Federal crop insurance. We might encourage the private insurance industry to offer multiperil crop insurance. We might amend the disaster program provisions to make the protection more in line with the needs of producers and to remove some of its unsound programs. And, we might extend the emergency loan program offered by FmHA to reach more producers.

Current programs provide reasonable income production to producers of wheat, feed grain, cotton, and rice. However, there is a much lesser level of coverage for producers of other commodities. Also, there is some overlap among the current programs.

Elimination of disaster payments with no offsetting changes would substantially reduce the Federal role in assuming a proportion of economic risks of losses from natural hazards. Producers of major crops would have a much more difficult time dealing with the financial problems of crop disasters. During the past year, many farmers in drought areas were able to stay in business only because of the disaster payments they received.

Expansion of Federal crop insurance could be of great assistance in helping producers to adjust to the uncertainty of natural hazards. However, current participation in crop insurance programs is too low to make the alternative viable. Two methods for increasing participation are increased sales activity and a premium subsidy.

Private insurance coverage might be expanded, but this would probably require Federal assistance in the area of subsidies, reinsurance assistance, or both. Private insurance companies have found that it is difficult for them to maintain reserves large enough to cover the risks of writing all-risk crop insurance. The large number of insurance companies and independent agents that sell other types of insurance to agricultural producers gives the private sector access to many potential buyers.

An expanded emergency loan program might help farmers reduce income instability. However, producers with low equity and income—particularly small farmers and those just starting in the business—are often so hard pressed that additional loans will not help. An expanded loan program would be more equitable than current policy in terms of availability of assistance. Participation would not be universal because some producers would be unable to carry additional debt.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL

The administration has proposed a crop insurance reform bill which spokesmen say would provide better protection for farmers than present programs at no additional cost to the Government. The proposed Farm Production Protection Act could consolidate the four present disaster assistance programs into one comprehensive, share-the-cost program. Coverage would be provided the first year for 18 crops which account for 89 percent of all cropland acreage. The program has potential for expansion to eventually cover all farm products including livestock.

Each farmer who participates in the proposed program would pay a premium on the level of protection he chooses and the risk involved in his farming operation. The cost of the insurance would be shared between the farmer and the government.

Under the program, each producer could choose from three levels of insurance coverage—50, 70, and 90 percent of normal crop production. The farmer would pay about half the actual cost of insurance for the minimum 50-percent protection. If he chose the 70-percent protection, he would pay for most of the cost of the additional 20 percent of protection. The farmer would pay all the cost for the final 20 percent of protection at the 90-percent level. These three levels might vary for different crops.

The insurance would be marketed through private insurance agencies and county ASCS offices. The program would be funded through USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation.

The proposed program would not eliminate all disaster programs. Those that cover land and building damage, flood damage to farms and commodities, and small business losses would remain.

The 18 crops initially covered by the proposal are wheat, cotton, corn, barley, grain sorghum, rice, sugar cane, sunflowers, citrus, dry beans, soybeans, oats, flax, peanuts, tobacco, raisins, sugar beets, and rye.

SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, farmers need programs to protect them from the uncertainties of nature. The economic risks of loss are too great for individual producers to bear alone. Failure on the part of the Federal Government to assume some portion of these risks will contribute to disinvestment, declining farm production, and higher consumer prices. As we study various crop insurance proposals during the coming months, we must insure that they will adequately protect farmers, that they are flexible enough to adapt to the widely varying conditions in our Nation's complex agricultural system, and that they treat producers equitably.

We need a better, more comprehensive program to provide protection for farmers against factors of production that are beyond their control. I intend to work with agricultural interests and my colleagues in Congress to develop such a program this year.●

WHY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY SHOULD BE RESTORED

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, pending before the Rules Committee is House Resolution 48, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) and me and which now has a total of 177 cosponsors. This resolution would restore the Committee on Internal Security which would have the authority to investigate threats of terrorism and subversion, develop necessary corrective legislation for our Federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies to meet these threats, and carry out oversight functions in these areas.

I ask those of my colleagues who have not yet cosponsored House Resolution 48 to do so at once and to join with us in urging the Rules Committee to report this resolution out for a vote before the end of this session.

A young college student, Stewart D. McLaurin, of Birmingham, Ala., who will be a sophomore at the University of Alabama this fall, has written an analysis of the need to restore the House Committee on Internal Security. Stewart McLaurin has worked this summer in my office under a program organized by Washington Workshops; his analysis reflects credit on the ability of the Washington Workshops to select excellent and well-informed students for their program, and also on his university and high school, Sades Valley High School, in Birmingham. I understand that Stewart's career goal is to be an attorney, certainly the manner in which he performed duties and conducted himself in my office indicate that he will bring considerable credit to the profession of law.

Stewart McLaurin has been able to comprehend something that many of my liberal colleagues seem to miss: That if we are killed by a terrorist bomb or are intimidated by an organization of totalitarian thugs, we lose all our civil and human rights. Knowledge of the plans of the enemies of freedom does not destroy freedom, it protects it. I offer for my colleagues consideration, Mr. McLaurin's article. His article without the appendixes follows:

WHY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY SHOULD BE RESTORED

During the last few years there has been a largely successful movement to weaken the preventive capabilities of law enforcement agencies. Intelligence files have been destroyed and the observation of violence-oriented groups has been eliminated. The House Committee on Internal Security (HCIS) has been abolished. Along with this, there has been a substantial increase in terrorist activity by factions which seek to attain their political goals by use of force and violence. As a result, innocent people are increasingly coming under attack, (i.e. being terrorized, held hostage and murdered), while restoration of the abolished HCIS would provide Congress with the data necessary to create legislation to deal with the growing threat to our security jeopardized by terrorist factions and their subversive supporters. Such action would enable the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and organizations like it, to resume their responsibilities in this field, and could prompt local law enforcement agencies to rebuild their intelligence-gathering capacities.[1] Restoration of the HCIS would be an appropriate and intelligent means of coping with the rising flood of terrorism and subversion which has resulted from the nearly total collapse of America's intelligence and internal security defenses. The need has never been more manifest.[2] Through its years of existence, the HCIS served to uncover and disclose several efforts to undermine the high principles of the United States. Its history of uncovering conspiracies, etc. speaks for itself and for its need today. Legislatively, the HCIS served to report on hundreds of bills and amendments which later proved to be cornerstones of American domestic preservation and protection.[3] To re-establish this committee could only serve to create a stronger national fortress against alien intelligence forces which plague our country like a cancer.

To give a comprehensive history of the HCIS would begin with its initial creation in 1938 as the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in 1969 changed to the Committee on Internal Security. Then, through a party whim, the HCIS was abolished in 1975. "The House of Representatives did not have the opportunity to vote on abolition which was achieved by a parliamentary maneuver. In 1974, the House voted to reject an attempt to abolish the Committee.[4] "

As for the specific function of the Committee, it had an official mandate directing it to:

". . . make investigations from time to time of (1) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, whether of foreign or domestic origin, their members, agents and affiliates, which seek to establish, or assist in the establishment of, a totalitarian dictatorship within the United States, or to overthrow or alter or assist in the overthrow or alteration, the form of government of the United States or any state thereof, by force, violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means, (2) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, of their members agents and affiliates, which incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism, or any unlawful means, to obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States, and (3) all other questions, including the administration and execution of any law in the United States, or any portion of the law, relating to the foregoing that would aid the Congress or any committee of the House in any necessary remedial legislation." [5]

Contributions made by the HCIS during its existence were not small in the least. Many investigations, reports and testimonies revealed significant problems within the United States concerning terrorism, subversion and espionage.

Among some of its more significant discoveries were:

"Extensive investigations into Soviet espionage: A major Soviet spy ring exposed by the Committee included high State Department officials such as Alger Hiss, officials in the Treasury Department, as well as other highly placed agents. Hiss was convicted of perjury as a result of the Communist Party, USA, the Committee found many links between the Party and Soviet espionage apparatus.

"Extensive investigations into the Communist Party, USA, revealed substantial Communist penetration into such sensitive areas of American society such as education, labor and communications. The committee's investigation of Communist penetration into the labor movement was substantially aided by members and officials of the American Trade Union Movement. As early as 1938, leaders of the American Federation of Labor appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities to present evidence of Communist infiltration and subversion. In 1949, the Congress of Industrial Organizations relied heavily on the Committee's investigations and expelled a number of affiliated unions that had fallen under Communist domination.

"In more recent years, the Committee investigated violence oriented groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society and the Black Panther Party. The Committee reported to Congress on the activities of such groups as they escalated their violence from street riots to terrorism. Remedial legislation, as well as action by the Executive Branch was based in part on the Committee's findings.

"During the last two years of the Committee, an extensive investigation was conducted on domestic and international terrorism. Much of the information now in the public record concerning this problem is based on the hearings and reports of the Committee." [6]

Now in 1978 we are confronted with issues demanding the same action, but the hands of American intelligence services are tied by their own regulations. In addition, they are blinded by the lack of enforcement ability.

Radical Leftists launched a successful campaign to destroy American internal security and have succeeded to the point of reducing the number of subversive cases investigated by the F.B.I. from 4,800 in 1976 to 214 in 1977. The number of Iron Curtain intelligence personnel working in the U.S. under diplomatic cover alone is close to 2,000.[7] There is, at the present time, no existing defense against internationally coordinated terrorist actions and threats. The resurrected House Committee on Internal Security would be a powerful factor in purging America of alien conspiracies. A revised Committee on Internal Security

Footnotes at end of article.

would be a bare minimum of what is now needed to arrest further infiltration.

The bureaucracy has such departments as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency, but these organizations do not possess the Constitutional authority to issue laws against subversive activity and provisions for those convicted of attemping to undermine the U.S.A.

One year after taking the oath of office as President of the United States, Jimmy Carter signed Executive Order 12036 which turned over U.S. intelligence services to a group of young academic Leftists who operate out of the Old Executive Office Building under the authority of Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director of the National Security Council. Such an array of executive intelligence agencies raise banners proclaiming to be the supreme authority, the immaculate expert, and the ultimate power when it comes to United States intelligence. None have the backing of the people or the Constitutional basis on which to function in such a way as to dictate American intelligence policy. Therefore, a source of intelligence investigation should arise out of our representative forces in Congress and cry out by action and with the voice of the people, that terrorism and subversive activity cannot and will not be tolerated. Bureaucratic machines dominate the international and domestic intelligence skyline, feeding themselves on their own quest for supreme jurisdiction.

A copy of the Attorney General's Domestic Security Guidelines, which have been made public, is attached. This guideline provides a form of investigation for such groups as the F.B.I. Also attached are the "content" pages of the annual reports of the House Committee on Internal Security (1969–1974). These reflections of content give evidence as to the myriad of issues once investigated by the much needed HCIS. (See Appendix A & B)

Congressman Gilman (R–N.Y.) stated in the Congressional Record on September 21, 1976:

"This country must take stronger steps in conjunction with other nations to deny a safe haven to terrorists and to establish sanctions against states which aid them or fail to prosecute or extradite them. I have long supported measures to put a stop to internal terrorism. . . . Unless we can protect those fundamental lines of government communication, terrorism will continue to threaten the very foundation of international relations. The impact of these acts are magnified as governments are forced to stand aside, appearing helpless or heartless and unable to protect their own officials and citizens." [8]

In agreement with the Congressman, I believe his testimony gives all the more reason to restore this necessary Committee. It would be detrimental to the U.S. to do away with the House Committee on International Relations; in that respect, how can one rationalize the demolition of a Committee that guards against alien intelligence infiltration and successful movements, plots, conspiracies and schemes.

Eleven bills have thus far been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives, 95th Congress, which seek to restore the House Committee on Internal Security as a standing committee. Unfortunately, as of March 7, 1978 none had been reported. These bills include:

House Resolution 15 by Mr. Ashbrook (R-Ohio).

House Resolution 48 by Mr. McDonald (D-Georgia) and others.

House Resolution 497 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 517 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 536 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 555 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 572 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 599 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 749 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 828 by Mr. McDonald and others.

House Resolution 912 by Mr. McDonald and others.

Currently 177 co-sponsors for these have been secured.

This further illustrates that it is an issue which has generated a great deal of concern, interest, and support over the last few months.

Justice Goldberg once stated that "The Constitution is not a suicide pact." Therefore, the First Amendment, pertaining to freedom of speech, was not designed to protect covert movements which are helping clandestine operations. It was, however, instituted to provide a means to speak out for or against the government. In light of this, the HCIS would not be any violation of the First Amendment.

Revival of the House Committee on Internal Security has a purpose, a need, and generous support. The only thing it lacks now is action by the Left wing liberals who sit perched on the lofty pedestals of Congressional seniority. Deterioration of the power to check alien intelligence cannot continue too much longer before we, as a country, will have hung ourselves with a noose of red tape from a bureaucratic limb. In light of this potential consequence, Congress must give close consideration to the recommendations presented that, the HCIS be restored as a standing committee in Congress and that the web of bureaucratic intelligence forces be restricted before America succumbs to a systematic takeover by foreign intelligences and powers.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Larry P. McDonald, M.C., "Dear Colleague" letter, U.S. House of Representatives, March 18, 1977.

[2] John Rees, "Security," *The Review of the News*, July 20, 1977, pp. 31–40. (Introduction).

[3] Herb Romerstein, "Fact Sheet on the House Internal Security Committee," 1977, pp. 1–3.

[4] Romerstein, p. 1.

[5] Romerstein, p. 1.

[6] Romerstein, p. 1 & 2.

[7] Rees, p. 35.

[8] Benjamin Gilman, M.C., *Congressional Record*, Sept. 21, 1976, p. 31584.

[9] Bill Digest; 95th Congress, pp. H–2, H–4, H–26, APP 8–25, H–28, APP 8–27, APP 8–28, APP 8–29, APP 8–36, APP 8–40, APP 8–44.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bill Digest, 95th Congress, Washington, D.C., 1978.

Gilman, Benjamin, M.C., *Congressional Record*, 95th Congress, Sept. 21, 1976, p. 31584.

Internal Security, House Committee on. Annual reports 1969–1974, content pages.

Judiciary, House Committee on, 94th Congress, hearing report on The Trans Alaskan Pipeline. April 1976–February 1977.

McDonald, Larry P., M.C., "Dear Colleague" letter, U.S. House of Representatives, March 18, 1977.

Rees, John, "Security," The Review of the News, July 20, 1977.

Romerstein, Herb, "Fact Sheet on the House Internal Security Committee," 1977.

UNITED STATES MUST PROTEST RUSSIAN SENTENCING OF VLADIMIR SLEPAK AND IDA NUDEL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, a new and heavy blow has fallen on the cause of human rights. The cruel action of the Soviet Union in sentencing Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel to long years in exile is an outrageous violation of their human rights. This official action of the Soviet Government is also a blunt message to the world that the U.S.S.R. will totally ignore the guarantee of human rights in the Helsinki Accords which Chairman Brezhnev signed with such ceremony in 1975. It is obvious the Soviet Government, concerned about the world protest to its policy of oppression, is making a ruthless attempt to crush all efforts of Soviet citizens to call attention to Soviet violations of the human rights section of the Helsinki Accords.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let this brutal challenge to human rights go unanswered. We must protest in the strongest terms to the Soviet leaders who are so blatantly ripping apart the solemn commitments they made in Helsinki nearly 3 years ago. We must unite in demonstrating our deep concern. I am sending a letter to Leonid Brezhnev denouncing this act of oppression, and pointing out the serious effects it could have on relations between the Soviet Union and our Nation. I urge my colleagues to join with me in such action.

Further, I am writing President Carter urging him to send a personal message to Chairman Brezhnev as a formal protest to the action taken against Slepak and Nudel, and recalling that in the Presidential campaign of 1976 Mr. Carter sent a telegram to Vladimir Slepak expressing personal interest in Slepak's human rights activities. If the President would follow up that interest with a formal protest, the cause of human rights would be given most significant support.

Such action would send a vital message throughout the world that the President of the United States will not ignore flagrant disregard for a solemn international agreement. It would serve notice on the Soviet leaders that their new campaign against human rights activists within the Soviet Union cannot stifle the will to freedom.

Moreover, such action would do much to strengthen the resolution of those courageous Soviet Jews who, despite the brutal Soviet tactics of suppression and oppression, continue to press for the freedom to emigrate to Israel.

Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel have demonstrated the greatness of the human will for freedom in refusing to bow down to the Soviet authorities. For years, despite threats and deliberate acts of persecution, they continued to work, not only for themselves, but for all Soviet Jews who seek freedom.

They deserve all the support we can give them.

Working together, Mr. Speaker, we can help their cause by focusing greater attention on the brutal, inhuman violation of human rights which has sent them into exile.●

THE SOVIET UNION IS THE MALICIOUS HOOLIGAN

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has once again demonstrated that it has little intention of living up to the Helsinki accords signed in 1975 by the Soviet Union and several other countries. On June 21, after a closed kangaroo-type proceeding, Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were sentenced to extremely harsh sentences for the "crime" of trying to leave the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families.

According to Soviet law, their crime was malicious hooliganism. Webster's 3d International Dictionary defines a hooligan as either a "ruffian" or "a person that as a representative of some special interest—as a political or racial philosophy—attempts to override the legal and human rights of other people." I think these definitions accurately describe the Soviet Government whose actions seem bent on subjecting Jews in the Soviet Union to relentless oppression. Who other than a hooligan would pour boiling water on the wife of Vladimir Slepak—who will go on "trial" in the near future—while she and her husband courageously hung a banner outside their window that said simply, "Let us out to our son in Israel." This hooligan act was committed by Soviet internal security agents.

The irony of this situation is far outweighed by the personal suffering of the Slepaks and Ida Nudel, and all of the refuseniks in Russia. These people have applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union and have been refused. As a result of their actions, these people lose their jobs, often their housing, and they become social outcasts under the surveillance of Soviet KGB agents. The Soviets make it almost impossible for Jews to live in Russia; at the same time they prevent Jews from leaving.

If the Soviet Union can approach the matter of human dignity and basic human rights in such a callous and pernicious manner, with total disregard for an international agreement, it reflects poorly on the entire spectrum of United States-Soviet relations. In order to establish the necessary international climate for a peaceful world, there must be a feeling of mutual understanding at least at a basic level. This vicious official state act would seem to indicate that at the present time, this basic level cannot be reached.●

IRISH LABOUR PARTY LEADER VISITS UNITED STATES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Cluskey, T.D., leader of the Irish Labour Party, was recently in the United States and met with a number of American leaders in Washington, D.C., on June 14. After his meetings, Mr. Cluskey made a statement in which he expressed the great concern of his party as well as that of the Opposition Party Fine Gael and the Irish Prime Minister over the continued violence in Northern Ireland. It is a fine statement and one which I believe my colleagues will find of great interest. The statement follows:

On the occasion of my visit to the United States I would like to associate myself with the statements on the question of violence in Northern Ireland made by the Taoiseach (Irish Prime Minister) Jack Lynch T.D. when he recently visited the United States. I share Mr. Lynch's view that the use of violence in Northern Ireland is not alone morally reprehensible but is a major obstacle to the unity of the Irish people and to political progress in Northern Ireland. As leader of the Irish Labour Party I join with the Irish Prime Minister Mr. Lynch, and indeed with the leader of the other Opposition Party Fine Gael, Dr. Garret FitzGerald, in comdemning the activities of the Irish Northern Aid Committee and the Irish National Caucus. These Organizations thus stand condemned by the entire spectrum of Irish political leadership.

The cause of human rights is a basic goal of my Political Party. That cause will not be helped if it is abused by those who have or who have had a public identification with the cause of violence. It is for this reason that I am concerned to learn of efforts being made to arrange Congressional hearings under the auspices of persons in the United States who have had an association with violence. Hearings under such auspices would not alone provide a platform for those who are destroying Irish lives but would create an impression, which would be tragic, that the cause of violence enjoys considerable political influence in the Capital of this great country.

Mr. Cluskey said that when in meeting American leaders he had expressed the gratitude of his party particularly to Speaker O'NEILL and Senator KENNEDY for their activities in support of a peaceful solution. He also indicated that his party warmly welcomed President Carter's policy statement on Northern Ireland of August 30, 1977, as a significant encouragement to those who are seeking a political solution in Northern Ireland by agreement which would involve participation by the elected leaders of the two sections of the community.

Mr. Cluskey told American leaders with whom he spoke that he saw the need for British active support for a power-sharing solution as imperative. Mr. Cluskey said that all the energies of those political leaders who wished to help bring about a solution in Northern Ireland should be concentrated specifically on the promotion of power sharing, and the apparent lack of political will by the British Government in pursuing their own declared policy with regard to power sharing was potentially extremely dangerous and could in fact undermine the position of those people in Northern Ireland particularly from the minority group who have been endeavoring, under very difficult and dangerous circumstances, to engage in rational politics over the years. The preoccupation of the British Government with their own internal political difficulties is obviously a major factor in the lack of progress on the political front in Northern Ireland and one which persons concerned with the preservation of human life in Northern Ireland must find deeply disturbing.●

THE ART OF GOVERNMENT

HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, while it is the multi-billion-dollar expenditures that do them the most damage, it is frequently the petty indignities heaped upon taxpayers by many public officials that most infuriate them. A recent example is the case of the 257 "unlocated" works of art that have been loaned out by the National Collection of Fine Arts to various executive offices.

According to a report by Dom Bonafede in the National Journal, at least 257 original works of art, purchased with tax dollars for the enjoyment of the public, and loaned primarily to Presidential aides, are likely never to be recovered. While no total value has been placed on these works, it is worth noting that only the highest quality art work is ever accepted or purchased by the collection in the first place.

This bipartisan thievery, and there is no other name for it in my opinion, typifies the lack of respect, manifested in so many other ways, that too many public officials have for taxpayer dollars. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the complete list of these missing paintings. While I doubt it, I would hope that some of their current "possessors" would be shamed into returning their stolen property.

The list follows:

THE TREASURE HUNT FOR 257 WORKS OF ART

(The following are the "unlocated" works of art, by artist and the year and agency to which they were loaned:)

W. H. Holmes, "A Md. Meadow, Watt's Branch, Near Rockville," 1/25/46, President Truman.

Houdon, "Thomas Jefferson," 12/3/46, White House.

Houdon, "George Washington," 12/3/46, White House.

A. P. Barney, "Village Street," 9/18/53, OMB.

A. P. Barney, "Bar Harbor," 9/18/53, OMB.

Hal Denton, "The Right Honorable Winston Churchill," 9/26/57, OMB.

Sidney L. Smith, "The Hon. Theodore Roosevelt," 9/26/57, OMB.

R. F. Seymour, "Tree Study," 2/1/61, OMB.
R. F. Seymour, "The Rough Camp," 2/1/61, OMB.
W. A. Sherwood, "Pecheurs de Crevettes," 2/1/61, OMB.
A. Thayer, "Male Wood Duck," 8/8/62, President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (defunct).
H. L. Doolittle, "From the High Sierras," 3/1/63, OMB.
F. F. Dodge, "A Ravine," 3/1/63, OMB.
F. F. Dodge, "Old Bridge, Jackson Park," 3/1/63, OMB.
Gustaf Dalstrom, "Cloudy Day," 3/1/63, OMB.
Beatrice S. Levy, "Rain in the Hills," 3/1/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Hampstead Heath, London," 3/1/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Cabin in the Wilderness," 3/1/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Venice Fisherman," 3/1/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Mill in Delft," 3/1/63, OMB.
Dahlgreen, "Evening Shadows," 3/1/63, OMB.
Dahlgreen, "Morning Shadows," 3/1/63, OMB.
Dahlgreen, "Winter Shadows," 3/1/63, OMB.
Dahlgreen, "Snowbound Creek," 3/1/63, OMB.
Dahlgreen, "The Rail Fence," 3/1/63, OMB.
J. H. Euston, "Pines along the Shore," 7/17/63, OMB.
J. H. Euston, "Spens in the Snow," 7/17/63, OMB.
J. H. Euston, "Verdugo Woodland," 7/17/63, OMB.
J. H. Euston, "San Gabriel Divide," 7/17/63, OMB.
Tallmadge, "Poplar Trees on the Dunes," 7/17/63, OMB.
R. Thompson, "Afternoon," 7/17/63, OMB.
Thompson, "The Watcher," 7/17/63, OMB.
Zella de Milhau, "Sand Dunes, Southampton, Long Island, N.Y.," 7/17/63, OMB.
Hurley, "Kentucky Backyard," 7/17/63, OMB.
H. M. Hobbs, "Tower, Belgian Village, A Century of Progress," 7/17/63, OMB.
H. M. Hobbs, "The Cottage," 7/17/63, OMB.
H. M. Hobbs, "Church in the Belgian Village," 7/17/63, OMB.
E. T. Hurley, "City Towers," 7/17/63, OMB.
H. M. Hobbs, "Chimney Pots of Old Brest," 7/17/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Mountain Ash," 7/17/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "May Cherries," 7/17/63, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Castor Bean," 7/17/63, OMB.
F. Leslie Thompson, "Autumn Days," 7/17/63, OMB.
R. W. Wolceske, "Winter's Mirror," 7/17/63, OMB.
A. Hutty, "Guardian Oaks," 7/17/63, OMB.
H. Winslow, "Wood Monsters," 7/17/63, OMB.
C. F. Gaertner, "Gravel, Fish and Soya Beans," 8/23/63, OMB.
W. H. Holmes, "Study of a Bridge," 1/18/65, White House.
W. H. Holmes, "Maryland Dirt Rd," 1/18/65, White House.
A. S. Pennoyer, "Top of the Ridge," 3/29/65, OMB.
F. C. Kirk, "Rue Petit, St. Michelle, Montreal," 3/29/65, OMB.
F. C. Kirk, "Industry," 3/29/65, OMB.
F. C. Kirk, "Harbor at Rockport," 3/29/65, OMB.
Philip Kappel, "Crossed Trails," 8/30/65, OMB.
Gerand K. Geerlings, "Black Magic," 8/30/65, OMB.
G. K. Geerlings, "Inland Islands," 8/30/65, OMB.
L. O. Griffith, "The County Seat, Broun County," 8/30/65, OMB.
Philip Kappel, "A Marine Pathway," 8/30/65, OMB.
Gene Kloss, "Taos Indian Gift Dance," 8/30/65, OMB.
Philip Kappel, "Lobsterman at Dawn," 8/30/65, OMB.
Henri de Kruif, "Gander Realm," 8/30/65, OMB.
Charles B. King, "Notre Dame," 8/30/65, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Spider Lake, Wisconsin," 8/30/65, OMB.
Henri de Kruif, "Dragon Mesquite," 8/30/65, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Palazzo Minelli, Venice." 8/30/65, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Thames Shipping," 8/30/65, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Volendam," 8/30/65, OMB.
B. E. Jacques, "Boats on Delft Canal," 8/30/65, OMB.
M. Hardie, "Low Tide," 8/30/65, OMB.
E. T. Hurley, "Memories of the Fair," 8/30/65, OMB.
K. Holmes, "Venice," 8/30/65, OMB.
Hobbs, "Notre Dame, Paris," 8/30/65, OMB.
Haberer, "Hill Top," 8/30/65, OMB.
A. Hutty, "Northern Pines," 8/30/65, OMB.
J. E. Allen, "Connectors." 8/30/65, OMB.
George C. Aid, "Les Deux Ponts, San Remo," 8/30/65, OMB.
George C. Aid, "La Maison de la Blanchisseuse," 8/30/65, OMB.
Charles B. Keeler, "Old Houses, Place Terra au Duc, Quimper," 8/30/65, OMB.
C. F. Sahlin, "Salascos, Ecuador," 9/29/65, OMB.
C. F. Sahlin, "Araucanions-Chile," 9/29/65, OMB.
C. F. Sahlin, "Santiago de Atitlan-Guatemala," 9/29/65, OMB.
C. F. Sahlin, "Shaleko Dancers," 9/29/65, OMB.
E. Kelly, "Abstraction," 10/20/65, White House.
John Sloan, "Hondo Reservoir," 12/10/65, White House.
F. W. Stokes, "Poi-du-neh," 3/66, OMB.
F. W. Stokes, "Gh-Lee-Eskimo Boy," 3/66, OMB.
F. W. Stokes, "Ung-Meh-Duk-Toe, Eskimo Man," 3/66, OMB.
F. W. Stokes, "Ko-Lo-Ting-wah, Eskimo Man," 3/66, OMB.
F. W. Stokes, "Meh-soh-neh, Young Eskimo Boy," 3/66, OMB.
F. W. Stokes, "Au-ring-ah-doh, wife of O-to-ne-ah, Eskimo Woman," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Arch of Titus," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Pont du Gard, France," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Bridge at Moret, France," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Baths of Caracalla, Rome," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Santa Maria della Salute," 3/66, OMB.
C. Gilbert, "Porta San Paulo, Rome," 3/66, OMB.
Ernest C. Peixotto, "Quaker Meeting House," 3/66, OMB.
Ernest C. Peixotto, "Park Overlooking Brooklyn," 3/66, OMB.
Ernest C. Peixotto, "Lake Scene," 3/66, OMB.
Ernest C. Peixotto, "Philadelphia, Independence Hall, Chestnut St.," 3/66, OMB.
M. Citron, "Horses," 6/67, Office of Economic Opportunity.
Walter Bohl, "Irish Setter," 6/67, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (STR).
Roland Clark, "Sundown," 6/67, STR.
A. Gatti, "Untitled, (Officers Reading Map)," 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "Carcassonne" 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "Church at Segovia," 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "Compton Castle," 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "Laon Cathedral," 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "On the Canal, Bruges," 6/67, STR.
C. Gilbert, "Tower at San Francisco Romano," 6/67, STR.
Delancey Gill, "Landscape," 6/67, STR.
Gordon Grant, "Hauling the Nets," 6/67, STR.
B. Jacques, "Duneland," 6/67, STR.
B. Jacques, "Winterberries," 6/67, STR.
J. C. Young, "Tranquility," 6/67, STR.
Charles Culver, "Pelican with Gull on His Head," 7/67, OMB
L. Macouillard, "Looking Past San Francisco, Calif.," 11/67, White House.
David Hayes, "Untitled," no date, White House.
Charles Culver, "Kingbirds at Nest with Eggs," no date, Camp David.
F. Palmer, "Catskill Mountains," no date, Council of Economic Advisers.
G. Antreasian, "New Mexico II," no date, CIA.
J. Ross, "Farm," no date, CIA.
G. Antreasian, "Shield," 10/27/77, CIA.
N. Azuma, "Calm" no date, CIA.
Bill Moss, "Oyster Shell Mounds, Crystal, Fla.," 1/69, White House.
James Rosenquist, no name, 1/69, White House.
D. Thompson, "New Orleans," 2/69, White House.
G. Catalano, "The Canal," 2/69, White House helicopters.
L. Sturges, "Spring," 2/69, White House helicopters.
R. Crosman, "Cook Tower, Rouen," 2/69. White House helicopters.
G. E. Burr, "Winter Evening," 2/69, White House helicopters.
E. T. Thompson, "Acadian Fishing Village," 2/69, White House helicopters.
John Bellamy, "E Pluribus Unum," 2/69, White House.
Rex Brandt, "Surf Boarders, La Jolla, Calif.," no date, OMB.
Edward Reep, "Panorama of Farmers Market, L.A.," no date, OMB.
James Twitty, "Old North Road," no date, White House.
Richard Brough, "Houseboating on Rainy Lake," no date, OMB.
H. G. Wegner, "Ghost Town of Fossil, Wyoming," no date. OMB.
E. Fulwider, "Harpers Ferry, W. Va.," no date. OMB.
R. Brough. "Winter Landscape near Scooba, Miss.," no date. OMB.
Dwight Shepler, "Cabin on Mt. Adams, New Hampshire," no date. OMB.
Unknown, "Twin Frame Houses," 3/69, White House.
Unknown, "J. Jacob Astor's Former Residence," no date, White House.
N. Smith, "Tippecanoe County Court House," no date, White House.
G. O'Connell, "Madison Series No. 2," 2/69, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
S. Moy, "Refuge," no date, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
Sonia Gechtoff, "Drawing D," no date OMB.
R. L. Crawford, "Scene near Beaufort, S.C.," 4/69, White House.
K. Appel, "Wild Horserider," 4/69, White House.
J. B. A. Guillemet, "Landscape," 5/69, White House.
L. M. Desire-Lucas, "Village Scene," 5/69, White House.
C. Leich, "New England Farm," 6/69, President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization (defunct).
G. Corneille, "La Soleil Rouge," 5/69, White House.

W. H. Holmes, "A Storm Beaten Coast," 6/69, White House.
Oldenburg, "Scissor Obelisk," 7/69, White House.
P. R. Denby, "Valley Near Cades Cove, Tenn.," 7/69, White House.
A. Warhol, "Flowers," 9/69, White House.
T. Stamos, "Abstraction," 9/69, White House.
Anonymous, "The Park," 10/69, White House.
C. Hunt, "The Falls of Niagara," 10/69, White House.
R. Havell, "Panoramic View of N.Y. from the East River," 10/69, White House.
W. Auerbach-Levy, "Quai Grande Augustine," 10/69, White House.
J. H. Moser, "Untitled" 12/69, Office of Former Presidents.
Currier & Ives, "The Bewildered Hunter," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Indian Town," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "The Trout Pool," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Blue Fishing," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Wood Ducks," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Ruffed Grouse," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "The Washington Columns," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "The Rocky Mountains," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Looking Down the Yosemite," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Silver Creek, Calif.," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "On the Coast of Calif.," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "The Home of the Deer," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Peytona and Fashion," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "Going to the Trot," 1/70, Camp David.
Currier & Ives, "The Celebrated Four," 1/70, Camp David.
K. Inukai, "Force Field," 3/70, White House.
F. C. Fiquet, "General Lafayette," 3/70 White House.
F. C. Fiquet, "George Washington," 3/70, White House.
Frank Skinner, "A Picardy Orchard," 5/70, White House helicopters.
Paul Manship, "Patriotism," 6/70, White House.
J. Hnizdovsky, "The Cat," no date, White House.
B. Jacques, "Sumac," 7/70, OMB.
B. Jacques, "Dandelion in Grass," 7/70, OMB.
W. Drewes, "Arizona Evening," 7/70, OMB.
W. Drewes, "Canyon Entrance," 7/70, OMB.
W. Drewes, "Summer Bouquet," 7/70, OMB.
W. Drewes, "Cherries," 7/70, OMB.
W. Drewes, "March Forest," 7/70, OMB.
Charles Culver, "Elk," no date, Camp David.
W. Warder, "Sandia Mountains," no date, Camp David.
F. Petrie, "Stevensburg Bridge," no date, Camp David.
F. Petrie, "Gloucester Boat," no date, Camp David.
F. Petrie, "Garrett Mountain," no date, Camp David.
R. Thompson, "Deer Family," no date, Camp David.
B. Jacques, "Madonna Lilies," no date, Camp David.
B. Jacques, "Anemones," no date, Camp David.
B. Jacques, "Magnolia Blossoms," no date, Camp David.
K. Matsubara, "A Young Couple," no date, Camp David.
C. Heil, "Young Blue Jay," no date, Camp David.
J. Allen, "Wood Ibis," no date, Camp David.
K. Marek, "Flight to the Moon," no date, Camp David.
P. Giddens, "Port of Calvi, Corsica," no date, White House.
Gernand, "Flowers," no date, White House.
C. F. Sahlin, "Macumbe Ceremony," 7/70, OMB.
C. F. Sahlin, "Mayas of Yucatan," 7/70, OMB.
W. H. Holmes, "Landscape," no date, Camp David.
W. H. Holmes, "On the Coast of Calif.," 8/71, Camp David.
R. Wilvers, "Country Church, Kettle Moraine Area, Wis.," 12/71, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
David Glines, "Winter Triptych," 12/71, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
Mitchell Jamieson, Untitled, 1/72, White House.
W. H. Holmes, "Maryland Wheat Fields," 5/72, President Nixon.
Charles Culver, "Ducks," 6/72, Camp David.
A. Philbrick, "Sloop at Anchor," 6/72, Camp David.
Paul Smith, "Pirates Alley," 6/72, Camp David.
E. Y. Soderberg, "Leaping Ahead," 6/72, Camp David.
E. Fulwider, "Highway to Lewis & Clark . . .," 6/72, Camp David.
Ivan Summers, "Old Senate House, Kingston," 6/72, Camp David.
Ted Kautsky, "Tidewater Creek, Oregon," 6/72, Vice President Agnew.
Unknown, "A Scouting Party," no date, Camp David.
Unknown, "The Advance of the Cavalry Skirmish Line," no date, Camp David.
Unknown, "A New Map of Va. & Md. & Improved Pars . . .," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after C. G. Bush), "The Ceremonies of Dedication of the Nat'l Cemetery . . .," no date, Camp David.
Unknown, "Pictorial Map of the Seat of War, Showing Partist . . .," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after E. Forbes), "Battle of Antietam," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after E. Forbes), "Invasion of Md., 1864, Driving off Cattle," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after A. R. Waud), "Reminiscences of the Md. Campaign," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after C. E. Bonwill), "General Buford's Engagement . . .," no date, Camp David.
Unknown (after E. Forbes), "The War in Md.," 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown (signed J. K. Naot), "The Rebel Army Crossing . . .," 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown, "Grand Review of Gen. Thomas' Brigade in Western Md. . . .," 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown, "View of Md. Heights," 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown, "View on the James River Canal," 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown (after Theodore R. Davis), four sketches, 8/72, Camp David.
Unknown (after Johua Fry & Peter Jefferson), "A Map of the Most Inhabited Part of Va.," 8/72, Camp David.
J. Dalrymple, "Map of N.J., Md., Pa., Va.," 8/72, Camp David.
Kurz & Allison, "Battle between the Monitor & The Merrimac," 8/72, Camp David.
D'Arcangelo, "Landscape II," 5/73, White House.
Sam Francis, "List Poster," 10/73, White House.
Cleve Gray, Untitled, 10/74, White House.
George Story, "Abraham Lincoln," 1/75, White House.
Charles Henry, "Landscape," 12/74, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
Sir Aston Webb, "Locksmith's Shop," 12/74, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
I. Kerr, "Dogs & Sled . . .," 12/74, President's Commission on White House Fellowships.
L. Ochtman, "A Morning in Summer," 3/75, Vice President Rockefeller.
Arthur T. Hill, "After a Storm, Amangansett," 3/75. Vice President Rockefeller.
W. Granville Smith, "Grey Day," 10/75, Vice President Rockefeller.
Minerva Chapman, "Garden at the Tuileries, Paris," 6/75, White House-Vice President Rockefeller.
George Catlin, "Wife of Bear Catcher," 3/76, White House.
C. Moorepart, "Water," 9/67, CIA.
W. P. Robins, "Old Shoreham Cottage," 9/67, CIA.
C. Stuever, "Old Houses in Bavaria," 9/67, CIA.
E. D. MacKinnon, "Chelsea," no date, no location.
John Rosenfield, "Ill., Small Town on the Miss. River," 2/69, OMB.
Paul Sample, "An American Road in Winter," 2/69, OMB.●

JUSTICE IN EVERYDAY LIFE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege on May 1, 1978 of having heard the Law Day address for the St. Joseph County Bar Association in South Bend, Ind., in the district I am honored to represent in Congress.

The address on this occasion was delivered by Thomas L. Shaffer, professor of law at the University of Notre Dame and former dean of the Notre Dame Law School.

Professor Shaffer addressed himself on this occasion to the meaning of justice.

I think that his remarks on this occasion will be read by every Member of the House of Representatives and Senate with great interest and, indeed, benefit.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Professor Shaffer's remarks.

JUSTICE IN EVERYDAY LIFE

One problem with the idea of justice is that it is too important. It is, like the ideas of patriotism and love of neighbor, functionally inaccessible, because we respect it too much.

A scholar is not free to criticize the idea of justice, but he may be free to break it down and look at it in some of its simpler forms. The idea might in that way become more accessible.

Breaking the idea of justice down into a simpler form is somewhat like what Sigmund Freud did to the idea of psychological health in his book "The Psychopathology of Everyday Life."

Freud was the founder of modern medical psychology. He spent his life laboring to cure those who were disabled by manias and hysteria. Some of them were paralyzed. Some couldn't talk or sleep or eat. Freud used hypnosis to find the causes of these disabilities. He invented psychoanalysis as a way to lead his patients to the discovery of the causes.

His career was among abnormal people. He noticed this, and noticed that his work led him to ignore the oddities, curious events, and foulups which make ordinary life uncomfortable and interesting.

"The Psychopathology of Everyday Life"

was about the ordinary and the normal in the way our minds work. It's a nice book, as books on psychology go, because it uncovers reasons for ripples in the routine:

Freud left his umbrella at a friend's house, and tried to figure out why, and realized that he left it because he liked being at his friend's house; he hated to leave, and he left a bit of himself—his umbrella—behind.

I am summoned to a meeting I don't want to attend. I say "I'll be glad to come." But when I go, I forgot to bring papers I need for the meeting. Did I really "forget" them? Didn't I really leave them because I'm telling myself something about boring meetings? I am fighting, but haven't admitted it.

Freud told about a patient of his whose wife had given him a book. Patient and wife weren't getting along. The patient lost the new book before he had a chance to read it. He looked everywhere; he could not find the book.

Six months later, when the patient and his wife were getting along better, the patient found the book, in an obvious place in his desk.

That's the "Psychopathology of Everyday Life." Freud's conclusion was that ordinary accidents and incidents of absentmindedness are not accidents at all.

There is also justice in everyday life, which is to cases in courts what Freud's lost umbrella was to psychoanalysis.

ORDINARY JUSTICE OF EVERY DAY LIFE

Ordinary justice is what we people give one to another because we hope to be able to live together. This justice is a quiet, everyday thing. Our access to justice is quiet and ordinary, too—as quiet and ordinary as the psychopathology of everyday life.

Contracts are an example. Law students study complex cases of disputed contracts. Hollywood even makes movies about law students studying contract disputes. The courts in one Indiana county may decide a hundred lawsuits this month and which involve contracts. But today, in the same county, tens of thousands of contracts will be performed without dispute—everything from two neighbors who agree to share the cost of repairing common driveway to a term loan agreement to finance a new factory at the edge of town.

For every lawsuit over a will which is tried in our courts, hundreds of wills are opened, read, and quietly carried out.

For every criminal case which goes to trial, hundreds of violations of the law are resolved or avoided by police officers, public officials, and such ingenious institutions as the night prosecutor's office in St. Joseph County.

All of this happens because most of us are willing to give justice to one another. We are willing, even, to give more than justice; we are willing to pay a little extra as an investment in order and mutual confidence and a peaceful community.

And so, if we are wise enough, we don't demand all our rights. The mortgage company takes a late payment. The man next door throws my son's ball back over the fence. The police officer takes more abuse than he should have to take from a drunk or a cocky teenager.

That is the justice of everyday life, and everyday life is our main access to justice. Everyday justice is not an accident, anymore than the psychopathology of everyday life is an accident.

JUSTICE IS A VIRTUE

The justice of everday life depends on good will, but the good will on which everday justice depends is not good will at large. It is not a matter of my extending kindness when I feel like being kind. The good will on which justice depends is more disciplined than that. This good will has been built on habit—the habit of justice under law. That's what we mean when we say justice is a virtue. That it is a habit. Virtues are good habits.

One reason tens of thousands of contracts are being performed today, without dispute, is that we expect one another to keep promises. And every year hundreds of lawyers and other citizens work those rules over, not to create lawsuits, but to prevent lawsuits.

Lawyers and legislators in Indiana have been revising the rules on probate of wills, almost continuously, since 1953—not so there will be more wills in court, but so that there will be fewer wills in court.

For most people, justice is not a matter of going to court. It is a matter of habit. It is a matter, first, of a personal good habit. Justice is also a social good habit; the social good habit is what we call government under law.

Justice is not a gift of the government. If it is a gift at all, it is a gift we give one another. Before justice is anything else, it is our willingness to work things out together. And then it is our willingness to work out rules for one another to follow. This willingness to work out the rules is what we mean by "justice under law." Our access to justice is an assurance that most of us, most of the time, will keep our promises, will follow what our relatives say in their wills, and will give decent respect to police officers.

JUSTICE AND THE LAW

Law comes into this at the point at which we begin to expect things from one another. Law is the conversation we have when we try to work out those expectations. If my neighbor and I cannot agree on who should fix the driveway, we are going to have to turn somewhere for a settlement of our disagreement. What we turn to is the experience of the community on fixing driveways. This includes our own experience, and our own attempt to make sense of our experience.

This is not a turning away from the virtue of justice, but it is turning away from reliance solely on good will. Good will is not necessarily a habit; it is not as dependable as a habit. But justice is a habit; it is more dependable than good will. The virtue of justice is involved when my neighbor and I disagree on repairing the driveway because the experience of the community on fixing driveways backs up to an idea about what a just person, a virtuous person, should do in the circumstances. In this way, law backs up to a challenge to our better selves. When it is any good at all, law is a challenge to our better selves.

When my neighbor and I turn to the experience of the community, we are likely to end up consulting what a virtuous person should do, whether we realize it or not. That's what happens when people turn to the law. Law is what we have decided together to expect of one another. As my colleague and friend, Professor Stanley Hauerwas says, law is the space God gives us to work things out for ourselves.

Of course, force is involved. Part of the idea of law is that force will be used, if necessary, to enforce the rules we have decided to have. Justice under law is a noble idea, but it is also a sad truth. We have found out that we cannot get along with good will alone. We have to work out rules. And we have to enforce the rules.

But government under law means that the rules come before the force. The rules we have worked out together come first; then the force, if force is necessary—and it is usually not necessary: For every broken law there are a million instances of law obeyed. The justice in everyday life, dispenses, for the most part, with any need for force.

It is as important as anything can be not to confuse justice with force. Force comes from the government, but justice does not come from the government. Justice is the gift we give one another as we go about living under the law, and as we go about making the law fit our lives. Our truthfulness in doing this is where justice comes from.

Justice is not the result of power. It is not the result of force. The idea that governments provide goodness—that power provides justice—is where tyranny begins.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

We lawyers should be sober and watchful about the horrors of what people have done to one another in the name of the law. These horrors occur when people begin to believe that good can be achieved with power. The holocaust is one example. The crucifixion is another.

The S.S. officer in "The Holocaust" did not set out to do evil. He did evil because he set out to do good with force and came to believe that force was the way to goodness. The same process is related in St. John's Gospel. Jesus was tortured to death because his raising Lazarus from the dead caused civil disturbance. Those responsible for civil tranquility in and around Jerusalem said, "If we leave him alone like this the whole population will believe in him. Then the Romans will come and sweep away our temple and our nation. . . . it is more to your interest that one man should die for the people, than that the whole nation should be destroyed." (John 11:48–51.) It is probably a good thing for a nation to be saved, but it is corrupt and fatal to suppose that power can save a nation.

We lawyers have to be careful about that corrupt and fatal notion in our everyday lives. We may begin otherwise to believe that what we call "the administration of justice" is some sort of dispensary. It is not a dispensary. The courts in which we work are places where citizens come to live out their gift of justice to one another. We don't dispense justice there; we are privileged to contemplate a few small examples of our fellow citizens dispensing justice. (The best examples are not in courtrooms.)

We obey the law, in this access to justice in everyday life, because of hope. A little of our hope is in governments and courts and lawyers, but most of it is a hope in one another. We have hope for law because we have this hope for what we can do together. My favorite text for that hope is not from Dr. Freud, but from a stern 18th century Scots Presbyterian from Pennsylvania named James Wilson. He was one of the founding fathers, a colonial and revolutionary lawyer who became one of the first judges on the federal Supreme Court: "The state, I cheerfully admit, is the noblest work of man," he said. "But man himself, free and honest . . . is the noblest work of God."●

NATION'S BIRTHDAY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we all look forward to the celebration of our Nation's birthday, I would like to share with my colleagues information on efforts made by Mr. Matthew T. Booker of St. Petersburg, Fla., to commemorate this important day and salute America:

HONOR AMERICA WEEKS JUNE 14–JULY 4

Quoting Mr. Hope from our nationally circulated bulletin of June 8, 1970: "Mr. Bob Hope, co-chairman of a national committee to Honor America, called on Americans to join in a big celebration to help us Americans put some starch back into our own backs and rekindle the American spirit of patriotism and respect for the individual liberties that made this country great . . .

"We want the world to see that Americans are proud of our country and welcome this opportunity to honor America. We want the

world to see that Americans can put aside their honest differences and rally around the flag to show national unity . . .

"At the same time, our committee is hoping for enough support to enable us to provide tie-in materials for local groups all over the country who want to schedule 'Honor America' observances in their local communities, large and small."

Honor America Weeks challenge of the century: To all citizens interested in aiding our cause: We, the undersigned, hereby commit ourselves to the promotion of safety and to the development of better citizenship among members of the youth community; and as a part of this commitment, we wish to assist any civic, service, fraternal, or religious organization by establishing "teen-teams" of youth-adult groups of no more than twelve members, striving for the joint accomplishment of similar objectives without regard for the affiliation of other members of the group; and we therefore wish to promote the acceptance of the challenge of the Twenty-One Day Salute to America and the development of the Appreciate America Decade, all of which will contribute to better understanding of what it really means to be an American.

Remember the Challenge of the Century—Twenty-One Day Salute to America. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, this coming Independence Day weekend, June 30 to July 4, 1978, the Diocese of Paterson, State of New Jersey will be the focal gathering place for approximately 2,000 visitors from throughout our Nation to join with the Rev. Albert Gorayeb, pastor, and members of the congregation of the host church, St. Ann's Byzantine Melkite Church, West Paterson, N.J., to attend the 19th Annual Melkite Convention of the Byzantine Melkite Rite of the Catholic Church.

At the outset may I commend to you the dedication, diligence and hard work that is being extended by the clergy, officers and members of St. Ann's Byzantine Melkite Church and the 19th Annual Melkite Convention committee who have been working with the Melkite Diocese of Newton and other leading citizens throughout the State in devising an outstanding program and seeking full citizens participation in this most important commemorative program. The roster of these exemplary community leaders and highly reputable citizens of New Jersey is, as follows:

PARISH ORGANIZATION

The Honorable: Reverend Albert Gorayeb, Pastor; Basil Samra, Deacon; Norman and Laura Dikdan, Trustees; Raymond and Marilyn Shenekji, Trustees; William and Barbara Rabbat, Trustees; Sam and Evelyn Kaspar, Trustees; Louis Iandoli, President, Parish Council; George Betar, Vice-President, Parish Council; Lucille Bsales, Secretary, Parish Council.

CHAIRPERSONS 19TH ANNUAL MELKITE CONVENTION COMMITTEE

The Honorable: William Rabbat, Boat Committee; Bud Peterson, Communications; Sam Tahmoosh, Convention Journal; Anne Shaker, Entertainment; William and Regina Siouffi, Friday Hafli, Charles Joseph, Financial; Gladys Santo, Hospitality.

Sandy Foster and Pat Rowek, Hospitality Gifts; Barbara Rabbat, Hotel Reservations; Raymond Yabroudy, Liturgical Committee; Barbara Mendillo, Mahrajan Committee; Blanche Hartaphilis, Mahrajan Committee; Anthony Liantonio, Mahrajan Committee; Joan Elia, Mahrajan Committee; Ann Hallock, Mahrajan Committee; Haymond Bsales, Mahrajan Committee; Sam Kaspar, Printing.

Luch Ilaria, Raffles; Barbara Ablahani, Reception-Registration; Albert Kahwaty, Security; Gene Ciccone, Theatrical Production; George Betar, Transportation; Louis Iandoli, Transportation; George Ged, Travel; Mary Baylouny, Workshops.

Philip Azoon, Workshops; Amy Berdetta, Mailings; Marie Dolling, Publicity; Norman and Laura Dikdan, VIP Hospitality; Marion Yabroudy, Secretary; Gladys Santo, Secretary; Dolores Gennaro, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that according to the Melkite Diocese of Newton, Archbishop Joseph Tawil has appointed St. Ann's Byzantine Melkite Catholic Church as the official host parish of the convention and the theme of this year's convention is: "Take Life From the Light that Never Dies," a combination that bespeaks the richness of the heritage in faith, love and tradition that binds the Melkite Christian Community in America. Workshops geared toward enlightenment and reenforcement of Eastern Catholic tradition, especially in Scripture and liturgy, will highlight the convention's educational endeavors. Daily liturgies with guest bishops as homilists will be provided for meditation and reflection. Social activities will include a grand ball, a moonlight cruise around Manhattan, an all-day Middle East Festival and a dinner-theater evening. Patriach Maximos V. Hakim of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem is the spiritual leader of the Rite and has been invited to attend. Pope Paul VI will send his Apostolic blessing as he customarily does each year as spiritual father of the Catholic Church, both Eastern and Western.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress a brief history and background of the Melkite Catholic Christian Community as related to me by Pastor Gorayeb, as follows:

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND, MELKITE CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

The Melkite Catholic Christian Community is scattered throughout the United States, and has its origins in the countries of the Middle East. They use the Byzantine Rite for their worship and theology. Their Christian ancestory grows out of the ancient cities of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria. In the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., those who followed the king (Melak) who was faithful to the united Catholic faith at that time, were nicknamed Melkites.

In the 11th century, when the church was divided between East and West, the predominent Rite used in the East was the Byzantine Rite. In the 18th century, several Bishops retaining their Eastern theology and striving for unity of the separated churches, created a union with the See of Rome.

Melkites in the United States of America number about 23,000 with approximately 3500 Melkites scattered through New Jersey. There are 27 Melkite Churches throughout the United States.

Shortly after the turn of the century, large numbers of Syrian immigrants began to arrive in the United States, mostly from Aleppo, Damascus and Lebanon. They were attracted to this area, the then textile center of the world, to pursue employment in their ancient craft, weaving and textile merchandising.

With a constant devotion to their ancestry and tradition they were served in the early days of their migration by visiting Melkite priests who held services in Paterson and in Union City and this status continued until December of 1919.

At that time, a young priest, Father Cyril Anid, who had just arrived in New York from Lebanon, was invited to serve the Christmas liturgy in Paterson. He celebrated the first Divine Liturgy for them in the Chapel of Saint John's Church, which is now the present Cathedral of the Paterson Diocese.

The success of this early mission was apparent, when, within a very short time, the facilities at St. John's Chapel proved inadequate to accommodate the crowds that responded to this unique "ritual pattern" of the Eucharisic Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The Reverend Father Carlo Cianci, then the Pastor of Saint Michael's (Italian) Parish, apprised of the situation, graciously offered the use of his Church and the emerging Melkite Community began to meet here for worship in January of 1920.

The first census showed 350 families—200 belonged to the Melkite Rite, and the other 150 to the Armenian, Syrian, and Maronite Rites. The need for a more permanent house of worship arose and a committee was delegated to undertake the responsibility of establishing a formal parish in the City of Paterson. The Most Reverend John O'Connor, then Bishop of Newark, consented to appoint Father Anid as permanent pastor and the new Parish of Saint George's Melkite Rite was launched, and concurrently, immediate plans were undertaken for the construction of a church of their own.

Mr. Speaker, it is also significant to note the leadership endeavors of the Pastor of St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church, the host parish of the convention and I would like to insert at this point a brief profile of this distinguished clergyman, good friend and community leader, whose standards of excellence in service to God and to our people have brought great pride and inspiration to all who have had the good fortune to know him. The biography of Rev. Albert Gorayeb is, as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF REVEREND ALBERT GORAYEB, PASTOR OF SAINT ANN'S MELKITE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Rev. Albert Gorayeb, was born in Brooklyn, New York and attended St. John's Prep School and College, New York; St. Anselm College, Manchester, New Hampshire; and St. Basil Oriental Institute of Sacred Studies, Methuen, Massachusetts. He was ordained in Methuen, Massachusetts on June 9, 1963 and pursued advanced courses in Eastern Christian studies at Fordham University.

Rev. Gorayeb has been involved in the scientific field of Parapsychology since 1971, and holds a Doctorate Degree in Psychorientology from the Psychorientology Institute, Laredo, Texas. He is a Certified Instructor, currently receiving a Ph. D., in the Silva Method of Mind Control, and a highly esteemed educator and national lecturer on this advanced study discipline.

Rev. Gorayeb's special field in the area of religion comes within the sphere of Eastern Christian Spirituality—the development and progress of the early churches of the East; the various Rites in Christianity, both Ortho-

dox and Catholic, and the current teachings and practices of Eastern Rite Catholics. He has served as Director of Youth Activities for 2 years in the Melkite Diocese of the United States, and on the Diocesan Pastoral Council, and currently is in charge of the Clergy Retirement Program for the Melkite Diocese.

Rev. Albert Gorayeb's first assignment was at St. Joseph's Melkite Church in Lawrence, Massachusetts; then transferred to St. Ann's in Paterson, New Jersey. He served as Associate Pastor for 12 years, then appointed Pastor of St. Ann's in March 1976. He has held positions as part-time chaplain at St. Joseph's Hospital; served as member of the Ecumenical Association of the Paterson Diocese; Moderator of the Catholic Alumni Club of Northern New Jersey; District Moderator for the Paterson Hawthorne Catholic Youth Organization; Professor of Theology at Tombrock College, West Paterson; and Assistant Professor of History at Fairleigh Dickinson University, Wayne, New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to call this most noteworthy annual event to the attention of you and our colleagues and seek this national recognition of the Melkite Catholic Christian Community. As a Nation of people of all nationalities and religious beliefs, the observance and commemoration of the 19th Annual Melkite Convention of the Byzantine Melkite Rite of the Catholic Church helps assure all of us that the faith, courage, and perseverance inherent in the original settlers of our land is still infused in the hearts and minds of the families of today's society where man's religious beliefs and aspirations tend to seem obscured by the modern and so-called sophisticated world of time and space.

We do indeed extend our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to Reverend Albert Gorayeb and all of the clergy and members of the Melkite Rite and St. Ann's Byzantine Melkite Church on the outstanding contribution they are making, in service to God and to our people, toward the spiritual, cultural and educational endeavors of our community, State and Nation—so vitally important to the quality of life and way of life here in America.●

BUBBLE GUM RAISES MONEY FOR MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, children are the future of our country and muscular dystrophy is the torment of that future. We all know about the ravages of the disease, its crippling effects, the sorrow and the hardships it incurs in the lives of many families. It strikes down the energetic and carefree in the midst of their happiest days. Despite those setbacks, the children, who are fighting back to lead normal lives, display an optimism and courage that is an inspiration to everyone who sees it.

The Muscular Dystrophy Association has played a big role in the past to help strong-willed youth stand up to the disease. This year Jerry Lewis and the M.D.A. are working hard once again to help these children. I am proud to cite one Rockford, Ill., company for joining the fight this year.

The American Chicle Division of Warner-Lambert is cosponsoring a bubble-blowing contest to raise money for research in muscular dystrophy. I find this effort particularly fitting as a celebration of the 50th anniversary of bubble gum considering the long bond with the youth of America that the bubble gum industry has enjoyed. I cannot think of a more sensitive and human way for a uniquely American company to say "thank you" to its supporters of the past half century and I am proud that the 16th District of Illinois is offering its services to help conquer this disease.●

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DIARIO LAS AMERICAS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the Congress to the forthcoming 25th anniversary of one of the great newspapers of the Americas, whose silver anniversary appropriately falls on the Fourth of July, the birthday of our free and freedom-loving multinational, multiracial, and multicultural Nation and people.

Throughout the Latin American communities of the United States, Diario Las Americas is a major source of information about United States, Latin, and world affairs, and under the careful guidance of Drs. Horacio and Francisco Aguirre it has become an active force for human freedom and enlightenment in non-Latin governmental, business, and diplomatic communities, not only in our own Capital, but in the capitals of Latin America as well. For those who are concerned with inter-American affairs, Diario Las Americas is an invaluable informant and faithful guide to events affecting Latin Americans throughout the Western Hemisphere.

"Diario," as it is fondly known, is Florida's only Hispanic daily newspaper and I am particularly proud that a daily journal of such outstanding quality and influence is headquartered in my congressional district. It is invaluable to me, as it is to our community, as I seek to serve one of the leading bilingual communities of the United States.

"Diario" is a labor of love for two outstanding men, brothers, trained lawyers, dedicated journalists, and devoted servants of freedom—Drs. Horacio and Francisco Aguirre. Their lifelong dedication to the cause of human rights, the principles of democracy, and the pursuit of justice goes back to their youth in Nicaragua. It grew in strength during their legal careers and first flowered in the field of journalism through Dr. Horacio Aguirre's experiences as editorial writer for El Panama America in Panama from 1948 to 1953.

Diario Las Americas represents the full blooming of the careers of two great and dedicated men. Their devotion to human freedom and dignity, their outrage at repression and inhumanity, became a fire in their souls which has lighted the pages of Diario Las Americas since its founding in 1953. Thus Diario has become a beacon of hope for those who have been subjected to injustice and tyranny, and particularly to those who have seen the beautiful island of Cuba subjected to the most ruthless and pervasive tyranny of mind and spirit in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

The respect which the Aguirre brothers have earned for their support of the cause of Cuban freedom has been reinforced in our area and wherever Diario is read by their solid reputation for editorial integrity and their active support for the aspirations and interests of all Hispanic Americans in the United States and throughout the world.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we can take great pride in sharing our Nation's day of independence with the 25th anniversary of a great journal devoted to the cause of human liberty. I congratulate Drs. Horacio and Francisco Aguirre and the dedicated members of the staff of Diario Las Americas for their contribution to the people of my district, of the State of Florida, the United States, and the cause of freedom everywhere. I ask our colleagues to join here in applauding this great journal and all the people who have made it such a respected and, I am sure, enduring institution in the service of freedom for all mankind.

THREE EAGLE SCOUTS NAMED IN HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, there are few honors for young Americans who demonstrate special achievements in community service that rival membership in the Eagle Scouts. It requires a 3-year effort for a young man to become an Eagle Scout, including 23 merit badges and a record of community service.

I am proud to report that on June 11 three young men in the First Congressional District of Michigan which I serve, became Eagle Scouts. They are Bradley Watkins who is a student at Cass Tech, and Jim and Tom Doran who attend the University of Detroit High School. They have become members of the Eagle Scout Troupe 1284.

The membership ceremony and dinner took place at St. Benedict Church in the city of Highland Park. The master of ceremonies was Dick Conlin, a member of the Highland Park School Board and an official in the Highway Department of the State of Michigan. Mr. Thomas F. Metevier, manager of urban affairs at

the Chrysler Corp., was a guest speaker. Among the other participants were Rev. Basilo David, pastor of St. Benedict Church, Jesse P. Miller, mayor of Highland Park, Tremon McDermott, clerk of Highland Park, and myself. Congratulatory messages arrived from President Carter, Governor William Milliken, Senators DON RIEGLE and ROBERT GRIFFIN, and Mayor Coleman Young of Detroit.

Bradley, Jim, and Tom having accomplished a great deal already, I am sure as Eagle Scouts, will accomplish even more as citizens of the Highland Park and Detroit communities.●

THE CONSERVATIVE FARMER: WILL HE SURVIVE?

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share the article written by Mr. Nathan H. Gellert of Boise, Idaho, which is a history lesson for all of us on how the Government has compromised the farmer until he now finds himself on the edge of bankruptcy. I believe it is up to all of us to put a stop to rampant Government spending otherwise our businesses and economy will cease to be effective and our freedom will be endangered.

The article follows:

THE CONSERVATIVE FARMER. WILL HE SURVIVE?

(By Nathan H. Gellert)

"Fifty Year's Experience Challenges the Future". A brave motto for this Convention. Will the farmers of tomorrow take their lessons from the 50 years that have just passed, or will they subscribe to the popular notion that past experience is no longer a guide to the future because of the new technology, the new morality and the new economics?

A good question! Some of us have already forgotten what we learned just last year. What we learned ten or fifteen years past we now struggle to recall. Twenty or more years ago we were busy avoiding the knowledge that we could have acquired from our parents. Before that it all seems like history, and historians, we suspect, are not very reliable, anyway.

Fifty years ago our country was in the midst of a credit inflation that was to drop us into the so-called "great" depression. Today credit inflation, amplified by expansion of government borrowings, is robbing equity and subsidizing debt. Inflation is transferring claims against future production from the hands of savers into the hands of borrowers, without the consent or participation of the savers.

As a result of this punishment of thrift and frugality, conservative farmers are being forced into debt in order to make the capital investment necessary for survival. As equity ratios drop in the farming industry, overhead rises, and the ability of each farmer to stay above the marginal line in impaired. The advantage which once accrued to conservative farmers is being eroded.

Farm debt in the United States has doubled in the past eight years, according to an article in Forbes Magazine of May 1, 1978. The ratio of farm debt to gross annual income, as calculated from U.S. Department of Agriculture sources, stood at 140 percent in 1970, improved to the even hundred mark in 1973, then rose sharply and is now climbing through the 180 percent level in 1978.

What has happened to the conservative farmer, the grower who keeps his debt ratio low, who holds a store of liquid assets as a protection against the inevitable fall in the cycle of farm price movements? Either he has lost his conservatism and has joined the ranks of high-overhead farmers, or he has watched his precious store of dollar assets decline in value so that they no longer offer the protection they were designed to provide.

In 1974, instead of holding on to the dollars earned from the prosperous year of 1973 and decreasing their ratio of debt to equity, many farmers rushed to exchange them for assets deemed more durable.

This may explain why, in 1974 and the years following, farmers reduced their liquid capital, assumed debt and purchased land, buildings and equipment. First, it appeared that fixed assets might well hold value better than dollar assets, and second, declines in the value of currencies have historically favored the debtor at the expense of the creditor.

The farmer is really in an almost impossible dilemma. If he keeps cash and fails to expand, his cash will decline in value and he will then be unable to expand. If he exchanges the cash for land or other productive assets and stays out of debt, he may be forced into debt when prices drop, because then he will have no dollar reserve.

If he rides the inflationary wave, counting on the decline of the dollar to benefit him as debtor at the expense of the creditor, he will find himself with debt service to pay even when revenues are inadequate. And should the credit bubble collapse, or inflation be finally conquered, with a consequent drop in prices, he will be obligated to pay off his debt in dollars of higher value. The debtor's advantage will have been lost, since deflation will be favoring the creditor.

Farmers can't be sure they are protecting the value of their assets by engaging in that time-honored custom, the purchase of land. When he seeks to buy buildings or equipment, the farmer faces only normal market forces. But when he goes into the market to purchase land he bids not only against other farmers who may desire to purchase the same land, but also against investors and speculators whose principal aim is not to increase the production of farm commodities, but to preserve the value of their assets.

The demand for farm land, then, is stimulated by fear of the decline of the dollar. In relatively inflexible supply, land, sought by ever-increasing dollars, must rise in price. Foreign investors are eyeing American farm land, too. Government's unwise policies too numerous to tabulate here have resulted in excessive dollar holdings abroad.

Foreigners must either find a place to spend and invest dollars, or consider them worthless. So, dollars that Americans have exchanged for foreign goods now seek value in the U.S. and find farm land more attractive than American-made merchandise or American-grown products. Farmers, then, are competing, not only against U.S. investors and speculators, but against foreign holders of U.S. dollars who may have no more sinister motive than the protection of their own legitimate assets.

Neither the farmer, nor any of the rest of us, is able to determine how much of the increase in the price of land is due to worldwide demand for food, how much is due to pure inflation (that is, the increase of the money supply by the U.S. Government and its agents, the banks), and how much is due to fear in the minds of investors, whether farmers or others, that the value of the dollar will continue to decline.

That much may be uncertain, but one thing is certain. As the price of farm land increases more rapidly than the price of the goods that the land produces, farmers will face an ever tightening squeeze between costs and revenue. This constraint, added to a high burden of debt, could force foreclosures that none of us want to think about.

The farmers of this country may turn to government for the solution to their financial problems, and in doing so they are not aiming at the wrong target. The government is the primary cause of the farmer's trouble, but not as some of us might suppose. It is not the lack of tariffs or of subsidies, nor the absence of parity payments or of any other politically structured farm program that is causing the farmer's troubles. It is the ceaseless attrition of his savings through dilution of the money supply. The result is the transfer of the value of farmers' savings to others in society. This is the element of government intervention that must be stopped if the conservative farmer is to survive. Without him, farming could approach mere speculation, and the buying and selling of farms seem more important than the production of food.

Farmers can be popular or unpopular depending on what kind of political pressure they apply. If they request programs, tariffs and subsidies to compensate for the damage they have suffered from past government actions, they will not only be unpopular, they will prolong the problems that now threaten their ability to produce. But if they join others in weeding out the root of the problem, namely, the decline of the dollar, they may become both popular and effective, and to the extent they succeed, we will all benefit, farmers included.

How do we fight the decline of the dollar? Not by price controls and rationing; not by "jawboning" big business; not by whipping the oil companies; not by blaming the Arabs; not by ranting against "obscene" profits.

Then how? By insisting that the money paid out by the federal government be matched by income that represents real earnings by real people, not just by IOU's that the government decrees we must accept as money; by demanding that the percentage of the national income now preempted by government be cut, so that private persons and firms will have control of more of the decisions in our economy; by supporting a balanced federal budget; by opposing give-away programs, grants to special interests and low interest loans; by requiring that welfare payments and food stamps be relegated to a "subsistence aid" category rather than a legal right; in short, by encouraging a smaller, less intrusive, more frugal National Government.

"Fifty Year's Experience (some of it bad) Challenges the Future". The farmer of tomorrow will have to sift the right from the wrong, the true from the untrue. Here's wishing him success.●

IN SEARCH OF A GLOBAL STRATEGY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been renewed interest in the strategic position of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. This resurgence of emphasis is welcome, though coming somewhat late in the game.

It is difficult for most Americans to appreciate the concept of global strategy,

a subject considered complex, abstract, and limited to discussion by professors and officials of the administration; it is not a subject thought to impact upon most of our daily lives. To the contrary, it is a topic of immense importance to the continued existence of the country, a reality of the highest order.

The perceived erosion of our national will and power, as well as our ability to demonstrate it, is worrisome. The recent Soviet exploitation of African situations and the confused and weak U.S. response indicates a trend we cannot allow to continue. The problem is that our strategy is not clearly defined. The necessary emphasis on national objectives is lacking. The Soviet's, by contrast, have never waivered in their strategy. They perceive and approach détente differently. They have maintained their resolve, their purpose, while we have allowed ours to slip.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has written an excellent article on the subject. It was printed in the New York Times, June 8, 1978. For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit the article, in its original, unedited form:

COUNTERING SOVIET GLOBAL AIMS

A general erosion in our commitment to fundamental national security objectives has been brought about in part by the perception that the competition between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. for dominance in world affairs is over. While the U.S. has in recent years backed away from such competition, there is no evidence that the Soviets have departed from their plan to attain a position of dominance. Many see detente as Soviet willingness to retreat, but Moscow openly describes it simply as one more approach in their plan. While the U.S. seems lacking in resolve, the Soviets remain committed to their national strategies which include the following:

Avoidance of a major confrontation, or nuclear conflict, with the West until the outcome favors the Soviet Union;

Development of the capability to win an Atlantic alliance-Warsaw Pact conflict;

Creation of an environment in the Third World countries conducive to Soviet orientation and alignment;

Exploitation of wars of liberation and "anti-colonialism" against "Capitalist" nations;

Development of the means to isolate the United States through denying Sea Lines of Communication;

Creation of an environment of debilitating competition among Western nations, fostering dissension among them.

The Soviet Union underwrites its objectives militarily and politically by doing the following:

Accelerating its development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles;

Maintaining a massive military force opposing NATO in Europe;

Developing naval forces for projection of power and acquisition of base rights in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, and the Caribbean;

Supporting uprisings, mostly recently in Angola, Afghanistan, and the Horn of Africa;

Deploying a Navy capable of threatening our access to sea lines of communication in a crisis;

Creating an environment of increased competition for scarce resources in the West, particularly with Middle East oil.

If we are to counter these Soviet objectives, we must be visibly committed to our own. Objectives critical to our national security must be underwritten with explicit strategies and with the deployment of effective military forces. To underwrite those objectives, our political statements and commitments must be orchestrated with the deployment and posture of our forces. We must strive to ensure that no situation becomes critical—that each area of concern remains stable. Our emphasis is on decisive actions to deter events which might lead to a crisis rather than reacting after the situation is out of hand. In recent years we have supported the following four national objectives:

We deter a Soviet attack on our cities by the threat of U.S. reprisal attacks against theirs, military forces in the form of the nuclear triad—submarines, land-based missiles and airplanes—are maintained to underwrite this strategy;

We deter nuclear attack on our forces by threat of reprisal, and by basing our forces and targeting them against both Soviet nuclear and conventional forces so that they perceive no net advantage in an initial attack;

We deter aggression against NATO by an overall military conventional and nuclear capability to contain such attacks, coupled with a firm commitment that any attack on our allies involves the United States. This objective is underwritten by the deployment of our Army and Air Force units in allied territory, by the presence of our Navy units on the Southern and Northern flanks of NATO, and by the maintenance of U.S. Navy forces worldwide to protect the sea lanes to Europe.

We maintain a military presence in the Western Pacific to keep Japan and South Korea aligned with us, and to prevent the Soviets from coercing the Peoples Republic of China into an alignment against us. Also, the present alignment of the Peoples Republic of China draws Soviet divisions from the European front.

Recent events underwrite what should be a fifth national objective equally critical to our national security, and a major component of a viable global strategy:

Preventing the Soviet Union from creating an environment in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, and the Horn of Africa which could result in denial of oil to the United States, NATO and Japan; and deterring the Soviets from any overt action against either Iran or Saudi Arabia.

There is a consensus that an uninterrupted flow of oil from the Persian Gulf is essential to the well-being of most Western nations. Interruption in the flow of oil, if prolonged, would have a debilitating effect during peacetime; a devastating effect during wartime. Oil from the Gulf could be denied to the West as a result of destruction of the oil fields or through a takeover of the producing countries. However, it is far more likely that the flow of oil would be disrupted as a result of Soviet coercion.

Through actions such as those in Ethiopia and Afghanistan, the Soviets can create the perception that the U.S. is impotent to respond and unreliable as an ally. In the presence of this environment, Saudi Arabia and Iran (long enjoying a special relationship to the United States) may be forced to decide that their national interests are best served by making substantial concessions to the Soviets.

The United States must proceed now to develop a clearly understood and fully supported strategy—both political and military—which underwrites the fifth objectives. Admonitions and verbal commitments will not suffice. Neither is it appropriate to adopt the attitude that we should wait and see what happens, that the situation is "not critical yet." Both Saudi Arabia and Iran are deeply concerned by the gathering storm and are distressed by our seeming lack of concern and commitment.

In particular, I would urge that we do the following:

Insure that the President is under no constraint that would prevent him from exercising his authority to counter Soviet initiatives promptly and decisively.

Make arrangements with the Governments of Iran and Saudi Arabia for the intermittent deployment of two carrier forces to the Eastern African littoral and Arabian Sea, conducting selected exercises inside the Persian Gulf on a random basis. Since we lack land bases of any kind in that region, the carriers would provide a visible presence and timely manifestation of United States resolve;

Revitalize the bilateral security agreement of 1959 with Iran and explore the possibility of similar bilateral arrangements with Saudi Arabia;

Explore with our allies (NATO and Japan) joint guarantees and military pacts which adequately reflect our common responsibility for maintaining stability in the region and for the security of the sea routes to oil-producing nations;

Exempt Saudi Arabia and Iran from quota restrictions on the transfer of military equipment, explicitly recognizing that they are as important to our national security as the other nations which enjoy this privilege.

Formally arrange for the periodic conduct of joint United States-Allied-Saudi-Iranian exercises involving all branches of the armed services—directed at possible *external* threats—in the Persian Gulf region.

Stability in the Perisian Gulf is critical to the United States, our NATO allies, and Japan. Our security is threatened if any of these three power centers does not remain strong. The Soviets are engaging in actions that give a clear message as to their aspirations. The Saudi Arabians and Iranians are very concerned; they cannot avoid questioning our commitment, our reliability, and the wisdom of maintaining their alignment with the United States. We must demonstrate our commitment by following an explicit political and military strategy. We must do this *now* lest we be faced *very soon* with a fatal and unsolvable problem.●

IMRE NAGY—20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, with the current trend increasing toward improved relations with the People's Republic of Hungary, I think it is important for those who advocate rapproachement with the Kadar regime to remember a brutal event which signaled forever an end to a brief moment of freedom in Hungary. I am referring to the tragedy that is Imre Nagy's execution on June 17, 1958.

A little more than 20 years ago, the world listened as both Radio Moscow and Budapest announced that Imre Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary, had been tried and executed for, according to his accuser, Janos Kadar, ". . . of not only undermining the party from within out of preparing its destruction from without, in alliance with the dark forces of reaction." Whatever the bogus charges levelled at Nagy, the circumstances sur-

rounding those charges, the trial and subsequent execution remain cloaked in absolute secrecy. This secrecy, indeed the court which allegedly tried Imre Nagy, and his death, were all in violation of existing Hungarian law and legal precedent. Those of us who have followed this case are well aware of these blatant, though not surprising violations of law and legal rights by the Soviet-installed regime still in power.

What we must also remember, and never forget, is the treachery of the man who now, as in June of 1958, heads the Hungarian Government, Janos Kadar. I use the word "treachery" with care because this word, better than any other, describes the duplicity so masterfully employed by Kadar.

According to the Hungarian newspaper, Nepszabadsag, on November 14, 1956, Janos Kadar told a delegation of Hungarian workers, "Imre Nagy is not under arrest. He left the Parliament Building of his own free will and neither the government nor the Soviet troops wish to restrict his freedom of movement. It depends entirely on him whether or not he participates in politics." Kadar reiterated this position on the 27th of November when he said, "We have promised not to start any punitive proceedings against Imre Nagy, and we shall keep our word." Less than a year later, following a series of denounciations by Kadar, and others speaking for the regime, Imre Nagy was executed.

While Kadar attacked Imre Nagy because he ". . . violated his oath of office and instead of defending constitutional order, he exploited his post of Prime Minister. . . ." it is clear that it was Kadar who was, and is, the interloper.

One of Hungary's leading and most respected sons, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, who died 4 years ago, stated at the time, and again in his memoirs:

Although Kadar was also a member of the Nagy government, I consider the government of Imre Nagy to be the sole legal Government of Hungary. Kadar was installed by foreigners; I reject him and his illegal government.

The words of this great Hungarian, symbolizing as he did during his years of asylum in the American Embassy in Budapest the hopes, fears, and dedication to freedom, are echoed by others with whom responsible men would not quarrel. Dr. E. Ronald Walker, on July 14, 1958, in his capacity as acting rapporteur for United Nation's Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, reported:

Moreover, although Mr. Kadar is reported as recently as 1 July 1958 as having denied that the Hungarian Government had broken its word, the record clearly shows that the action of the Hungarian Government in bringing Imre Nagy to trial was contrary to solemn assurances which Mr. Kadar, on behalf of the Hungarian Government, had previously given . . .

To whom did Kadar give such assurances? Its neighbor to the north, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

The record is still incomplete because Hungarian and Soviet authorities have refused to cooperate with any international organizations most notably the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary. Undoubtedly, it is their intention to forever remain silent about the manner in which Nagy was tried and found guilty. We know, as do the Soviet and Hungarians, that to reveal the truth would be an admission of Kadar's treachery and, therefore, the lies upon which his power is derived.●

VETERAN'S WIDOW COMPENSATION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1977, I introduced H.R. 1744 to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the remarriage of the widow of a veteran after the age of 60 would not result in the termination of dependency and indemnity compensation.

I have learned that this bill is favored by the Veterans' Administration, and I am pleased to introduce a copy of the VA's report at this point in the RECORD. I hope that it will be possible to act on this bill this year, since it would mean so much to a number of older surviving spouses.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF
VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1978.

Hon. RAY ROBERTS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to respond to your request for a report on H.R. 1744, 95th Congress.

The bill would amend section 103 of title 38, United States Code, "to provide that remarriage of the widow of a veteran after age 60 shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation."

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 91–376, effective January 1, 1971, the remarriage of a widow(er) constituted a permanent bar to the payment of Veterans' Administration gratuitous benefits. The law (38 U.S.C. § 103 (d), as amended by Public Law 91–376) allows the Veterans' Administration to restore those benefits when the spouse's remarriage terminates or is dissolved, absent fraud by either party or collusion. The veteran's spouse may therefore enter into a second marriage without fear of economic deprivation, should the second marriage prove to be short-lived. This provision of the current law proves especially beneficial to older surviving spouses who tend to marry men or women of advanced years.

The purpose of H.R. 1744 is to extend the liberalization provided by Public Law 91–376 to the dependency and indemnity compensation program for surviving spouses.

When a surviving spouse of advanced age remarries, termination of dependency and indemnity compensation may impose severe financial hardship. The new spouse, similarly advanced in age, is generally preparing for or already retired. Such new spouse faces a reduction in income and may be unable, because of age or disablement, to augment it. The remarried, aged surviving spouse also in many instances is precluded from employment to supplement the loss of dependency and indemnity compensation. H.R. 1744 would provide remedial action to retain for surviving spouses, age 60 or over, entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation at an economic level at least comparable to that which existed prior to the remarriage.

We observe that the bill employs the term "widow" of a veteran. We believe that, if further consideration is given to this measure, a technical correction may be required to change the term "widow" to "surviving spouse," in order to conform with other recent enactments attempting to eliminate any reference to the gender of a surviving spouse.

Assuming an effective date of October 1, 1978, the estimated 5-year cost of H.R. 1744, if enacted, is as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Cost (in thousands)*
1979	$1,556
1980	1,646
1981	1,716
1982	1,801
1983	1,887

In view of the foregoing, the Veterans' Administration favors enactment of H.R. 1744.

This will also serve as a report on H.R. 2893, 95th Congress, an identical measure.

Advice has been received from the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

MAX CLELAND,
Administrator.●

CHANGING OF THE GUARD—REPUBLICAN 94TH CLUB

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1978, the Republican 94th Club met for perhaps the last time, with all of its members. The 94th Club was elected in the year of Watergate which shall become known to many as the "Republican Watergate holocaust." This valiant band of 18 Members of Congress is the third smallest number of Republican freshmen in recent history.

We met in sincere camaraderie on that day to elect new officers of our rather exclusive club and to wish well those members who of their own volition will not be with us in the next Congress. The newly elected officers are: the gentleman from Louisiana, W. HENSON MOORE as president; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, WILLIAM F. GOODLING as vice president; and the gentlelady from Nebraska, VIRGINIA SMITH as Secretary-treasurer.

At that meeting, we also paid tribute to our immediate past president, the gentleman from Florida, RICHARD KELLY; who served our class during the first term of the 95th Congress. He served with great distinction and was the source of inspiration for the meeting on June 21. He did much to give expression to our class and help distinguish as a readily

identifiable group within our beloved House. We presented to him a plaque in grateful memory of his stewardship.

At that evening's meeting, we also initiated a tradition that we sincerely hope is not often repeated. We presented plaques to the departing members of our class. Plaques were presented to the gentleman from Texas, Ron Paul who did not return to the 95th Congress; the gentlelady from California, SHIRLEY N. PETTIS who is retiring at the end of this Congress and who has our love, esteem, and well wishes for the future; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GARY A. MYERS who has admirably put family first and is retiring at the end of this Congress to return to private enterprise and the rearing of his family; the gentleman from South Dakota, LARRY PRESSLER who is not seeking reelection to the House in order to seek a seat in the other body from his State who also has our well wishes and expressions of success; and the gentleman from Wisconsin, ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR., who is also not seeking reelection to the House in order to offer himself to the people of his great State as its Governor. Again, we all wish him every success.

Of our original band of 18, there may be at the beginning of the next Congress only 13 remaining. For those who stay on, we pledge to do the best we can to continue the work begun almost 4 years ago when we came together to this great place with every expectation in our hearts of serving this Nation as best we can. To those who are leaving us, we shall sincerely miss them, but our thoughts and prayers shall be with them in their new endeavors. We should also like them to know they will always be members of our 94th Club and welcome to rejoin us professionally or socially at any time.●

PHILANTHROPY UNDER SEIGE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I became aware that the administration cost containment bill for hospitals, if enacted in the proposed form, would have seriously undermined philanthropic giving to hospitals, and perhaps destroy their endowment base. Over $4 billion is now given by the public to hospitals and medical research. and if that is stopped, these funds would have to be made up with Federal tax dollars, and an important spirit of public participation in community institutions would have been lost.

Consequently I introduced an amendment protecting philanthropic giving, which was accepted by the Subcommittee on Health and Environment on which I serve, and subsequently it was adopted by the Subcommittee on Health of the Ways and Means Committee, and I am informed that the Senate Finance Committee is now considering that language for their bill.

Recently I received an award, which I treasure greatly, given to me by the National Association for Hospital Development, which was given for my work protecting philanthropy, and my work on this amendment. In my acceptance talk, I spoke of the vital importance of preserving philanthropy. Many of my views given then were similar to a recent Time magazine essay by former Secretary of HEW John Gardner. He tells about how philanthropy is threatened by still another legislative proposal, which comes to us under the rubric of "tax reform." I urge my colleagues to read this excellent essay, and take it into consideration when such legislation comes before us:

THREAT TO AN AMERICAN TRADITION

"These Americans are a peculiar people. If, in a local community, a citizen becomes aware of a human need which is not being met, he thereupon discusses the situation with his neighbors. Suddenly a committee comes into existence. The committee thereupon begins to operate on behalf of the need and a new community function is established. It is like watching a miracle, because these citizens perform this act without a single reference to any bureaucracy, or any official agency."

Just so, 150 years ago, Tocqueville described a unique feature of the American system. It is the spontaneous working of a creative public spirit. Out of this fundamental national trait have come such vitally important institutions as libraries, museums, civic organizations, great universities, the United Way, the Little Leagues, the Salvation Army symphony orchestras, garden clubs, historical societies, adoption services, hospitals, religious organizations, Alcoholics Anonymous, the 4-H clubs. Indeed, this American spirit reaches into almost every field of human interests. Tied to another powerful American tradition—that of private giving for public purposes—the volunteer spirit has released incredible human energy and commitment in behalf of community all over the country.

Yet in the next two or three years the Federal Government may destroy this feature of the American system. The destruction could be accomplished silently and invisibly—in the name of tax reform. The threat lies in proposals that would reduce, directly and indirectly, the charitable contributions Americans itemize as deductions from taxable income. And there are even those who, with the intent of simplifying the tax code, would eliminate such deductions entirely. With due respect to the reformers, the alarm should be shouted: Our tradition of private giving for public purposes is endangered by some of their good intentions.

Up until now, Government tax policy has deliberately fostered that tradition. The deductibility of charitable gifts is based on the idea that it is good for a great many people, independently, privately, to contribute to charitable, religious, scientific and educational activities of their choice. Such giving supports the American pluralism that allows all kinds of people to take the initiative in all kinds of activities. In reality, the tradition that has produced the innumerable institutions that are sometimes called the nonprofit sector lies at the very heart of our intellectual and spiritual strivings. The deductibility of charitable donations has been only an expression of that larger philosophy.

Now, there is a new school of thought with a very different view. It holds that a deductible dollar donated, say, to a school for blind children, would have found its way into the federal treasury—if it had not been deductible. That dollar is therefore to be regarded as Government money—and labeled a "tax expenditure." This new doctrine began innocently enough with a concern about the multiplicity of existing tax loopholes. It made sense to calculate the amount of benefits granted by the Government through allowable deductions—as, say, certain industrial tax credit. So the term "tax expenditure" was invented as a convenient way to describe such an amount. Some tax-simplification theorists just have not given much thought to the implications of applying that term to voluntary charitable donations. But there is another type of theorist we have to cope with: the Government-knows-best type, who positively resents the freedom of the tax-deductible gift. His argument is to eliminate the deductibility of that dollar given to the school for the blind, take the money into the treasury and, if the school needs money, let Congress and the federal agencies appropriate it.

Such a doctrine makes the head ache. The American people have been remarkably resourceful in launching activities to serve their communities. They freely give $30 billion a year and contribute God knows how many billion more in nonmonetary services. Now Americans are told that Congress and the Government bureaucracies could do a better job.

Somehow the available evidence on Government efficiency (speaking with the respect of one who served two tours of duty in Government) does not drive one toward that conclusion. But apart from the question of efficiency, if Government preempted "charitable" functions, what outlet would be left for personal caring and concern? Can anyone believe that a manual of regulations from Washington would unlock the miraculous energy which has been so impressive since the days of Tocqueville?

The truth is that the present charitable deduction is not adequate to bring out the best of which Americans are capable. Even recent increases in the standard deduction—five in the last eight years—decreased the number of taxpayers itemizing deductions from almost 50 percent in 1970 to less than 25 percent today. The result damaged the voluntary sector. Contributions to public charities decreased, with losses recently estimated at $5 billion. In 1977 alone, greater use of the standard deduction could cost voluntary American institutions some $1.3 billion. It is estimated that only 16 percent of taxpayers will itemize deductions (and thus have an added incentive to make charitable donations) if the Carter Administration's tax reform proposals are enacted.

What would result if the new antideduction doctrine ever were in force is not pleasant to contemplate. As it is, the trend is already running against voluntarism. The only way to reverse this trend is to amend the tax code to allow all taxpayers to deduct charitable gifts whether they itemize or not. This change alone would eliminate a twofold danger: first, that denying most Americans any encouragement to give will bring more Government into their lives; second, that charitable giving will become the province of only the wealthy.

The Government will best contribute to the health of the society if it actively furthers the vitality of the private, voluntary sector. We must wake up to the fact that the government of a gigantic, tumultuous society cannot be administered entirely by a conventional, centralized, top-down governmental hierarchy. Local levels of government and local private institutions are going to have to figure out how they can collaborate to make things work in the community. The old American trait of voluntary activity and giving is indispensable to that end.

Finally, it is not easy to make a blanket defense of private giving; after all, it consists of so many unrelated, unofficial, un-

classifiable activities. Yet that diversity is one of the qualities that make it beautiful. It is an area in which freedom survives and flourishes. Let's keep it that way.●

DR. ELKINS TO RETIRE

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the day go by without saying a few words about Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, who retires Friday, June 30, after more than two decades as president of the University of Maryland.

In the 24 years since Dr. Elkins took Maryland's helm, the College Park-based university has undergone tremendous growth, both in enrollment and academics. This combination, improving academic standards while also undergoing rapid growth in enrollment, is no small achievement for a State institution, and most of the credit for Maryland's success through this period must go to Dr. Elkins.

Born on a Texas farm some 70 years ago, Dr. Elkins excelled in virtually every category in his own undergraduate career at the University of Texas. A Phi Beta Kappa in the classroom, "Bull" Elkins, as he was known in those days, also earned eight varsity athletic letters. In his final year, he captained the school basketball team while also serving as president of the student government. He was graduated in 1932 with both a B.A. and M.A. degree.

After graduation, Dr. Elkins traveled to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. He earned a Ph. D. in 1936 and returned to the University of Texas to teach history for 2 years before being named president of San Antonio Junior College.

In 1949, he was appointed president of Texas Western College, a post he held until becoming the 21st president of Maryland University in 1954.

At College Park, Dr. Elkins found a school with a good reputation for athletics, but in danger of losing its accreditation. He moved immediately to strengthen the school's academic standing.

Under Dr. Elkins' leadership, Maryland's enrollment grew from 15,000 to 78,000. The first budget he administered was $23 million, the last $316.8 million.

Academically, Maryland today is recognized by both the Association of American Universities and Phi Beta Kappa. In research, it is among the top 30 institutions in the Nation.

Dr. Elkins guided Maryland through the rapid growth years of the late 1950s and early 1960's and through the turbulence of the Vietnam war era when dissent and violence wracked so many of our educational institutions. Through it all, Dr. Elkins and Maryland University survived in fine form.

To be sure, there were times of stress. There were demonstrations and a takeover of the administration building. Unlike other schools, however, there were no students injured at College Park. That may tell you something about the administration of Wilson Elkins.

New challenges face Maryland University today. A continued push for academic excellence is underway and enrollment still is rising. The current era is one of growing demands and ever more scarce educational dollars.

But if Maryland can count in the years ahead on the kind of leadership it has had under Dr. Wilson Elkins, we need not worry about its future. It will be in good hands.

The residents of Maryland owe Dr. Elkins a debt of thanks for his efforts over the past 24 years and we all wish him and his most gracious wife, Vivian, every success in whatever new endeavors they undertake.●

SINGLAUB'S CHALLENGE TO CARTER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed to read an article by Mr. Brownfeld regarding the President's foreign policy decisions and the military's lack of involvement in those decisions. Retired Army officer General Singlaub is quite alarmed about this pattern in our Government. Singlaub points out that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not been contacted by the President when crucial decisions are made." I have personal knowledge that they have been ignored, that they were never consulted." The military which is such an essential part of our foreign policy outlook should never be left out of the decisions. I believe that the pattern which is developing is not in the best interest of the country, and I urge all my colleagues to read this article.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Lima News, June 11, 1978]

SINGLAUB'S CHALLENGE TO CARTER

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Major General John K. Singlaub, who was forced into retirement after twice criticizing President Carter, made his first public appearance as a civilian on June 2 and charged that the Carter administration was making major defense decisions without consulting military leaders.

The general, who retired from the Army after more than 35 years in the military, said that President Carter had failed to consult the Joint Chiefs of Staff in deciding to defer production of the neutron bomb and on plans to slow the withdrawal of American combat troops from South Korea.

"I have personal knowledge that they have been ignored, that they were never consulted," said the 56-year-old general.

Singlaub reported that President Carter had told him, in a meeting attended by Defense Secretary Harold Brown, that the White House decision to withdraw combat troops from South Korea came after military advisers recommended the move and the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed. "I gave the Secretary a cold stare," General Singlaub said. "The Chief of Staff had not been consulted." When he was asked if the president had been untruthful in his statement, the general said, "Yes."

The Singlaub case is properly causing a major stir in Washington. At issue is not only the substance of the general's serious charges—but whether a military leader even has the right to express his own views—even when specifically asked for them. The latest incident which caused trouble for the general was the question and answer period after a talk to Georgia Tech ROTC students. Singlaub was asked his personal view of the president's neutron bomb decision. He responded that, in his view, the decision was "militarily unsound."

The dilemma for President Carter seems to have been somewhat ignored in the discussion of the Singlaub case. The president once told the American people he would "never lie" to them. Would he have a general in the U.S. Army, when asked his personal view of a military matter, lie to the students who asked the question? Evidently he would, for General Singlaub was forced to retire shortly after giving an honest answer to an honest question. The president should carefully consider what he means when, in the future, he speaks of "morality" and "truthfulness" in government.

Discussing Singlaub's willingness to express his views—when other military leaders prefer to remain silent and advance in the ranks—Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., declared: . . . what we have here is a brave and courageous man willing to stand out alone among his fellow officers and declare what he feels to be right."

The American Conservation Union—which General Singlaub now has agreed to assist in the preparation of a film on the SALT talks—states that the forced retirement of the general for disagreeing with certain administration policies shows a "double standard" on the part of the president. ". . . the president has consistently tolerated outrageous statements by Andrew Young which have been both inaccurate and antagonistic toward our allies. General Singlaub's remarks, on the other hand, have been neither. It also must be kept in mind that in the most recent incident, the general was responding to questions from a group of future military leaders. . . . For him to have given them anything but an honest appraisal would have been in conflict with the principle of integrity so vital to the officer corps."

Singlaub properly insists that be believes in civilian control of the military. He notes, however, that, "One of the key issues here is that a professional officer has to be able to distinguish between proper and improper dissent and between proper and improper support. Blind, unquestioning obedience to decisions on military matters which were made without reference to the nation's military advisers may not be in the best long-term interests of the U.S."

What kind of government makes military decisions without reference to the advice of military experts? If the American people suspect amateurishness in the conduct of government by the Carter administration, the charges of General Singlaub bolster that feeling.

Our friends abroad are equally mystified by the decision-making process—or lack of it—now evident in Washington. General Singlaub notes, "Our allies simply do not understand U.S. policy. When they ask me for an explanation, I cannot give it because I don't understand it myself. Many of our allies have expressed some concern that we do not live up to our obligations as the leader of the free world. Our actions have spoken louder than our rhetoric."

General Singlaub has made serious charges against the President and his conduct of policy. Thus far, there is no evidence that he is either wrong or overstating his case.●

FLORIDA DRUG ENFORCEMENT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Washington Post for its June 21 editorial on "Drug Running in the Southeast." The editorial calls attention to legal restrictions in current drug laws which are hampering enforcement efforts in Florida and other Southern States.

The Post also recognizes and applauds the involvement of drug officials in overcoming the limitations imposed by Federal statutes and international treaties. One effort in this direction has been the creation of a White House Review Group. Formed at the urging of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the Review Group has been studying the situation in south Florida.

The committee awaits with great interest their forthcoming report on future and current Federal efforts to assist south Florida.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 21, 1978]

DRUG RUNNING IN THE SOUTHEAST

A legal loophole is complicating efforts by drug-enforcement officials to staunch the flow of marijuana and cocaine from Latin America into the southeastern United States. That region has become the major channel of the drug traffic since enforcement efforts focused on California and the Southwest began to take hold. Most of the drugs reaching the area are being transported by seagoing cargo ships to locations outside the 12-mile limit of U.S. territorial waters. There they load their illicit cargo aboard small, fast "courier" boats for transport ashore. Federal officials can and do intercept these boats as they head toward shore. But, obviously, it would be more effective to confiscate the drugs before they leave the mother ship and to arrest the crews.

That effort, however, has been hampered not only by the need for international cooperation in combatting drug smuggling, but by a serious omission in U.S. drug laws. Because of the omission, it is no crime now for a U.S. citizen or a U.S.-registered ship *outside* territorial waters to have illegal drugs aboard. Civil statutes allow the drugs and the ship to be confiscated. But there can be no criminal prosecution of the people (whether American or foreign nationals) involved unless intent to smuggle the drugs into the United States can be proved. The huge amounts of money involved in even a single large drug transaction reduce the practical effects of the loss of one cargo ship to almost nothing. Thus, the deterrent effect—prosecution of the drug runners—is lacking.

Drug officials are urging a revision of federal statutes and international treaties to amend that oversight. In our view, that's a good idea. They've also begun applying a federal law, originally enacted during Prohibition, that allows the Coast Guard to board any vessel outside territorial waters if it can prove that U.S.-registered boats have tried to smuggle some of the ship's cargo ashore. A White House task force also is studying other ways—including closer cooperation with other countries and the use of military radar planes to track suspicious cargo ships on the high seas—of combatting seaborne drug smuggling. These are welcome actions. They show that drug officials have learned well a lesson of the past decade: The pervasive, corrupting effects of the drug trade make it imperative to respond quickly whenever it makes a new appearance.●

REAL TEST OF U.S. PRINCIPLES

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the role of the United States in South Africa, specifically Namibia is reaching a crucial point. In a recent article by Allan Brownfield, he outlines our situation, "Do we believe in majority rule, or in conquest by terror?" Our role is very important in this area of the world and should not be overlooked by the Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to read this article.

The article follows:

[From the Lima News, June 8, 1978]

REAL TEST OF U.S. PRINCIPLES

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

WINDHOEK, South West Africa.—One would not imagine, here in Windhoek, that South West Africa/Namibia is one of the centers of world attention. The city reflects the German character of those who built it when, in 1884, Germany, in the midst of the Western scramble for Africa, occupied the territory. Even now, this writer could book a hotel room only for a single night—because the city was preparing for a carnival and people from all over the territory were coming to celebrate.

While terrorists continue to attack across the Angolan border, here in Windhoek men and women of all races—white, black, brown—eat together in the hotels, dance together at the discotheques, and mingle in the streets. Although everyone knows this is a period of dramatic political transition, Windhoek itself is the picture of calm.

South West Africa has been administered by the Republic of South Africa since the defeat of Germany in World War I. The South African government has now agreed in principle to leave the territory and allow it to become independent—agreeing to a Western plan calling for free elections. One would suspect that the West would welcome this decision by the government in Pretoria. Unfortunately, the black terrorist group, the Southwest Africa Peoples Organization (SWAPO), wants control of the territory—and doubts that it can win a free election.

Just as the South Africans agreed to the Western plan, SWAPO stepped up its terrorism. One of the leading black moderates in Namibia, Chief Clemens Kapuuo—a man who could win a free election—was murdered. The West made almost no protest. Then, when South African troops crossed into Angola to destroy the terrorist camps from which SWAPO raids had come, the West did protest—vocally, denying South Africa the internationally recognized right of "hot pursuit."

Among the documents captured by South Africa during the raid in early May were detailed assassination plans and official congratulations for the killing of Chief Kapuuo and Ovambo Minister of Health, Toivo Shiyagaya, SWAPO leader Sam Nujoma has not hesitated to proclaim his belief in a one party, Marxist state and has shown nothing but contempt for the idea of free elections.

Professor M. Wieckers of the University of South Africa, an expert in Namibian affairs expressed dismay at the role played by the U.S. He said: "The U.S. has sent observers to South West Africa but while there they spoke only with representatives of SWAPO, not of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance." A. H. Du Plessis, the leader of the National Party in South West Africa, stated:

"We can't understand the U.S. attitude . . . If Nujoma and SWAPO were convinced they could win an election, they would accept the terms of the Western proposal. If SWAPO finally rejects the plan, it seems to me that the five Western powers would be under strong moral obligation to stick to their guns."

One of the leading non-white members of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, L. Barnes, told this writer of a meeting he had with Rep. Charles Diggs, D-Mich. He said: "Diggs wanted us to turn our country over to SWAPO. He knows almost nothing about Namibia. There is, unfortunately, a great lack of communication between my country and people and your government. SWAPO has become nothing but a Communist front. It has been murdering people who oppose it for years. How can the U.S. with a highly developed foreign affairs department be fooled by SWAPO?

"We now have found a democratic formula which can work and can move toward real majority rule. Ninety-five percent of apartheid already has been removed. If anyone told me we would have such progress five years ago, I would have called him a liar."

Those who have been working so hard for a non-racial, democratic Namibia cannot understand why the U.S. continues to advocate the participation of the terrorists of SWAPO. Former Windhoek mayor Ernst Kashik asked: "We have agreed to universal elections—1 man, 1 vote. What else can we do?"

There is every reason to feel optimistic about Namibia's future. It is one of the least densely populated countries in the world with only 762,184 inhabitants spread over 317,827 square kilometers. More than 150 delegates from the nation's 11 black, brown and white population groups met Sept. 1, 1975 in the historic Turnhalle in Windhoek to discuss the constitutional future of Namibia. While there is disagreement about many specifics of their proposal, the democratic formulation is wholly consistent with the Western plan.

Now, the U.S. and the other Western nations must face the test of their principles: Do we believe in majority rule, or in conquest by terror? Peace-loving Namibians of all races want to know the answer.●

IGOR VYACHESLAVOVICH OGURTSOV—A CHRISTIAN PRISONER OF COMMUNISM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, no one knows the exact number of citizens of the U.S.S.R. who are in forced labor camps, but, it is generally agreed that the number is growing under the leadership of Brezhnev. One of these who is wasting away in camp is Igor Ogurtsov, who is not well known in Western circles. Like thousands of others, he is dying the slow death of the camps caused by overwork, limited rations and nonexistant medical care. It is murder by degrees, started by Lenin, perfected by Stalin and now carried on by Brezhnev. It is the Soviet

Union's unique contribution of a step backwards for civilization.

Ogurtsov's major crime was the founding of a religious organization called the All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People. This organization was based upon the Russian Orthodox religion and was both nationalistic and slavophile in its outlook. Its avowed goal was the overthrow of the Soviet dictatorship. The organization VSKhSON, an abbreviation based upon its Cyrillic lettering, set up a program to abolish all vestiges of the Soviet police state and to provide for some private ownership of land and production facilities, and representative government. It was to be a state founded on Social Christianity. The organization itself was founded in 1964 and grew slowly until 1967, when a member betrayed the organization to the KGB. The leaders of VSKhSON were all arrested and tried in 1967, while the rank and file of the organization were arrested in 1968.

The leader Ogurtsov appears to be a most remarkable person. He was born on August 22, 1937, in the city of Volgograd (then Stalingrad). At an early age his family moved to Leningrad. His father was a naval officer and a party member. His mother was a pianist. And, contrary to the usual practice in the U.S.S.R., his family did not abandon him when he was arrested, but, supported efforts to free him. A fellow Russian dissident, who also served time in the forced labor camps, for his work on SAMIZDAT, Vladimir Osipov, said the following of Ogurtsov:

Igor Ogurtsov. is an exceptional and unusual person. From childhood on, he continually honed his will, was merciless toward his own weaknesses, led an ascetic mode of existence, neither smoked nor drank, slept virtually on boards. An enormous strength of will, high intelligence erudition, a knowledge of several foreign languages, skill at writing, an excellent knowledge of music and, at the same time, moral purity and a sensitivity toward those around him—all of this sharply singled Ogurtsov out wherever he happened to be: at home, at work, in the organization. A vegetarian, Ogurtsov did not eat meat, refused everything that smacked of luxury. At the same time, he used to pull drunks out of ditches, would never pass by a beggar without contributing, suffered at the sight of the unfortunate. Ogurtsov was a Christian and a convinced Russian patriot. A decisive influence on his world-view . . . was exerted by the great Russian thinker Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdiaev.[1]

In the above description, students of Russian history can certainly see that the Russian strain of religious mysticism and nationalism is alive and well within the confines of the present day U.S.S.R. For his pains, Igor Ogurtsov was tried and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment in 1967 to be followed by 5 years exile. Ogurtsov's health is reported to be very bad, but, his spirit is undaunted. He has reportedly lost his teeth, his hair, has high blood pressure and is completely emaciated. This is not the new "Soviet man" the Central Committee talks about. Whether he will live to see exile at all is doubtful but, his example to the dissident movement in the U.S.S.R. will live on. One can only hope that Brezhnev, in a fit of remorse over his lack of compliance with the Helsinki Agreements will relent and release this man to live out the rest of his days, but, mercy is not a Communist trait.●

[1] "The New Russian Revolutionaries," John B. Dunlop. (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1976), pp. 20–21.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, some of the objectives of the United Nations Decade for Women (1976–85) concern the equality of men and women, and increased involvement of women in the development of friendly relations between states. It is estimated that by the year 2000, almost 87 percent of the world's population will live in underdeveloped countries. This brings the development of Third World countries into the prime focus of all Western states. It has been found that the educational levels of women in Third World countries is a fairly accurate indicator of the number of children they will bear. Increased education of women in these countries represents not only a decrease in birth rates, but also increased opportunities for equality and involvement in society. Agricultural problems relating to deficits and malnutrition can also be reduced with the increased involvement and education of women in these countries.

The goals of the United Nations Charter are "to promote the fundamental human rights of every individual, the dignity and worth of every person, the equal rights of men and women and social progress and better standards of living, everywhere on earth." To fulfill these goals, more persons must become aware of the problems concerning Third World development—especially the problems of women in these countries.

The following article, by Agency for International Development Director John J. Gilligan, addresses these problems and the enormous potential of women in the Third World. It appeared in the Washington Post editorial page recently and I highly recommend it to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1978]

WOMEN AND THEIR IMPORTANCE TO THE THIRD WORLD

(By John J. Gilligan)

In the year that I have been administrator of the agency for International Development, two facts have become more and more apparent to me. The first is that the economic and social development of two-thirds of humanity may well depend on women—far more than it will depend on men. And second is that the success of women in expediting the development of Third World countries will very significantly affect our own future security and well-being.

Let me supply some of the background that has led me to those conclusions:

In the next 25 years, the world's population will increase from 4 billion to 6 billion people. Most of that increase will be in developing countries: By the year 2000, 87 percent of the world's population will be living in the less developed countries—the "LDCs."

By the year 2000 there will be a food deficit of 100 million tons in the Third World. That deficit can be made up only if the developing countries increase their agricultural production 3 to 5 times.

Most of the people of the LDCs are unhealthy. . . . Major components of disease are inadequate nutrition and sanitation. 100 million children under the age of five are always hungry. Fifteen million children die each year from a combination of infection and malnutrition.

There are 800 million illiterates in the world; nearly two-thirds of them are women. The number of illiterate men rose by 8 million between 1960 and 1970. The number of illiterate women increased by 40 million, bringing the total number of women unable to read or write to half a billion.

Once upon a time the people of this country might have supposed that, grim as life was in the Third World, the problems were theirs, not ours. But if that belief was ever true, it is so no longer. What happens in that half of the world now has impact directly on our lives and on our future. . . .

As a result of record population growth in the last two decades, people in many countries are entering the job market faster than the economy can absorb them. Unemployment in many of LDCs run from 25 to 45 percent. This trend is increasing, and it is estimated that by the year 2000 at least 800 million more people will lack a means of making a living. . . .

The United States has already begun to experience the result of excessive Third World population growth and lagging economic development. Today there are an estimated 6 million to 8 million undocumented aliens from Latin America and Mexico in the United States. . . . Many of these immigrants have taken jobs that might be filled by Americans. Many have migrated to our cities, adding to overcrowded housing and welfare rolls. Mexico has one of the highest population growth rates in the world—3.4 percent annually. With 46 percent of the population under 15 years of age, the potential for increased migration to the United States is enormous.

A key to the resolution of the problem of excessive Third World population growth, of course, is family planning, and the key to that is women.

Twenty-five years of accumulated knowledge and experience have told population experts two things:

First, fertility rates begin to decline when a woman is able to nourish her children properly and keep them healthy, thus ensuring that they survive to adulthood. Only then do couples in poor countries begin to understand that they dare limit the number of their children, who traditionally have been perceived as extra labor on the land and support in old age.

And second, fertility rates begin to decline when the educational level of parents rise. The educational level of the father is important. But that of the mother is more so. In almost every country, the more education women have, the fewer children they bear. For example, in a 1972 study from Jordan of women aged 30–34, illiterate women were found to have an average of 6.4 children while those with a primary school education averaged 5.9. For secondary school graduates, the average was 4.0 and for university degree holders, only 2.7 children. In

Latin America, studies indicate that women who have completed primary school will average about two children fewer than those who have not.

The message is clear: If population growth rates are to be reduced . . . the education of the women in developing countries is an urgent imperative.

Third World food production is also directly related to U.S. prosperity and security—and to the role of women.

. . . We must face the prospect that by 1985—seven years from now—there will be a global food deficit of 100 million tons in developing countries, directly attributable to population growth outstripping agricultural production. It is most unlikely that the food-producing countries of the West will be able to make up this deficit. Even if they tried, the cost of achieving that additional production would be so high that food prices would rise astronomically everywhere.

The only possible solution to this problem is for the less developed countries to increase their own agricultural production to 3 to 5 times their present levels. The people who will have to do this job are the millions of subsistence farmers who scratch out precarious livings on small plots of arid and barren land. . . .

It so happens that those farmers are mostly women. Forty to 70 percent of Third World agricultural labor is female. Depending on the traditions and customs of a particular country, they plant the seed, haul the water, till the soil, harvest the crops, market the produce, tend the animals and strive to keep their families alive by growing the village vegetable gardens.

Today more and more women are being forced into those roles. The lure of the city and cash-producing work is drawing the men away from the farms, leaving the women behind. It is estimated that some 30 percent of rural families in the Third World are now headed by women. . . . If those women—in their interests and ours—are significantly to increase food production, they must learn the use of new fertilizers, irrigation systems and power machinery. They must have roads to get their produce to market, and they must have transportation on those roads. They must have provision for food processing and storage and understand how to use it, and they must have simple economic structures to provide them with credit.

Women have been handicapped in their efforts to get more from the land they work because of their generally "inferior" social position. They have often been barred from owning or inheriting land, obtaining credit or receiving agricultural inputs from development programs. Even when they have been left behind on the family plot as their men have migrated, they have found their situation difficult because control over economic resources and land was left in the hands of male relatives who have not migrated.

In nearly all developing countries, agricultural training—such as it has been—has been given only to male farmers. Wives, daughters and hired female laborers have been largely ignored. Until very recently, women frequently have not benefitted from projects designed to assist farmers because Western development experts simply assumed that farmers were male. . . .

The conclusion is only too clear: If agricultural production and productivity are to increase, development planning in the Third World must give an equal place to women. . . .

In recent years there has been a growing awareness of a fact that women everywhere have always known: That women played the major role in determining the health of their families in acquiring and preparing food for them.

In some cases, because of the depths of their poverty, there is little they can do to improve their nutrition. But in many cases, malnutrition is the result of ignorance. Without any changes in food supplies, miracles can be wrought with simple changes of diet and food habits if women only had the knowledge to make these changes.

Nutrition specialists in Africa, for example, have found that in most villages women could find the right food for their families, or the right combinations of food, if they knew what to look for. A combination of wild greens, a few beans and an occasional egg, mixed and prepared so it can be spoonfed and fed daily, can save a child's life.

Public health workers in Malaysia noticed that Chinese children were surviving and Malaysian children were dying despite the fact that the same food was available to both. When the situation was investigated it was discovered that Chinese mothers understood the importance of diet—particularly of protein—and the Malaysian women did not.

In respect to health, the story in the Third World is much the same. Knowledgeable women could make an enormous difference to the health of the people, for the single major cause of disease in developing countries is related to the failure to observe elementary household and village sanitation. If a woman lacks that knowledge—if she does not understand how or why disease occurs or how it is transmitted—she has no understanding of the importance of keeping food covered or water clean. If she has no notion of what viruses or bacteria are, she has little incentive to observe even the most elementary sanitation precautions.

The critical word in all the foregoing, of course, is "knowledge," meaning education—and especially education for women. If population growth rates are to be reduced, in the interests of all of us; if food production is to be increased, in the interests of all of us; if the health and nutrition of 87 percent of the world's people is to be improved, in the interests of all of us, the women of developing countries must be educated. The enhancement of their status is critical.●

TANIA MARIA WELLS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a distinguished constituent of mine, Ms. Tania Maria Wells. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Wells, 1562 Crider Street, and an active member of the Ward Chapel A.M.E. Church, Memphis, Tenn.

Tania is very unique in that this is the first time in the history of Memphis that anyone has ever participated on a high school level in international competition in Europe. Youths from the ages of 8 to 18 will participate in the events. It is felt that she will definitely aspire for the 1980 Olympics.

Tania is characterized as being unselfish, and "never rings her own bell." She is an above average student at Melrose High School.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with you an article taken from the June 28, 1978, Commercial Appeal on Tania:

MEMPHIAN WELLS EARNS SPOT ON AAU TEAM

Tanya Wells' second-place finish in the 1,500-meter run Sunday in Bloomington, Ind., won her a position on the U.S. AAU Women's Junior Track team, which begins its international tour Friday.

The men's and women's teams will leave from New York for a week in Russia and West Germany and a final week in Great Britain before returning home July 13.

For the Melrose High School senior, her qualifying finish in the Junior Women's Nationals ended a four-year goal.

Wells finished third last year and sixth the year before.

"Tanya has been working for this trip ever since she's been running track," her father Ted Wells said. "The girl that won first place only beat Tanya by a fraction of a second. It was more of a leaning-type victory."

However, Wells says that Tanya's finish wasn't too surprising.

"She had already told all the people she knew that she would be making the trip this year," he said. "I think she felt she was going to win."

Another Memphian, Judy Poldon, came close to making the team, with a second place in the 400-meter hurdles. However, the hurdles are not an international event.

Former Memphian Billy Hill, now head trainer at Ohio State, will serve as the team's trainer.

For Tanya, these international meets are just the beginning of a busy summer.

She will attend a training camp in Colorado Springs at the end of July and then journey to Squaw Valley, Calif., for a National Olympic Committee camp.

At Squaw Valley, Tanya's running will be evaluated to determine her strengths and weakensses.

"Tanya has a pretty full summer as you can see," her father said. "But I think the international trip made her very happy. She's not very emotional, but I know she was happy on the inside." ●

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY J. DeLORENZO

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of one of Connecticut's truly great citizens, Anthony J. DeLorenzo, a United Auto Workers official, who died yesterday in New Britain, Conn., after four decades of service to his State and the labor movement.

We, in Connecticut, who knew him and relied on his sound and compassionate advice, are proud to pay this tribute to a man whose life was rich with selfless dedication and concern for others.

He was a man of many accomplishments. At the time of his death, he was special assistant to UAW president Douglas Frazier in Detroit. He had formerly served as a member of Connecticut's Mediation Board and was a past president of UAW Local 626.

Known as a tough negotiator, he was awarded in 1973 the Eugene Debs Award by the Connecticut Socialist Party for "progressive community and labor leadership." On receiving the award, he commented:

I am pleased to accept this award. I have put my whole life in the labor movement and in things I believe to be right.

Serving as a member of the Bristol Board of Finance, Mr. DeLorenzo was instrumental in increasing benefits and improving working conditions for city employees. Considered by many to be an authority on parliamentary procedure, he was appointed as a layman to a statewide committee which produced a legal practice book for probate judges. He also was a past director of Bristol Hospital.

In addition Mr. DeLorenzo has been active in Connecticut politics since 1950 when he became a member of the Bristol Democratic Town Committee. Later he rose to the position of Democratic town chairman and twice served as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention.

The announcement of his death yesterday brought words of tribute from citizens and public leaders alike. While it had been widely known that Mr. DeLorenzo had been ill, his death nevertheless leaves a void that can never be filled. I wish to express my deepest sympathies to his family and especially his wife, Alice. Many share her sorrow today and will long remember the great contribution made by Anthony J. DeLorenzo to the quality of life of many of Connecticut's citizens.●

ANTHONY PISANO—LEADER IN COMMERCIAL FISHING

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1978, the commercial fishing industry of the San Pedro area will pay tribute to a man whose leadership and foresight have played an important role in its continued success and development. Anthony Pisano, general manager of the Fishermen's Cooperative Association of San Pedro, will be honored by his colleagues in the industry for his many contributions over the years.

Born in Ischia, Italy on September 25, 1919, Tony—as he is known to his many friends in the San Pedro community—received his elementary and preparatory education in his native island of Ischia. Anthony emigrated to the United States in August of 1938, and came to San Pedro, Calif.

At that time, fishing was one of the town's major industries, with many Americans of Italian and Yugoslav descent providing the experience, knowledge, and impetus leading to the growth of the industry. So it was only natural for Tony Pisano to become a deckhand on the *Claremont* upon his arrival in southern California.

Ten years after entering the San Pedro commercial fishing fleet as a deckhand, Anthony Pisano became a boatowner with the purchase of the *Saint George*. He served as captain and general manager of the craft until 1956, when he purchased a larger vessel, the *Saint George H*. He operated this craft until 1966, during which time he also bought the *Saint Jude*.

Tony Pisano's affiliation with the Fishermen's Cooperative began in 1955, when he joined the association. He was active on the board of directors, and served as president of the San Pedro Fishermen's Cooperative Association for 4 years, 1962 to 1963 and 1965 to 1966. During this time, Anthony Pisano was especially involved in the association's fish marketing and legislative programs.

In December of 1966 Tony Pisano became general manager of the Fishermen's Cooperative Association of San Pedro, a position he has held to this day. His many years as a fisherman, including crew member, captain, manager, and owner have given him the experience needed to help the association's members maintain the commercial fishing industry as a vital part of the San Pedro community.

Commercial fishing is a chancy business—it can be very good or very bad, because it depends on the availability of natural resources, the skill of the captain and crew, and to a growing extent on international law. Tony's many years of experience in the industry, combined with his total devotion to the men and women who depend on the industry for a living, have made him a widely known and respected expert in the field. His penchant for hard work, combined with unquestionable honesty, have made him a trusted figure by all those involved in commercial fishing.

Tony has served as an advisor to a number of bodies involved in fisheries resource management, including the U.S. section of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission; the Fish and Game Department of California; and the Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council on Anchovy and Mackerel Fisheries.

In addition, Anthony Pisano is a member of Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley's Citizens Planning Advisory Committee for the Los Angeles Harbor Area, and is a member of the Department of Commerce Ad Hoc Committee on Commercial Fishing Vessel Insurance.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony Pisano is a man whose personal integrity, abilities, and knowledge have earned him the respect and high regard not only of the fishing industry, but of the community he has made his home since he arrived from Ischia in 1938. My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating him on his many achievements, and in wishing him well in the years to come.

We would also like to express our best wishes to his lovely wife, Eva, and their children: Chris, Tony, Philomena, Terry, Camela, and Antoinette.●

ON REWRITING HISTORY: PBS AND THE ROSENBERG CASE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I addressed this distinguished House on the abortive attempt to rehabilitate Alger Hiss, Stalin's agent, who managed to pilfer Government secrets and deliver them to the Soviet Union. As I mentioned, this attempt to vindicate Hiss was wrecked on the shoal's of Allen Weinstein's research, published under the title "Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Trial." But the attempt to resurrect "demons," it seems, never stops.

Now we come to the Rosenberg case. Nothing could have been more vicious than the deliverance of vital military secrets to a totalitarian power, information which could give the Soviet Union the capability to aim nuclear death upon millions of Americans. This is the crime for which the Rosenbergs were convicted and sentenced to death. Judge Irving Kaufmann, who passed sentence, described their crime as one of the most hideous crimes in recorded history.

Radical, pro-Communist, and Communist spokesmen have attempted to make the Rosenberg case a cause celebre. Helen Sobell, wife of convicted Soviet spy Morton Sobell, Dave Dellinger, a self-professed Communist sympathizer and a supporter of the Communist regime in Vietnam, were recently joined by Russell Means, leader of the American Indian Movement and Ron Kovic, a disabled Vietnam veteran who is now a leftwing political activist in sponsoring a "Tribute to Ethel and Julius Rosenberg." To such a band, I suppose the question of whether or not the Rosenbergs were guilty is beside the point. To them, the United States is guilty, and no punishment of the American Republic could possibly be too severe. To the "Hate America" crew, espionage means little or nothing. For the antipatriotic, patriotism is itself a crime.

Then, there is a more subtle attempt at rehabilitation, sowing the seeds of doubt by slanting the historical evidence, by picking and choosing one set of facts to the exclusion of others. In academia, this is dishonest scholarship. In journalism, it is dishonest reporting. In either case, it is an attempt to rewrite history. Recently, the PBS aired a program entitled, "The Unquiet Death of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg." Great numbers of the television audience were once again treated to a classic example of historical distortion. Once again, Americans were presented with a rehash of an old controversy, slanted to fit the preconceptions of liberal ideologues.

The mind of the ideologist is closed, encased in steel, locked up like a strong box in the Bank of London. His narrow vision focuses like a laser beam on his private little "Truth" which he protects and defends against the inevitable assaults of reason. When his theory does not fit the facts, he simply changes the facts. So it is with the Rosenberg case.

Keep in mind that Lee Harvey Oswald began his deadly affair with the radical-left after reading a pro-Rosenberg pamphlet of lies.

I was privileged to receive a copy of recent communication from Mr. Reed Irvine to Mr. Lawrence Grossman, president of the Public Broadcasting Service, dated June 14, 1978, on the PBS presen-

tation of the Rosenberg affair. With Mr. Irvine's permission, I am happy to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

ACCURACY IN MEDIA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1978.

Mr. LAWRENCE K. GROSSMAN,
President, Public Broadcasting Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GROSSMAN: In your recent correspondence about the Joris Ivens' films you emphasized the dedication to PBS of the highest standards of professionalism in journalism.

Permit me to call to your attention a program that you are planning to distribute for airing on June 19 that raises some serious questions about whether or not your organization is engaging in journalism or propaganda.

I refer to the program called "The Unquiet Death of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg."

This program was aired over WETA on December 13, 1975. The program was a thinly disguised effort to present the theories that the Communist Party has been pushing for a quarter of a century about the Rosenberg case. Note, for example, the extensive attention given to Miriam and Walter Schneir and their book, *Invitation to an Inquest*. They do not have the reputation of being objective researchers like Allen Weinstein, to say the least. After using them to impugn Harry Gold's testimony, the narrator notes that Harry Gold left behind a lengthy rebuttal of the Schneirs. The viewers are not given a single sentence from that rebuttal. They are told instead that Gold "had difficulty separating fantasy from reality."

I shall not go into a detailed analysis of the numerous flaws in the original program here.

What interests me now is the so-called up-date of this documentary in light of the documents that the Rosenberg partisans obtained under the Freedom of Information Act.

After these documents were released, a story in The Washington Star on December 8, 1975 (prior to the broadcast of this documentary), said: "The tens of thousands of pages of government documents on the case now available to the public have revealed little to indicate the jury was misled a quarter of a century ago when it found Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and Morton Sobell guilty in an espionage conspiracy."

One of the documents that was released was an FBI report about statements made by Jerome Tartakow, a prisoner in the same jail as Julius Rosenberg. Tartakow told the FBI that Rosenberg had given him rather detailed information about his spying activities. One of the documents indicates that Rosenberg hoped to enlist Tartakow as a spy.

According to Tartakow, Rosenberg said there were two spy units operating in the New York area, one headed by Rosenberg and the other by two men. Rosenberg told Tartakow of some of his espionage exploits, including the photographing of some "terriffic" material allegedly removed from secret files at Columbia University by a protege of one of the top scientists in aerodynamics. The FBI found that the man in question had signed a receipt for 24 documents at Columbia on the day before Rosenberg spent 17 hours in his apartment photographing this "terriffic" material for the Soviets.

Another document revealed that Ethel Rosenberg's mother told the FBI after her daughter's execution that she believed Ethel "was guilty and a soldier of Stalin."

In addition to these U.S. documents, some further information has come from a Czech, Karel Kaplan, who escaped from Czechoslovakia with a large archive of official Czech documents. According to a story in Time magazine of May 9, 1977, Kaplan "claimed that Czech intelligence documents described Julius Rosenberg . . . as 'our agent.'"

I wondered why no mention was made of the documents released under FOIA when the program was originally broadcast in December 1975, since, as I recall, the producer appeared live to comment on the documentary. But I thought that perhaps the release was too recent to permit the kind of analysis he wanted to make.

When I heard that you were airing an update prepared by Mr. Goldstein on June 19, I naturally assumed that this would include information about the evidence found in the FBI files, such as the Tartakow reports, that confirmed the guilt of the Rosenbergs. I thought that Karel Kaplan might even be interviewed.

To my amazement, I found that Goldstein's script says this

"In struggling to penetrate the murky grey veil surrounding this remnant of our Cold War past, I attempted to gain access to government files on the case. They were not available in the America of Watergate. Now an estimated ten percent, one hundred thousand FBI pages, have been released. For the most part they are filled with the minutiae of hearsay FBI investigation. They do not settle the vexing questions. They neither confirm nor deny the guilt, or innocence, of the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell. They seem to reveal more about the FBI, its methods, and our justice system, than about justice itself.

"Throughout this case, the government's prosecutors claimed there was 'evidence, not usable in court, showing the Rosenbergs were the head and center of an espionage ring.' We searched the newly released files for that evidence. In Julius Rosenberg's FBI file: no new evidence to support that claim. In the Ethel Rosenberg file: no new evidence. In the Morton Sobell file: no new evidence.

What we did find, however, suggests that the judge who sentenced the Rosenbergs to death was not detached."

Goldstein then launches into a discussion of some of that "minutiae" in the files. But he mentions only the "minutiae" that might be construed as casting doubt on the fairness of the judge or the validity of the evidence against the Rosenbergs.

Not a single word is said about any of the material found in those files, such as the Tartakow reports and the statement of Ethel Rosenberg's mother which support the findings of the jury that the Rosenbergs were guilty!

Is this not dishonest journalism?

Moreover, I do not recall that in the original program any mention was made of prosecution claims that the case against the Rosenbergs would be strengthened if they could use other evidence in the files. I do recall that for years the people who were contending that the Rosenbergs were unjustly convicted were claiming that the files, when opened, would show that they were railroaded.

That is why they made such a determined effort to get those files released. Mr. Goldstein engages in some sleight of hand in suggesting that he searched those files for evidence that would buttress the government's case and could not find it. The fact is that he and those who were out to prove the innocence of the Rosenbergs were searching for evidence that they were railroaded. They did not find it, but he does not say that.

If this were honest journalism, he might at least have said as The Washintgon Star did on December 8, 1975, that those thousands of pages of documents "revealed little to indicate that the jury was misled." That, after all, was the big news that came out of the examination of those documents. That was the big disappointment. He might at least have mentioned Karel Kaplan's statement. He didn't.

Since the documents have failed to provide the ammunition that the apologists for the Rosenbergs hope to find, they have switched their attack. The emphasis now is not so much a contention that the evidence shows the Rosenbergs were innocent. Rather they are attacking Judge Kaufman. That line emerged in June 1976, two years ago. It was fully discussed in the press at that time.

What possible justification can there be for taking time and money two years later to rehash these old charges?

Well, it so happens that the Communist Party and assorted fellow travelers are planning a big demonstration to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the execution of these "soldiers for Stalin." That is the occasion for a replay of this propaganda production over public television.

You will perhaps disclaim any association with that political rally, but I note that the press release about your program that was issued by WETA on May 19, 1978, specifically mentions this demonstration. One might even say that it is a "plug."

Mr. Grossman, since you say that you uphold the highest standards of professional journalism and recognize your responsibility to live up to the fairness requirements imposed on public broadcasting, please tell me what you plan to do to see that the broadcast on June 19 of the "up-date" of this Rosenberg propaganda program at least informs the public of the fact that the FBI files did turn up documents that confirmed the guilt of the Rosenbergs.

Please tell me if you will insist that the audience be informed that the opening of the archives proved to be a vast disappointment to those who had hoped to find evidence that the Rosenbergs were innocent or that the government manufactured the evidence that helped convict them.

If you cannot do this on the program in question, will you tell me what plans you have to see that a more accurate update is provided to the same audience at a later date?

Sincerely yours,

REED IRVINE.●

PHILANTHROPY UNDER SEIGE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I became aware that the administration cost containment bill for hospitals, if enacted in the proposed form, would have seriously undermined philanthropic giving to hospitals, and perhaps destroyed their endowment base. Over $4 billion is now given by the public to hospitals and medical research, and if that is stopped, these funds would have to be made up with Federal tax dollars, and an important spirit of public participation in community institutions would have been lost.

Consequently I introduced an amendment protecting philanthropic giving, which was accepted by the Subcommittee on Health and Environment on which I serve, and subsequently it was adopted by the Subcommittee on Health of the Ways and Means Committee, and I am informed that the Senate Finance Com-

mittee is now considering that language for their bill.

Recently I received an award, which I treasure greatly, given to me by the National Association for Hospital Development, which was given for my work protecting philanthropy, and my work on this amendment. In my acceptance talk, I spoke of the vital importance of preserving philanthropy. Many of my views given then were similar to a recent Time magazine essay by former Secretary of HEW John Gardner. He tells about how philanthropy is threatened by still another legislative proposal, which comes to us under the rubric of "tax reform." I urge my colleagues to read this excellent essay, and take it into consideration when such legislation comes before us.

The article follows:

THREAT TO AN AMERICAN TRADITION

("These Americans are a peculiar people. If, in a local community, a citizen becomes aware of a human need which is not being met, he thereupon discusses the situation with his neighbors. Suddenly a committee comes into existence. The committee thereupon begins to operate on behalf of the need and a new community function is established. It is like watching a miracle, because these citizens perform this act without a single reference to any bureaucracy, or any official agency.")

Just so, 150 years ago, Tocqueville described a unique feature of the American system. It is the spontaneous working of a creative public spirit. Out of this fundamental national trait have come such vitally important institutions as libraries, museums, civic organizations, great universities, the United Way, the Little Leagues, the Salvation Army, symphony orchestras, garden clubs, historical societies, adoption services, hospitals, religious organizations, Alcoholics Anonymous, the 4-H clubs. Indeed, this American spirit reaches into almost every field of human interest. Tied to another powerful American tradition—that of private giving for public purposes—the volunteer spirit has released incredible human energy and commitment in behalf of community all over the country.

Yet in the next two or three years the Federal Government may destroy this feature of the American system. The destruction could be accomplished silently and invisibly—in the name of tax reform. The threat lies in proposals that would reduce, directly and indirectly, the charitable contributions Americans itemize as deductions from taxable income. And there are even those who, with the intent of simplifying the tax code, would eliminate such deductions entirely. With due respect to the reformers, the alarm should be shouted: Our tradition of private giving for public purposes is endangered by some of their good intentions.

Up till now, Government tax policy has deliberately fostered that tradition. The deductibility of charitable gifts is based on the idea that it is good for a great many people, independently, privately, to contribute to charitable, religious, scientific and educational activities of their choice. Such giving supports the American pluralism that allows all kinds of people to take the initiative in all kinds of activities. In reality, the tradition that has produced the innumerable institutions that are sometimes called the nonprofit sector lies at the very heart of our intellectual and spiritual strivings. The deductibility of charitable donations has been only an expression of that larger philosophy

Now there is a new school of thought with a very different view. It holds that a deductible dollar donated, say, to a school for blind children, would have found its way into the federal treasury—if it had not been deductible. That dollar is therefore to be regarded as Government money—and labeled a "tax expenditure." This new doctrine began innocently enough with a concern about the multiplicity of existing tax loopholes. It made sense to calculate the amount of benefits granted by the Government through allowable deductions—as, say, certain industrial tax credit. So the term "tax expenditure" was invented as a convenient way to describe such an amount. Some tax-simplification theorists just have not given much thought to the implications of applying that term to voluntary charitable donations. But there is another type of theorist we have to cope with: the Government-knows-best type, who positively resents the freedom of the tax-deductible gift. His argument is to eliminate the deductibility of that dollar given to the school for the blind, take the money into the treasury and, if the school needs money, let Congress and the federal agencies appropriate it.

Such a doctrine makes the head ache. The American people have been remarkably resourceful in launching activities to serve their communities. They freely give $30 billion a year and contribute God knows how many billion more in nonmonetary services. Now Americans are told that Congress and the Government bureaucrats could do a better job.

Somehow the available evidence on Government efficiency (speaking with the respect of one who served two tours of duty in Government) does not drive one toward that conclusion. But apart from the question of efficiency, if Government pre-empted "charitable" functions, what outlet would be left for personal caring and concern? Can anyone believe that a manual of regulations from Washington would unlock the miraculous energy which has been so impressive since the days of Tocqueville?

The truth is that the present charitable deduction is not adequate to bring out the best of which Americans are capable. Even recent increases in the standard deduction—five in the last eight years—decreased the number of taxpayers itemizing deductions from almost 50 percent in 1970 to less than 25 percent today. The result damaged the voluntary sector. Contributions to public charities decreased, with losses recently estimated at $5 billion. In 1977 alone, greater use of the standard deduction could cost voluntary American institutions some $1.3 billion. It is estimated that only 16 percent of taxpayers will itemize deductions (and thus have an added incentive to make charitable donations) if the Carter Administration's tax reform proposals are enacted.

What would result if the new antideduction doctrine ever were in force is not pleasant to contemplate. As it is, the trend is already running against voluntarism. The only way to reverse this trend is to amend the tax code to allow all taxpayers to deduct charitable gifts whether they itemize or not. This change alone would eliminate a twofold danger: first, that the denying most Americans any encouragement to give will bring more Government into their lives; second, that charitable giving will become the province of only the wealthy.

The Government will best contribute to the health of the society if it actively furthers the vitality of the private, voluntary sector. We must wake up to the fact that the government of a gigantic, tumultuous society cannot be administered entirely by a conventional, centralized, top-down governmental hierarchy. Local levels of government and local private institutions are going to have to figure out how they can collaborate to make things work in the community. The old American trait of voluntary activity and giving is indispensable to that end.

Finally, it is not easy to make a blanket defense of private giving; after all, it consists of so many unrelated, unofficial, unclassifiable activities. Yet that diversity is one of the qualities that make it beautiful. It is an area in which freedom survives and flourishes. Let's keep it that way.●

THE REAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of the death of Robert F. Kennedy.

His assassination cut short a public life which was devoted to calling attention to the problems which plague our society. The Senator was a champion of people who were too poor, too young, too old, or too weak to wage their battles alone, and his is a voice which has been sorely missed.

A recent edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer carried the following personal account of Robert F. Kennedy. The column was authored by Edwin Guthman, who served as press secretary to the Senator, and who is now editor of the Inquirer. I commend this piece to the attention of my colleagues, because it captures the essense of a man who has become recognized as a very special person in our Nation's recent political history:

RFK DREAMED DREAMS THAT NEVER WERE

(By Edwin Guthman)

From the day in 1954 when he almost came to blows with the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy's chief counsel, Roy Cohn, during the Army-McCarthy hearings, Robert Kennedy was controversial and still is. Mention of his name now—a decade after his death—provokes an argument in almost any gathering.

Many who battled against him on the political hustings, in court or across the counsel table use adjectives like "ruthless", "power-hungry", "opportunistic" and "little— — — — —" in describing him. Those who knew him well and worked with him, remember him as "brave", "gentle", "wise" and "responsible."

Who was the real Robert Kennedy? Well, for one thing he wasn't "little." He was 5 feet, 10 inches tall, weighed about 165 pounds and had muscular forearms and thighs. Wiry best described his appearance although it was his eyes—perceptive and blue—set in a craggy, weatherbeaten face that caught one's attention, not his build.

I knew Robert Kennedy for 12 years. We met first in the fall of 1956 when he arrived in Seattle under an assumed name—"Mr. Rogers"—to ask me and another Seattle Times reporter for help. For eight years, we had been investigating Seattle's most prominent citizen, Dave Beck, then international president of the Teamsters Union. Kennedy was chief counsel of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, about to embark on a sweeping investigation of labor racketeering.

A Washington reporter who was familiar with our work suggested to Kennedy that Beck's activities were a ripe place to start the probe and called me to ask if we'd see a "young lawyer" from the committee.

"Who is he?" I asked.

"Bob Kennedy," the reporter said. When I didn't respond, he continued, "You know, he's Senator Kennedy's brother."

"That's fine," I said, "but can you trust him?"

In 1956 the name "Kennedy" did not mean much 3,000 miles from Massachusetts and Washington, D.C., and the question of trusting "a young lawyer" from a Senate committee in the wake of the McCarthy era and in the face of Beck's power was very real. Trusting Kennedy also involved giving him sensitive information, but we took a chance after questioning him because we had hit a stonewall that only some official agency with the power to subpoena records could break down.

We never regretted our decision for he kept his word to us absolutely, while bringing to public attention the extent of Beck's dishonesty and abuse of power, forcing Beck out of office. And something else caused us to regard him highly: He took responsibility for the accuracy of witnesses' testimony before the committee.

That was the beginning of our relationship which he would characterize eight years later in an inscription on a drawing of the Department of Justice: "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

For a public man, he was remarkably shy and introspective. Though he had a marvelous sense of humor and could be outgoing, he often was laconic and restrained and thus, he did not make friends easily. It was necessary to go through some difficult experience with him—to test and be tested—but once formed, the bond of friendship persisted regardless of the passage of time or a change in circumstances. He would go to great lengths to help a friend or someone he respected, particularly if they were in trouble.

There was about him a presence of command. Had he chosen a military career, he would have been the rare platoon leader or regimental commander whom infantrymen would follow into combat believing that no harm could come to them as long as he was with them. But neither that nor his strong sense of loyalty were what drew people to him. It was his honesty, his commitment to freedom and justice, his concern for the underdog and his ability to act effectively to change conditions which he saw as being "unacceptable."

It was this last-mentioned quality that was so unique. He could not see or become aware of something wrong and not act, whether it was an injured bird or a crying child or abuse of public office or ghetto poverty. Others might stand around or make speeches. He had to act.

When the white officials of Prince Edward County, Va., closed public schools rather than accept court-ordered integration in the early 1960s, the white children went to private schools but about 1,500 black children were simply cast adrift. When all efforts failed to persuade the Prince Edward officials to reopen the schools, Kennedy, then attorney general, established the Prince Edward County Free School. Outstanding teachers came from around the country, and the black children received a better education than they ever could have hoped for in Southside Virginia. That 1,500 children could not go to school was unacceptable.

When a meeting bogged down, he would say in a low, slightly irritable voice: "Don't keep telling me what I can't do, tell me what I can do." He would take risks for what he believed was right, but took responsibility for his decisions.

When a riot developed at the University of Mississippi in 1962 over the admission of a black student, James Meredith, and 300 U.S. Marshals were under siege and 29 had been wounded by gunfire, he refused to order them to fire back, avoiding a certain bloodbath. He was 35 years old and he made that decision on the spot.

Six months later, in planning to deal with any eventuality when Alabama Gov. George Wallace would "stand in the doorway" to prevent two black students from entering the University of Alabama, Army generals urged him to leave the decision to open fire, if it became necessary, to the commander on the scene.

"No," he said. "I have to decide if troops are sent in and if anyone is killed, it will be my responsibility."

Fortunately, troops were not needed, but when students were shot and killed at Kent State, Peoples Park in Berkeley and in other demonstrations, I remember Robert Kennedy. No other political figure took responsibility for actions of the lawmen they sent to quell riotous demonstrations, particularly as to when weapons would be fired.

As the years passed, particularly after President Kennedy was assassinated, many writers perceived a great transformation in his character—more compassion and tolerance—and in his outlook—more liberal and more dissatisfied with the status quo. There was more truth that his outlook changed than that his character changed. He had an inexhaustible curiosity that drove him to seek ever more knowledge and his views broadened incredibly with each new experience.

His family and friends will gather at sundown Tuesday at his grave in Arlington Cemetery. Ten very long years have passed, yet he remains vividly alive in our memories. I hear him now, saying, as he did so many times:

"Some men see things as they are and say why?

"I dream things that never were and say why not?"

That was the real Robert Kennedy.●

PRUSSIANS IN AFRICA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the Moscow-Havana Axis continues its bloodletting in Africa, while the U.S. African policy flounders in a mire of self-deception, indecision, and hyprocrisy. No aid or support of Africans resisting this new imperialism appears forthcoming. But the fleeting strategic opportunity to turn the tides is surely there. Cuban casualties have been getting unpleasantly heavy, and Dr. Castro's wounded are being cleverly spirited off to hospitals in East Germany.

Good, stolid, obedient clients, these East Germans. I suppose their leaders, like a previous generation before them, still know how to obey orders. It is a rare feat to train, discipline, and equip a whole army of border guards to shoot their fellow countrymen in the back. But somehow they have been able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I think we may rightfully expect that these obedient clients of the Soviet Union will do their part as Russia's partners in advancing the cause of "proletarian internationalism" in Africa. Already, East Germany has supplied advisors to their Cuban comrades in Angola, and, allegedly, they showed up in Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. I wonder if anyone in the administration is going to lose sleep over it. Perhaps our esteemed Ambassador to the United Nations has convinced Hamilton Jordan to tell Amy to tell the President that the East Germans would be "a stabilizing influence" in Guinea-Bissau. After all, East Germans probably think that there is really nothing wrong with Africa that a little Communist discipline would not cure.

A British analyst, Mr. Ian Greig of the Foreign Affairs Research Institute of London provides us with a penetrating analysis of the impressive possibilities for agents of proletarian democracy in the African bush country. I beg your indulgence of his observations.

The analysis follows:

INDIRECT AGGRESSION BY WARSAW PACT AND CUBAN FORCES IN THE THIRD WORLD

(By Ian Greig)

The Commander-in-Chief of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces is the Prime Minister, Dr. Fidel Castro. He is assisted in this role by his brother Mr. Raul Castro, who holds the post of Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and he is also a Vice-Premier and Second Secretary of the Cuban Communist Party.

The total strength of the full time forces is put at 189,000 of whom 160,000 are in the army, 9,000 in the navy and 20,000 in the air force. There is a period of compulsory military service of three years. Soviet military aid began to arrive in Cuba in 1960 and by the early 1970s had reached an estimated annual inflow valued at $150 million each year. Several thousand Soviet instructors serve in Cuba under the command of a lieutenant general and senior Cuban officers frequently attend courses in the Soviet Union. Since early 1978 some Soviet pilots appear to have been flying routine defence patrols in Cuban aircraft, presumably because of the fact that many Cuban pilots are now serving in Africa and elsewhere.

Cuba has a defence and mutual assistance treaty with the Soviet Union. Although it is not formally a member of the Warsaw Pact, hints have been dropped by Moscow that it might be invited to join should Spain join NATO. 34% of the country's trade is with the Soviet Union and in addition to purchasing almost all the island's sugar crop at prices nearly double the world average, the Soviet Government also provides subsidies running at the rate of $2 million a day. Since 1972, Cuba has been a member of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance or COMECON, the Soviet bloc economic alliance. One point sometimes forgotten when the question of Cuba's independence of action is raised, is that in addition to subsidies, the Soviet Union has for some time provided Cuba's entire requirements of oil supplies including the aviation spirit so vital to sustain the airlifts which form such an essential part of its foreign ventures.

It was estimated in 1971, that Cuban defence spending was then running at about $150 million a year or about 6% of the country's GNP. The Cuban Army consists of 15 infantry "divisions" whose strength approximates more to that of a brigade in most other armies, three armored regiments, and some independent regiments or battalion groups. Its equipment includes over 600 Soviet-made tanks. The navy has nearly 50 fast patrol craft, obtained from the Soviet Union. The air force now has 210 combat aircraft. The regular army reserve has a strength of about 90,000 men and there is also a well armed People's Militia about 200,000 strong which has home guard and internal security duties as well as forming a fallback reserve for the army. Internal security is further strengthened by the existence of a force of about 13,000 state security troops. In addition, support for the regime is ensured by the existence of a network of Committees for the Defence of the Revolution (CDRs) to which it has been estimated that probably 75% of the adult population belong and which organise both political education programmes

and "voluntary" work tasks in aid of the state.

45,000 CUBANS IN AFRICA

A congress of representatives of CDR's held in the autumn of 1977 committed all members to serve overseas if needed, with the priority for the time being given to African tasks. In the same month, the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party reaffirmed Cuba's decision to give all possible aid to the cause of "proletarian internationalism" despite difficulties which distance and other factors might provide. Current Western estimates of the numbers of Cubans now serving in Africa show considerable variation, but, if as would seem probable, a recent State Department estimate of a total of 45,000 (including approximately 39,000 combat troops) is roughly correct then it would seem that one Cuban in every 250 is already serving in Africa, as compared with one American in every 400 during the height of the Vietnam war. 5,000 reservists are known to have been called up in January to replace regular troops serving in Africa.

Cuban troops in considerable numbers also continue to be stationed in the People's Republic of Democratic Yemen (South Yemen) and an aid mission to Laos reportedly includes a military element whilst an "international builder's brigade" from Cuba serves in Vietnam.

Relatives of military personnel who become casualties whilst serving overseas are informed of the fact, but it would seem that the total number of casualties suffered by the various Cuban expeditionary forces is not made public. However, Western estimates reckon that the Cuban forces have suffered some 4,000 casualties in Angola since 1975. It has been reported that some Cuban wounded have been sent for treatment to the Soviet Union and East Germany, so as not to risk lowering home morale by their presence in Cuba.

In an article in The Times of 16 August 1977, Mr. Herbert Marchant, a former British Ambassador to Cuba, recorded that in March of that year, Dr. Castro had himself admitted that it was not possible for Cuba to both enjoy a high standard of living and support large scale military and other operations overseas. The course of events since then, would seem to have indicated only too clearly where Dr. Castro's priorities lie. An article in the British Communist Party's newspaper The Morning Star of 3 August 1977 gave an interesting insight into the latter's reasons for seeing Africa as a particularly tempting field in which to indulge in foreign adventures. The author quoted Dr. Castro as having said a few weeks previously that "Africa is the weakest link in the chain of imperialism." In Latin America, Dr. Castro continued, the middle class, "that bastion of fascism", had impeded revolutionary progress, but Africa had no middle class, and it was, therefore, possible for the people to be led directly from tribalism to socialism.

CUBA'S INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

The Cuban Government's policy of granting vigorous aid to the cause of revolution in a growing number of areas of the world is prosecuted, not only through its armed forces and civil aid, but also by means of the operations of its very active intelligence services. The chief of these, the Direccion General de Inteligencia or DGI was reorganized with the help of the KGB in 1971, and, since then, its operations have to a very large degree been controlled by the Soviet service. An interesting summary of its activities have been given by Mr. Brian Crozier in his recent study, The Surrogate Forces of the Soviet Union.[1] He states that the DGI is the only Communist intelligence service known to have received financial support from the Soviet Union for the specific purpose of extending its foreign operations. A special organisation known as the National Liberation Directorate has also been established to handle the execution of subversive operations in the Third World and elsewhere.

More than 50 Cuban intelligence officers currently receive training in the Soviet Union each year. As many as 10% of these may be recruited during their training to work as KGB agents within the Cuban intelligence apparatus.

The present Cuban Ambassador in Angola Mr. Oscar Oliver, is known to be an experienced DGI officer who previously served as Ambassador to Equitorial Guinea, Mali, and Guinea. It is also thought that a percentage of the Cuban soldiers serving as soldiers in such countries as Congo-Brazzaville and Guinea are in fact DGI agents.

AN INCREASING ROLE FOR EAST GERMANY

With just over one quarter of the Cuban regular army's total strength now serving in Africa, there is an increasing strain on the social services of the island (the total population of which is smaller than that of the Greater London Area). It may very well soon become apparent that Cuba's trained manpower resources are no bottomless well. Should the Soviet Union continue with its forward policy in Africa, as at present seems likely, and should in particular this lead to a large scale military campaign developing in Southern Africa, the Soviet Union will quite possibly increasingly have to look to additional surrogate forces on which to draw. It would seem probable that one of the first to which it will turn in this event will be East Germany.

The East German Army is smaller than that of Cuba having a strength of 105,000 men but is reputed to be highly efficient. Its fighting formations include two armoured divisions and four motorised infantry divisions, plus an airborne battalion which has received special training in infiltration and sabotage techniques. It has about 2,000 tanks and is backed by a reserve force of some 200,000 men. Internal security is catered for by the existence of a workers militia about 500,000 strong and by over 70,000 border guards and security troops. The airforce has 460 combat aircraft whilst the navy includes a force of about 3,000 marines.

East Germany has already established a record for itself as being probably only second to the Soviet Union amongst the Warsaw Pact countries, as far as both civil and military activity in African countries is concerned.

Mr. Crozier has, for instance, recorded that several hundred East German military advisers are known to have aided the MPLA and Cuban forces in Angola. That campaign had not been long over when the West German newspaper Die Welt carried an article on 9 November 1976 in which the Rhodesian Army's Director of Operations, General Peter Wali, was quoted as saying that a sizeable detachment of officers and non-commissioned officers of the East German Army (NVA) had arrived in Mozambique.

Most of them were said to be assault pioneers who specialized in training guerrillas from Rhodesia in planting mines, blowing up bridges, power lines and railway tracks, etc. Others were communications specialists, some of whom were working on airbases in the south of the country whilst a smaller contingent gave instructions on radio operating to guerrillas in base camps near the Rhodesian border. The same article described NVA pioneers as being engaged upon various military construction tasks in Guinea-Bissau and Angola, whilst a party of East German military advisers had also begun work in Libya.

In the Algerian Army, Colonel Messali Muhammed, commanding the Hamada district of Algeria, was said to have expressed thanks to NVA experts for their aid in constructing a supply airbase designed to bring aid to POLISARIO guerrillas operating in extremely difficult country on the borders of Moroccan Sahara.

One West German expert, Mr. Hemming Lowis, has estimated that by 1977 the East German Government was spending about 200 million marks a year on military aid to guerrilla movements in Africa and the Middle East. The East German intelligence service of MFS is known to be heavily involved in assisting the new governments of Angola and Mozambique in establishing efficient security services and reportedly also in the setting up of special camps for political prisoners. The presence of East German security advisers engaged upon similar tasks has also been reported from Uganda and Ethiopia.

They have certainly played a major role in the People's Republic of Democratic Yemen where as many as 2,000 East German advisers of various kinds are at work. The West German Newspaper Bild Zeitung has reported the presence of a training camp for Palestinian terrorists near East Berlin and in a recent incident on the border of Namibia, a NVA officer was killed by South African security forces whilst accompanying a party of SWAPO guerrillas. A company of NVA assault pioneers is reported to have given support to the Ethiopian Army during the recent fighting in the Ogaden.

The importance which the East German Government gives to events in Africa was illustrated by a statement broadcast over its radio station "Voice of the GDR" on 19 March 1977 that: "The African continent, which lay so long in chains, has become the burning point of the world revolutionary process". Three months later a senior member of the East German Politburo, Mr. Ernest Lamberz, arrived in Lusaka in the course of a tour of Africa and held discussions with Mr. Joshua Nkomo and other representatives of the Patriotic Front and also with members of the South African National Congress

ASPECTS OF SOVIET BLOC MILITARY AID

One aspect of the large scale training facilities now being offered by the Soviet bloc to both the regular forces and guerrilla movements of the Third World is the very considerable degree of "political education" which forms an inseparable part of all military training in Communist countries. Current Soviet regulations insist that each non-commissioned member of the armed forces must receive two two-hour periods of instruction in Marxist-Leninist theory per week, and one hour per week Marxist interpretation of current events as a basic minimum. Further troops in the field during major exercises receive special talks on such subjects which sometimes last up to three hours in length.[2] In addition to supervising such activities, all officers have to receive up to 50 hours of special instruction per year. Defectors from various foreign armies and movements who have attended courses in the Soviet bloc have frequently spoken of encountering similar indoctrination. Mr. Crozier has pointed out that although trainees who go for instruction in such countries probably do not absorb all the political indoctrination they receive, some of it seem bound to stick and makes them at the very least more receptive to pro-Communist or anti-Western propaganda.

A report produced by the Senior Specialists Division of the U.S. Congressional Research Service for the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives[3] stated that over the period 1955–1974 over 33,000 Third World trainees received mili-

[1] "The Surrogate Forces of the Soviet Union." By Brian Crozier, Institute for the Study of Conflict, 12/12A Golden Square, London W1R 3AF. £2 or $4.50.

[2] "The Soviet War Machine." Salamander Books, London 1976, pp. 34–36.

[3] "The Soviet Union and The Third World: A Watershed in Great Power Politics?" May 1977.

tary instruction in the Soviet Union and that the numbers were increased each year. In 1974, some 3,000 trainees were under instruction in that country whilst nearly 7,000 Soviet advisers and military technicians were stationed in Third World countries.

The same report noted that the amount of material military aid given by the Soviet Union to the Third World had reached a level double in value to that of the former's civil aid programme. An American expert was quoted as estimating that the Soviet Union's supply of arms to the Middle East alone during the years 1955–74 probably accounted for as much as 6%–9% of the USSR's total arms production. The authors made the point that the process of breaking free of dependence on Soviet supplies of arms once a country's forces had become used to receiving them was often a complicated and slow one. It has, for instance, been estimated that it will take the Egyptian Army from between 5–10 years to become entirely equipped and trained with weapons from non-Soviet sources.

According to a published CIA report released last autumn, the Soviet Union concluded arms supply agreements with Third World countries valued at about $2.34 billion during 1976 and actually delivered arms worth $2.25 billion as compared with deliveries of non-military aid worth $900 million. The report said that the number of Soviet advisers and technicians in Third World countries had increased by 10% during the year whilst the presence of those of Communist China had decreased by 30%.

The use of surrogate forces by the Soviets is clearly designed to refute charges that Moscow is undermining detente by itself engaging in dangerous military adventures overseas. Possibly also the nuclear alert ordered by President Nixon when the Soviet Government threatened to use its own airborne forces to intervene in the Arab-Israeli war of 1973 is still a major factor in the minds of Soviet planners. It was a reminder that the day has not yet come when the West can be challenged too openly and with immunity. However, the use of surrogate forces taken in conjunction with the obtaining of a considerable degree of influence over the military establishments of Third World countries through the granting of lavish military aid; the achieving of a very real dominance over the high command of "liberation movements" by the same means, and the greatly enhanced capacity of the Soviet Union to move large quantities of men and material over long distances in a very short space of time, is enabling the Soviet Union to use indirect aggression against the West strategically by proxy in certain countries under the overall cover of detente.●

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIANS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 38th anniversary of the forcible invasion and occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. June 15, 1940, marked the beginning of the deportation of many thousands of Lithuanians to Siberia, and the subsequent deprivation of basic human rights of Lithuanians.

Soviet oppression in this former Baltic nation, Mr. Speaker, has reached even greater heights in recent years. "Show" trials and harsh sentences are used to intimidate and silence the nationalist movement, and to crush religious freedom. Today, many hundreds of Lithuanian dissidents find themselves imprisoned for exercising basic human rights which are supposedly guaranteed by international treaties signed by the U.S.S.R.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following four examples of Lithuanians who are now in prison because of their courageous activities on behalf of the Lithuanian nationalist movement:

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

Name: Balys Gajauskas. Born: 1927—Kaunas, Lithuania. Background: Gajauskas was first arrested in 1948 as a Lithuanian partisan and sentenced to twenty-five years in Soviet labor camps. Released in 1973 he was denied validation of his internal passport, constantly is harassed and interrogated. His aged and sick mother was fined several times for harboring an "illegal resident."

Gajauskas has distributed money to Lithuanian political prisoners and their families from the Solzhenitsyn fund. On December 23, 1974, the KGB searched his apartment and found religious literature, personal notes, 50 pages of a Lithuanian translation of Solzhenitsyn's "Gulag Archipelago," a list of 135 political prisoners and some money from the Solzhenitsyn fund. Following the search, Gajauskas was picked up, interrogated for three days and finally released.

On April 20, 1977, Gajauskas was picked up again by the KGB as a witness in a case involving the underground publication "Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania." His apartment was again searched, and valuable documents confiscated. Among that documentation was historical data about the 1944–52 Lithuanian resistance movement, some documents of the United Democratic Resistance and the Lithuanian Freedom Movements.

Gajauskas was detained at the KGB Isolation Prison in Vilnius until his trial in April 1978.

On April 14, 1978 Gajauskas was sentenced to 10 years in Soviet special regime labor camp and 5 years of exile for alleged anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda (paragraph 68 part II of the Criminal Code of Soviet Lithuania).

Name: Viktoras Petkus.

Born: 1929 in Lithuania.

Background: Petkus is a member of the Lithuanian Public Group to promote the implementation of the Helsinki Agreements, (a five member group formed in Vilnius on November 25th, 1976).

Petkus was first arrested in 1947 for his activities in the Catholic Youth Organization, and after serving six years, he was released in 1953. He completed high school and then attended the University of Vilnius where he studied literature.

Petkus was arrested again in 1957, this time for possession of anti-Soviet literature—a collection of poems by Jurgis Balrusaitis. These poems were published five years before the revolution in 1912, and were included among the "Anti-Soviet literature". He was not released until 1965. Since that time, while working as a hospital attendant, and then as a church sextant, Petkus became an expert in Lithuanian literature and had collected a massive bibliography on Lithuanian poets. He attracted a wide circle of young Lithuanians, who were constantly shadowed by the KGB and questioned about Petkus. These statements may be used in a forced to sign false statements concerning Petkus. These statements may be used in a pending trial against him.

Petkus was arrested on August 23rd, 1977 and his apartment was searched in connection with the case of Balys Gajauskas. Among the items seized in that search were Documents 3–12 of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, three (3) copies of "Act of the Establishment of the Supreme Committee of the National Movement of Estonia-Latvia-Lithuania", issues 1–4 of the underground periodical "Dievas ir Tevyne" (God and Country), some other underground publications, and two portable typewriters.

Viktoras Petkus is still in prison, but has not been tried.

Last known address: Vilnius, Lithuania SSR, Gavelio G–VE 16, Apt. 4, Viktoras Petkus.

Name: Petras Plumpa.

Born: 1939 Rokiskis Raion, Lithuania.

Background: Petras Plumpa grew up, and was educated under the Soviet system but he refused to accept the Russians as his masters.

At the age of 19, Petras was arrested. The Soviet authorities charged him with taking up and circulating petitions, and with having hoisted the Lithuanian national flag in Petrasiunai, a town in Lithuania. For this, he was sentenced to 7 years under strict security.

On November 19, 1973, Petras Plumpa was arrested again and was held without trial until December 2, 1974. This time he was charged with having printed the Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church (Articles 68 and 70 of the Penal Code of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic). The trial was conducted behind closed doors, the charges were never proven and evidence was produced that the fingerprints on the Chronicle were not Plumpa's. Nevertheless, he was sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment, to be served in strict regime camps.

Plumpa accepts his imprisonment in a deeply Christian spirit, forgiving even those who persecuted and betrayed him. He asks only for prayers. His current address is: District of Permie 618263, Cusovoj Kraj, Kuchino. vs 389/36–2, U.S.S.R.

Plumpa will be able to receive food packages only after 4 years. He is allowed to write only two letters per month.

Name: Sarunas Zukauskas.

Born: 1950 Kaunas, Lithuania.

Background: Sarunas Zukauskas had an exemplary academic record, and by the time he was in his last semester at Kaunas Medical Institute, he was considered to be among the outstanding students of his graduating medical class.

However, after undergoing a program of intense Russification in the schools and youth organizations to which he belonged, as well as witnessing the repression of Lithuanian heritage and cultures by the Soviet communist regime, Sarunas Zukauskas sought to combat the injustices in Lithuania and joined the dissident movement.

Just prior to graduation, he was betrayed by one of his colleagues and placed under arrest. He was held under Article 70 (Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda) and Article 72 (forming an anti-Soviet organization) of the criminal code of the Russian SFSR.

In March 1973, Sarunas Zukauskas was convicted and sentenced to six (6) years of strict regime labor camp. His mother, Birute, had lost her job upon his arrest, and by the time of Sarunas' trial she had been hospitalized for severe ill health. His brothers continue to be harassed, taunted and discriminated against in school, at work and at home.

Sarunas has already served five years of his sentence, is in poor health—suffering from severe malnutrition—and in need of medical attention, which is consistently denied him.

He is denied his right to family visits and correspondence. Corrpendence to him from relatives in the USA is returned without explanation.●

POLICE, FIREMEN, AND URBAN REVITALIZATION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Mr. Paul Pulitzer, president of the Union, N.J., based National Institute for Environmental Communications.

Mr. Pulitzer writes of the demoralizing effect crime is having on efforts to rehabilitate our inner cities, and of the valuable services provided by our public safety officers to reverse this trend.

We often forget, however, that police officers and firefighters are subject to excessive stress and responsibility, which sometimes results in marital difficulties or other personal problems. Mr. Pulitzer points out the significant results achieved by the New Jersey-based Disabled Police and Firemen of America, an independent, nonprofit rehabilitative counseling service, in providing confidential counseling to public safety officers in its first year of operation.

I would like to commend the officers and members of the Disabled Police and Firemen of America for their innovative work and urge that attention be given to Mr. Pulitzer's commentary.

POLICE, FIREMEN, AND URBAN REVITALIZATION

Economic experts testifying recently before Senator Lloyd Bentsen's (D.-Texas) Congress Joint Economic Subcommittee on Economic Growth urged that "unless violence and thefts diminish, blighted cities and neighborhoods are not likely to recover, regardless of how much money the federal government might spend for jobs, housing, or transportation." This consensus of opinion suggests that, before federal funds allocated for urban rehabilitation can be invested with some assurance of reconstructive effectiveness, local police and firemen, who are already over-burdened and over-harassed, will be called upon to pave the way for it by bringing crime, arson, and vandalism under acceptable control. Unfortunately, however, such expectations cannot be realized unless some present restrictions upon law enforcement and fire protection capabilities are lifted and a change in public opinion and apathy attained.

The long, thin, blue line of defense standing between the law-abiding citizenry and criminal anarchy in urban centers is under increasing assault by rising incidents of crime, arson, and vandalism. Concentrated efforts to contain this vicious onslaught have been consistently neutralized by the dispensation of "revolving door" criminal justice, "do-gooder" interventionism, media subjectivity, and organized abuse. These exercises in irresponsible citizenship have been nourished by public indifference. Consequently, police and firemen are forced to labor under a state of demoralization. Therefore, it can be assumed that the obstacles impeding urban revitalization cannot be removed from the path of progress unless the wage-earning, tax-paying, and law-abiding citizenry are first made aware of the linkage between the effectiveness of local police and firemen, the reduction and control of urban criminality, and the rehabilitation of blighted urban areas. It can also be suggested that this problem should be recognized as an environmental issue warranting immediate attention and action.

AN UNREALIZED SOURCE OF POLLUTION

Mental, moral, and spiritual deterioration attributable to socio-economic conditions, which must be recognized as another root cause of accelerating criminality and a contributory factor in urban degeneration, is just as hazardous to the health of the human and urban environments as are contaminated air, water, soil, and food. In fact, unless this aspect of the overall environmental problem is taken into serious consideration, it is not likely that federal and state programs designed to bring pollution under control will ever attain the level of success envisioned.

Because police and firemen are constantly exposed to the lethal fallout from mental, moral, and spiritual pollution, they, too, have become susceptible to its bacillus. Yet, even though this lethal source of environmental degradation exerts an adverse human and economic impact upon all federal and state efforts to uplift the quality of life in America and does, indeed, inhibit the full employment of police and firemen capabilities to cope with criminality, it remains excluded from urban rehabilitation and environmental protection programs. It seems that promulgators of legislation and appropriators of funds have overlooked the fact that the unemployed, the underemployed, and the economically disadvantaged, as well as the criminally inclined, could not care less about urban rot, the "greening of America", or environmental pollution. Yet, people cause urban decay and environmental degradation and, when it comes to the bottom line, people will have to stop it. For them to do so will require a change for the better in mental, moral, and spiritual attitudes. Such an improvement, of course, would help to reduce and control crime, arson, and vandalism.

Obviously, an error in judgment on federal and state levels has been unintentionally committed, and it must be rectified to assure cost-benefit effectiveness. But corrective action must be predicated upon the acceptance of some harsh realities.

URBAN DECAY BREEDS CRIMINALITY

Urban ghettos are the breeding beds of crime, arson, and vandalism. This contaminated source exports its end product to suburban areas and to other crime-free areas. Consequently, unless federal, state, county, and municipal plans for the reconstruction and economic stabilization of urban centers include a comprehensive program designed to bring criminality under control, costs will be much greater than benefits and the seed of crime, arson, and vandalism will be planted nationwide. Moreover, such programs of urban rehabilitation must take into account that it is almost impossible to cure blight while urban-center dwellers, most of whom are unemployed, underemployed, or economically disadvantaged, are also obliged to live in a state of criminal siege. It must also be taken into consideration that business and industry, which provide jobs and are the economic pipeline of any urban community, cannot be expected to remain in a dangerous environment or be lured back into it by monetary inducements or promises of peace and tranquility.

In order to create an urban climate in which people can live in peace and in dignity, it follows that local police and firemen will have to be called upon to spearhead the implementation of rehabilitative programs. However, the mental, moral, and spiritual decline affecting these vital occupations must be reversed before they can be relied upon to open the route towards urban revitalization.

THE STATE OF THE POLICE AND FIREMEN ENVIRONMENTS

What has happened to police and firemen employed in urban areas is not generally known or, if known, almost totally ignored. But the time has come when it must be exposed in the public sector and must no longer be swept under the rug by those who are aware of it. Particularly, because the problem concerns not only police and firemen, but also every man, woman, and child in America, whether urban, suburban or rural resident.

Because of the abnormal physical, mental, moral and spiritual stresses and strains under which police and firemen must carry out their assigned duties, both of these vital occupations have become vulnerable to outbreaks of violence and brutality, emotional disturbances, family breakups and divorce, drug addiction, alcoholism, and suicide. Exacerbating this susceptibility, is the "us against them" syndrome caused by public apathy and many incidences of organized abuse orchestrated by certain elements to discredit the integrity of police in particular. Most Americans, of course, have yet to become knowledgeable of these serious job-related problems affecting police and firemen's efficiency, or about how budgetary cutbacks, judiciary weaknesses, and journalistic subjectivity have impacted what were once honorable and respected professions. Nor do most Americans realize what this deterioration represents in terms of personal or individual security and cost.

In a recent study, for example, the International Conference of Police Associations (ICPA), comprised of 425 local police unions and about 200,000 police officers, learned that, among the 20,000 white, male police officers interviewed, 37 percent responded that, among their five closest "brothers", there were serious marital problems; 36 percent, serious health problems; 23.4 percent, alcohol problems; 21 percent, problems with their children and neighbors; and about 10 percent, serious drug problems. These appalling statistics should shatter public apathy because, on a nationwide level, they indicate that society's barrier against rampaging criminality is beginning to crumble.

Dr. Edward Shev, the well-known psychiatric consultant to the Sausalito (California) Police Department and those of many other major cities infected by criminality, recently reported that "police have a suicide rate six times that of the general population" and that "at least 40 percent of all police don't receive help with their problems and half of those will assault their wives and children, and about 10 percent to 20 percent of that half will either kill or be killed by family members." Other just as reliable sources of information, clearly indicated that, while firemen may not be exposed to such a high rate of job-related hazards, nevertheless the rate of incidents are still far too high to be accepted with equanimity by the general public.

ATTEMPTS TO COPE WITH THE PROBLEM

Federal, state, and county law enforcement agencies, local police and fire departments, and other concerned sectors are, of course, well aware of the serious job-related problems confronting some of their rank and file, and some major cities (New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Dallas, etc.) have already established counselling services. However, the reason why most of these efforts have failed to achieve significant breakthroughs is due to the fact that many deeply troubled police officers, as well as firemen, are reluctant to expose their personal problems to departmental authorities for fear of tarnishing their performance records and jeopardizing their pension benefits. A unique pilot project set up in New Jersey, however, may be the nationwide answer to this situation.

Founded by a disabled police officer, the New Jersey-based "Disabled Police and firemen of America" has achieved remarkable results in the first year of its existence. An independent, nonprofit organization, this agency provided free, confidential, rehabilitative counselling services for more than one thousand police and firemen during its first twelve months in operation and anticipates handling more than two thousand cases during its second year. It has also counselled many wives, widows, and children of police and firemen, and expects to handle many more such cases.

Begun on a county level with a staff of volunteer experts in every possible problem area, the Disabled Police and Firemen of America has now expanded its services statewide and has established cooperative relationships with available state agencies concerned with vocational rehabilitation programs. It is also planning to extend its concept nationwide.

THE PUBLIC AND THE PROBLEM

The rising cost of crime, arson, and vandalism is paid for by every wage-earner, taxpayer, and law-abiding citizen in America. The amount of the bill paid in human suffering and degradation, as well as the cost of insecurity, cannot be tabulated. Suffice to suggest that this situation is a national disgrace, and one that can no longer be tolerated. Nor can the American people continue ignoring the job-related problems hindering the efficiency of police and firemen or remain indifferent towards their appeal for help and support.

It cannot be denied that most of the American people have so many things to worry about that it is difficult for them to concentrate upon or be motivated into positive action by any one, single problem. They are concerned with inflation, unemployment, urban rot, criminality, taxation, education, and even about who will push the button somewhere to blow the world into oblivion. Concentrating upon these problem areas, however, is paradoxical in a sense because, if crime, arson, and vandalism were brought under control, the tax-dollars saved, which could amount to billions, would go a long way towards helping to solve other domestic headaches, while creating the kind of peaceful, human environment needed in which to achieve construction goals.

If the wage-earning, tax-paying, and law-abiding sector of American society really hopes to see an improvement in law enforcement capabilities in order to achieve a significant breakthrough in urban revitalization, they will have to begin supporting their local police and firemen. For police and firemen need the American people and the American people need them more than they now think.●

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT SOCIAL SECURITY PROBLEM FOR ELDERLY

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct a problem for retired persons which arose as a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1977. Joining me as cosponsors are the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. STEIGER.

Before enactment of the 1977 amendments, a monthly measure of the social security retirement test (or earnings limitation) was applied prior to application of an annual measure. Thus, a beneficiary could have earned income, in excess of the earnings limit, in 1 month only, and still draw benefits for the other 11 months of the year.

A provision of the 1977 amendments repealed the monthly measure of the retirement test generally, but with the exception that the monthly measure would continue to be applied in the year in which a covered worker began drawing benefits. The new statutory language was not specific, however, as to application of the change in 1978. The administration chose to interpret the law to mean that anyone who had begun drawing benefits before 1978 would have the annual measure applied in 1978. Many retired persons—notably the self-employed and particularly those engaged in farming—felt the law should have been interpreted to mean that 1978 is, in effect, a "grace year", that beneficiaries should be allowed to have the monthly measure applied this year, because they had planned their retirements accordingly, and the annual measure should not be applied mandatorily until 1979.

The legislation which I am introducing is designed to achieve that end; that is, to permit those who had begun receiving benefits before 1978 to continue having the monthly measure of the retirement test applied during 1978. I regard this as a reasonable and equitable course.●

VIETNAM VETERANS EMPLOYMENT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. WOLFF, and I are introducing the Vietnam Veterans Employment and Training Delimiting Date Extension Act of 1978.

As ranking members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, my distinguished colleague and I introduce this legislation to permit Vietnam veterans who are pursuing or entering a program of apprenticeship, on the job or cooperative training, to complete their training notwithstanding the 10-year time period normally limiting use of such veterans' benefits.

This legislation would enable those Vietnam veterans who were discharged during the height of the Vietnam era to acquire meaningful employment and viable career training through their earned G.I. bill entitlements.

Because of our limited fiscal resources, the Congress must address the Vietnam veterans most critical readjustment need: a good career, one that is commersurate with their aspirations and abilities and at a wage sufficient to support their wives and families.

Enactment of this legislation is imperative if we are to meet the needs of those veterans who bore the brunt of the fighting in Vietnam, and who bear the burden of unemployment and underemployment at home.

I urge the Congress to support this effort to alleviate one of our Nation's last remaining responsibilities to the combat veterans of the Vietnam era.●

EXPORT OF HAZARDOUS INDUSTRIES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the export of hazardous industries is a potentially serious problem for the United States and the world, and a survey by my office of U.S. and international agencies indicates that we are all but totally unprepared to deal with this threat.

Simply put, the problem is that as we learn more and more about the health hazards which certain manufacturing processes pose for workers and the general public, there is apparently a growing trend toward moving such manufacturing to countries where knowledge of the health hazards is limited or where concern about worker and public health is secondary to economic development goals. The result is that citizens of foreign countries sacrifice their health, U.S. workers lose their jobs and ethical businessmen who go to the expense of implementing needed safeguards are undercut by those who knowingly poison foreign workers and their communities in order to gain competitive advantage.

Unfortunately, we know very little about the extent to which such relocations have occurred or which industries have been affected by them. We do know that in some instances, manufacturers apparently have chosen to relocate outside of the United States and other developed countries in order to avoid the cost of installing equipment that would prevent human exposure to toxic substances. We also know that our technical capacity to identify hazardous industrial chemicals is expanding rapidly, and that in the years ahead, public concern about cancer, respiratory diseases, nervous disorders and other health problems that can result from exposure to such chemicals will force many more industries to invest in antipollution and worker protection equipment, thereby increasing the possibility that such industries will relocate in the Third World.

This is an issue in which our Government clearly has a major stake. We should be prepared to act to protect our businesses, our workers and the health of workers abroad from those who would relocate rather than clean up their factories. Right now, however, the Federal Government is doing very little to understand the dimensions of this problem, let alone respond to it.

I am inserting in the RECORD an abridged version of what is probably the first major study ever conducted of the export of hazardous industries. The author, Barry I. Castleman, is a young chemical engineer who lives in Washington. Over the last 3 years, he has performed most of the research for this project without any outside assistance. Mr. Castleman is to be commended for

his energy and for the service he has performed in bringing this important issue into clearer focus. This report raises a number of questions which must be addressed:

THE EXPORT OF HAZARDOUS FACTORIES TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In the next decade, the export of hazards from the U.S. to Third World Countries is likely to increase. Banning of unsafe consumer products, foods, drugs, and pesticides here has often led to the subsequent export of these products. Similarly, U.S. pollution control laws and occupational health standards may soon lead to wholesale exodus in major industries, as manufacturers move to avoid the large costs imposed here while continuing to sell their products in the United States.

Typically, several years elapse from the time of the discovery that a high-volume chemical causes serious disease at low levels of exposure until the time that appropriate regulations are implemented to protect workers and communities. In many of our most polluting and hazardous industries, many of the existing plants are very old and incapable of being made safe by adding on control devices. These plants need to be redesigned and rebuilt, not just fitted with exhaust fans. Faced with this reality, some manufacturers find it economically attractive to move hazardous manufacturing plants to less-restrictive locales rather than stay where they are and meet tough regulations. Today, "runaway hazardous shops" are leaving the United States, whereas in the past they only crossed state boundaries within the country.

Of course, there is not usually a one-for-one correspondence between plants closed in the U.S. and foreign sources of supply opened. Nor are all foreign plants that export to the U.S. from non-regulating countries owned by multinational firms. However, the economy of hazard export is emerging as a driving force in new plant investment in many hazardous and polluting industries.

The following table compiled from McGraw-Hill annual surveys shows that pollution control costs are much higher in the U.S. than outside the U.S. American industrial companies are spending twice as much for air and water pollution control in the U.S. as they spend "overseas," in terms of pollution control expenditures as a percent of capital spending. These figures are actually a conservative indication of the true disparity, since worker protection, solid waste disposal, and land reclamation (mining) are counted in the non-pollution-control share of capital spending.

It is inescapable that, as manufacturers in industrial nations are forced to absorb the economic burdens of preventing and compensating occupational and environmental diseases caused by their operations, pressures favoring hazard export will increase. National efforts to implement environmental controls for hazardous industries may have to be complemented by measures that prevent the mere displacement of killer industries to "export platforms" in non-regulating countries. Poverty and ignorance make communities in many parts of the world quite vulnerable to the exploitation implicit in hazard export.

ASBESTOS TEXTILES AND FRICTION PRODUCTS

Occupational and environmental exposure to asbestos in this century has been the cause of a monumental tragedy whose full extent is not yet known. In the U.S., the number of people now living who worked with asbestos and will someday develop cancer as a result has been conservatively estimated at 400,000. In the past 5 years, the asbestos industry has faced increasing regulation of workplace exposure and pollution. The regulations show no sign of abating, following as they do a steadily growing body of knowledge about the effects and prevalence of "low-level exposure."

Historically, asbestos manufacturing has been done in industrial nations, and the U.S. has been a world leader. Now that industrial nations are applying increasingly costly controls, some of their asbestos manufacturing industries are declining. Three years ago, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) noted that the U.S. asbestos textile industry faced mounting competition from imports:

"Foreign facilities, which may be owned by domestic companies, typically have a competitive advantage over domestic producers since they do not have to pay for environmental controls capable of meeting the OSHA [Occupational Safety and Health Administration] standards. Consumers are already turning to foreign suppliers for dry processed asbestos products which have been discontinued by domestic producers in order to comply with OSHA standards."

The earliest runaway hazardous shops jumped state borders, as noted previously. Jones reported that asbestos manufacturing firms were forced to pay very high rates for worker's compensation insurance in 1935 in New York State. Private insurers, some of whom had refused to sell life insurance to asbestos workers as long ago as 1918, were turning down the asbestos firms as unacceptable risks for worker's compensation insurance.

"As a consequence of these very high rates and the inability of some industries to get any kind of insurance at a price that permits continuance of operations, many establishments are laying off workmen and either closing down or sending their hazardous work out of the state . . ."

Brodeur's book, *Expendable Americans*, describes an extremely hazardous asbestos insulation plant that was moved from New Jersey to Texas in 1954. Follow-up of former plant workers in New Jersey has shown that an excessive incidence of fatal lung cancer has occured in men employed there for one month and less. By 1965, it was established that cancer rates among asbestos workers were extremely high; moreover, even family members of asbestos workers and neighbors of asbestos plants were dying of asbestos cancers.

The current U.S. workplace asbestos standard took effect on July 1, 1976. However, it was a scheduled reduction in the standard issued June 7, 1972; in other words, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) gave U.S. manufacturers four years to lower the asbestos dust levels in their plants from 5 million to 2 million fibers per cubic meter of air. Perceiving that further reductions were necessary to reduce asbestos workers' cancer risk, OSHA proposed on October 9, 1975 to lower the standard to 500,000 fibers per cubic meter. This was followed at the end of 1976 with a recommendation by NIOSH to lower the standard still further to the lower limit of detection by optical microscopy, 100,000 fibers per cubic meter. NIOSH acknowledged that there is probably still an increased risk of cancer at that level of exposure.[1] OSHA will promulgate the new standard late this year.

The asbestos industry responded to OSHA's 1975 proposal by submitting a consultant report that said the asbestos textile industry and many other asbestos manufacturing industries would be unable to comply with the proposed 500,000 fiber limit. The report concluded that even with implementation of best available technology, the achievement of an exposure limit of 500,000 fibers per cubic meter would not be feasible for 65 percent of the manufacturers' processing steps. The consultant forecasted that the already depressed domestic asbestos textile industry would suffer an accelerated decline with mounting imports from countries with weaker regulations. Foreign competition is intense, and imports already supply 35 percent of U.S. demand, the report noted.

Penetration of the domestic asbestos friction products industry (brake linings, etc.) was also predicted, if the proposed OSHA standard is implemented. The report said that the U.S. has already begun to import asbestos friction products from Korea. The friction products industry in the U.S. employs more workers than any other asbestos manufacturing industry. Raybestos-Manhattan, a leading manufacturer of asbestos textiles and friction products, declared in its 1976 Annual Report that the NIOSH recommendation to OSHA was "so extreme as to be totally unrealistic and impractical." The report went on to say:

"The escalating costs associated with handling this raw material and the uncertain consequences of future government asbestos regulations . . . have necessitated our decision to work toward the elimination of asbestos from all our friction products and this eventuality has become an essential part of our long term product and manufacturing plans." [2]

Most of the company's business is in friction products.

In Cork, Ireland, Raybestos has just built a plant to produce 10 million disc brake pads a year for export primarily to countries in the European Economic Community. This plant apparently conforms to all existing (if not all pending) U.S. standards of control. As the $8 million plant was completed, the local community held a large meeting and set up an investigating committee. Early last year, the residents' committee issued a report declaring that the factory "constitutes a major health risk to the local population which we regard as totally unacceptable." The residents were alarmed about hazards to the community from the plant's air pollution and solid waste dumping, as well as hazards to workers. The residents now appear to be equally divided on whether to accept the 30 to 100 jobs the plant would provide if allowed to open. Citizens have challenged government approvals of the plant and dump sites in the courts.

Abex Corporation, a U.S. subsidiary of the British-based firm Imperial Chemical Industries, recently built an asbestos friction products plant in Madras, India. In 1976, the plant was covered by over $1 million in political risk insurance by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), an agency of the U.S. government. OPIC, whose mission is to promote needed U.S. industrial investment in developing nations, made no effort to obtain an accounting of measures that would be taken to protect workers in the design and operation of the plant. Abex replied to OPIC's perfunctory question on ecological effects by simply saying, "The company will comply with government regulations regarding wastage disposal."

The torrent of health-related regulations for U.S. asbestos manufacturers could have been anticipated at the outset of this decade, with the passage of the Occupational Safety and Health Act and the Clean Air Amendments of 1970. There is no end yet in sight;

[1] The workplace standards apply only to the largest airborne fibers, since the fibers are counted using light microscopes. Duplicate sample analyses with electron microscopy has typically shown that for every other seen with a light microscope, there are 100 more "submicroscopic" sized fibers present. Unfortunately, electron microscopy is very costly and few labs are equipped for it. So it is not suitable for routine monitoring of compliance with workplace standards.

[2] This company does not have asbestos mining properties, and thus does not have the commitment to stay with asbestos that some other firms do.

in March 1977, the Environmental Protection Agency announced that asbestos would be one of 15 substances targeted for priority attention under the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976. In addition to workers' compensation premiums and numerous environmental control regulations, the asbestos industry incurs the expense of high wages in the U.S., where by regulation asbestos workers must be informed of the mortal hazards of asbestos, given regular medical examinations, and monitored to assure that their exposure does not violate the standard.

U.S. imports of asbestos textiles have soared since 1970. Prior to 1970, over 99 percent of U.S. asbestos textile imports came from Canada, Europe and Japan. Imports from these "regulating countries" stayed at around 3 million pounds per year in the years 1970–1976, while total imports from Mexico, Taiwan and Brazil shot up to nearly 4.5 million pounds in 1976.

The Asbestos Textile Institute reports that its membership included seven U.S. primary producers in 1972, and currently there are only three U.S. primary asbestos textile producers who are member companies of the organization. Fiber consumption reported by the U.S. asbestos industry fell precipitously after 1974. The depressed state of the U.S. industry is further indicated by the steep drop in U.S. imports of textile grade asbestos fiber after 1974. Despite the fact that there were major strikes at the Canadian mines in 1975 and general economic conditions were poor that year, the continued depressed level of textile fiber imports in 1976 signifies that the U.S. asbestos textile industry has diminished in size. In 1976, one of the remaining U.S. manufacturers, Southern Asbestos, closed one plant and consolidated all operations at its other textile facility.

Amatex, a firm based in Norristown, Pennsylvania, closed a new (opened 1967) asbestos yarn mill in Milford Square, Pennsylvania, in 1973. Amatex has operated an asbestos textile plant in Agua Prieta, a small town just across the Mexican border from Douglas, Arizona, since 1969. The company owns another asbestos textile plant in Ciudad Juarez, across the border from El Paso, Texas. In December 1974, Amatex began to import asbestos textiles into the U.S. from the Juarez plant. Amatex "imported" about two million pounds of asbestos textiles from its Mexican border plants in 1975, about one fourth of U.S. imports from the entire world in that year. The asbestos fiber used by the Amatex mills in Mexico comes from Canada; there are no asbestos mines in Mexico. Workers are paid the minimum wage.

In March 1977, a reporter from the Arizona Daily Star and a prominent industrial health specialist, Dr. William Johnson, visited the Agua Prieta plant. They saw part of the interior of the plant, and the reporter gave the following account of conditions:

"Asbestos waste clings to the fence that encloses the brick plant and is strewn across the dirt road behind the plant where children walk to school.

"Inside, machinery that weaves yarn into industrial fabric is caked with asbestos waste and the floor covered with debris. Workers in part of the factory do not wear respirators that could reduce their exposure to asbestos dust."

The Arizona Daily Star story was reprinted in Spanish in an Agua Prieta newspaper, and the workers in the plant called for an investigation, which was started by Sonora (state) health officials.[3] Workers must now wear uniforms to cover their street clothes and leave them at the plant, so their families will not be endangered. However, none of the workers have quit, and due to the scarcity of jobs the union reportedly pressured the workers to be silent. The union, which is known for its alliance with management, has threatened workers with loss of their jobs if the complaints continue. Since publication of the first news article, the factory exterior has been cleaned regularly so there are no longer threads of asbestos clinging to the fence behind the building. However, Dr. Johnson said the company's improvements were "cosmetic," pointing out that clumps of asbestos fiber could still be seen on the road behind the plant and shrubs in nearby lots.

In September 1977, a Texas television team visited the 3-year-old Amatex plant in Juarez. A worker, whose identity was concealed, said he had not been warned that he could develop a fatal disease from breathing asbestos. He went on to describe the plant as having no dust controls in the dustiest parts, and said no provisions were taken by management to provide workers with functioning respiratory protection or a change of clothes for work. Dust levels in the plant were not monitored; in its U.S. plants, Amatex had been required to monitor fiber levels in the workplace air at least twice a year, and make the data available to workers, since 1972. Despite repeated atttempts the television reporter was unable to get Amatex President and principal stockholder, John Rainey, to submit to an interview.

Mexico does not have specific regulations to protect workers from asbestos. The 1945 Regulations on Work Health have general provisions that workplaces using toxic or suffocating substances must display posters warning workers of the dangers to which they are exposed, and they must provide adequate protective means to the workers. The fine for not having warning posters and protective equipment may be no more than 1,000 pesos ($45), up to 2,000 pesos for a failure to take corrective action within the specified timetable. Mexico does not have specific regulations for control of asbestos air and water pollution. By contrast, the State of California began this year to implement its Occupational Carcinogens Control Act of 1976, which provides fines of $1,000 for violations and $5,000 for repeated violations of carcinogen standards at least as stringent as OSHA's. California also authorized $1 million for the first 6 months of 1977 to assure that the law would be enforced. OSHA has in the past assessed smaller fines, but under the law could fine employers up to $1,000 for serious violations and up to $10,000 for repeated or willful violations.

The Amatex plant in Meredith, New Hampshire, was until late 1977 unable to comply with the OSHA standard promulgated in 1972. This plant has just attained the degree of control required by OSHA as of July 1976. It is possible that Amatex, with its long record of repeated and serious OSHA violations, would close in New Hampshire rather than meet the further reductions of the OSHA standard recently proposed.

Raybestos-Manhattan, on the other hand, has invested $11 million in a modern wet process for making asbestos yarn in the U.S. in compliance with OSHA standards. In its 1975 report to stockholders, Raybestos acknowledged that foreign competition from non-regulating countries is a serious threat to domestic asbestos textile manufacturers. In 1974, Raybestos bought a 47 percent share of an asbestos textile plant in Venezuela. John Marsh, Raybestos' chief of environmental affairs, says that the Venezuelan plant operates at airborne asbestos levels lower than the peak level allowed by the current OSHA standard in the U.S.[4]

One of the U.S. customers of the Venezuelan plant had been Standco Industries. In 1975, Standco turned to two plants in Spain for over 400,000 pounds of asbestos textiles. In 1976, statistics on overall imports by country suggest that Standco, a Texas firm, is now buying most of its asbestos textiles from Mexico.

Taiwan and South Korea have been displacing Japan as a source of asbestos textiles for the U.S., as this industry has come under regulation in Japan. The plant in Taiwan and one of the plants in South Korea exporting to the U.S. are owned by the Japanese firm, Nippon Asbestos. In 1976, Taiwan shipped 1 million pounds of asbestos textiles to the U.S. The U.S. importer of record for asbestos textiles from Taiwan and Korea is the Japanese global trading company, Mitsui. These asbestos textiles may also be made largely from Canadian asbestos fiber. There are no specific health regulations for asbestos in Taiwan and South Korea.

Brazil is the other country that supplies large quantities of asbestos textiles to the U.S. There, a 1965 law established a scheme of hazard-pay increments for various industries. The law provides for three levels of wage premiums to be paid in a number of industries, determined by the official hazard class for each industry.[5] The maximum hazard-pay increment is 40 percent of the minimum wage, which might be a 20 percent increase over base pay for a typical worker. If the labor courts find that the hazard has been eliminated or controlled, the pay increases are discontinued accordingly.

By making hazardous work economically attractive and by making workers suffer pay cuts in exchange for improved working conditions, the law undermines all efforts to improve working conditions in hazardous industries. Management has the choice of taking steps to protect workers or paying them extra for losing their health, and presumably does whichever costs less. The concerned worker has little choice but to accept management's terms or look elsewhere for a job. This law is fertile soil for the growth of hazardous industries.

Mexico, Brazil, Taiwan, and South Korea are among the developing nations that recently have been declared "beneficiary countries" under the generalized preference system for tariffs on U.S. imports. Some of the asbestos textiles from these countries enter the U.S. duty-free, and the standard 4 percent duty is charged for the rest.

The Johns-Manville Corporation is the leading producer of asbestos fiber in the Western Hemisphere. Johns-Manville sales policy includes the following statement:

"We will reserve the right to refuse to sell asbestos fibers to customers who fail to meet applicable governmental regulations on asbestos exposure and thereby endanger the health of their employees, and expose J-M to unwarranted liability. In countries where there are no governmental regulations on asbestos exposure, accepted industrial hygiene practice shall apply."

The effect of this policy so far has been to assist J-M customers in complying with government standards, primarily in the U.S. J-M officials do not make a point of

---

[3] It would be surprising if any of the Aqua Prieta workers have already developed symptoms of asbestosis. Asbestosis rarely appears until 10 years or more after the onset of exposure. Cancer rarely appears until more than 20 years have elapsed since the onset of exposure, even in cases of continuous exposure.

[4] Nonetheless, it appears that housekeeping in this plant leaves something to be desired. A photo of a new yarn-making facility at the plant, included in the firm's 1976 Annual Report, shows most of the floor area blanketed with white dust.

[5] Asbestos textile manufacture is not even listed among the scheduled hazardous industries. Asbestos brake shoe and asbestos cement product manufacture are rated as medium among hazardous industries.

visiting many of their far-flung customer plants around the world, however. J-M has dropped out of the asbestos textile business and is now producing only enough material to support the firm's needs for its other product lines.

The U.S. has long been a world leader in manufactured asbestos products, with manufacturing plants in the eastern U.S. drawing fiber from the large asbestos mines in Quebec. Little asbestos is mined in the U.S. Consumption of asbestos textiles for the U.S. economy is believed to have declined slightly in recent years, owing to the loss of some older markets to substitute materials and failure to develop new markets. However, no figures are available.

ARSENIC AND REFINED COPPER FROM PRIMARY SMELTERS

On January 21, 1975, OSHA proposed to lower the workplace limit for airborne arsenic exposure from 500 micrograms per cubic meter of air to 4 micrograms per cubic meter, in light of mounting reports on carcinogenicity of inorganic arsenic. NIOSH recommended that OSHA adopt a standard of only 2 micrograms per cubic meter. In June 1976, OSHA released an Inflationary Impact Statement on its proposed standard, which would have its most severe impact on non-ferrous smelters, especially copper smelters. Arsenic is present in copper ores, and a few copper smelters are designed to recover arsenic trioxide ("white arsenic") as a by-product from high-arsenic ores.

The only U.S. producer of arsenic is Asarco's copper smelter in Tacoma, Washington. OSHA determined that this plant, which has supplied about half of domestic arsenic demand, would alone incur a $9.9 million annual cost to meet the standard. OSHA estimated that even if the workplace standard is set as high as 50 micrograms per cubic meter, Asarco's annual compliance cost would be $7.4 million. At hearings held in Washington in September 1976, Asarco representatives said they would close the plant rather than achieve the proposed 4 microgram limit, at a cost, they said, of more than $15 million per year. The final standard of 10 micrograms per cubic meter was issued by OSHA on May 3, 1978.

Asarco's Tacoma smelter is also a major source of community exposure to arsenic air pollution. The application of available technology for the improved control of arsenic air pollution would put Asarco to considerable additional expense. Epidemiologist at the National Cancer Institute reported that in the period 1950–1969, mortality for lung cancer in U.S. countries with copper, lead and zinc smelting and refining was significantly higher than other countries: the researchers believed that arsenic air pollution was a contributing cause to the high lung cancer rate. Previous reports have demonstrated excess rates of lung cancer among smelter workers and workers exposed to arsenical pesticides. Community exposures to inorganic arsenic near the Tacoma smelter are within an order of magnitude of the limit proposed by OSHA for the workplace, and high urinary arsenic levels in children who live near the smelter have been reported. Soils for miles around non-ferrous smelters are ruined permanently from years of being rained on with metallic pollutants, and road dust and playgrounds are likewise contaminated. It is likely that before 1980 EPA will promulgate rules requiring best available technology for the control of arsenic air pollution from smelters.

Asarco's Tacoma smelter is now in violation of sulfur oxide air pollution standards. The maximum degree to sulfur oxide control achieved by existing equipment is only 51 percent. A consultant has determined that any EPA requirements for additional sulfur oxide controls, coupled with the expected workplace arsenic standard, would make continued operation of the smelter unprofitable. EPA is trying to determine whether to approve Asarco's request for a 5-year variance from complying with the sulfur oxide standards.

The smelter will probably not be allowed to operate as it does now for much longer. Alerady, Asarco has taken steps to reduce the amount of arsenic processed at the plant. In early 1976, Asarco terminated its agreements with other companies to accept high-arsenic residues from their non-ferrous smelters. As a result, Anaconda's Montana copper smelter has been stockpiling high-arsenic dusts such as those recovered by air pollution dust collectors. Anaconda has also given money to support university research on what to do to process the dusts. Asarco/Tacoma still takes the Asarco Montana lead smelter's "speiss," which is 20 percent arsenic and 50 to 60 percent copper.

Two thirds of the copper produced at Tacoma is made from ore mined in the southwestern United States and scrap. This ore is low in arsenic. Asarco could alleviate its principal problem at Tacoma if it is able to shift further in the direction of using low-arsenic raw materials. However, this would have the effect of selectively exporting the production of arsenic by-product to copper smelters in other countries.

The remaining sources of raw materials processed at Tacoma are high-arsenic copper ore concentrates from the Philippines and Peru. Due to Asarco's unwillingness to renew its contract for Philippine ore, Lepanto Consolidated Mining Company has started constructing a copper smelter in the Philippines that will produce 8,800 tons per year of by-product arsenic trioxide, beginning in 1980. In 1973, over 60 percent of the arsenic trioxide produced at Tacoma came from Philippine ores. The high-arsenic concentrates from Peru are from a marginal mining venture owned entirely by Asarco.

Asarco might be pleased to divert some of its arsenic business to Mexico. Asarco retains a 34 percent interest in a metal and coal mining and refining company called Industrial Minera Mexico (IMM). IMM's copper smelter, formerly Asarco Mexicana, is in San Luis Potosi, about 500 miles from Laredo, Texas. This smelter has been a steady source of arsenic trioxide for the U.S. market, and is the sole source of arsenic trioxide from Mexico. In 1976, 89 percent of U.S. imports of arsenic trioxide came from the IMM smelter. This smelter is designed to handle high-arsenic raw materials, and its arsenic output could be increased without any expansion of copper capacity if the plant receives "dirtier" raw materials in the future than it has in the past. It could process residues from U.S. smelters and high-arsenic ore concentrates from Peru, to produce more arsenic for the US. market.

A newer source of arsenic is Namibia (South West Africa), where the U.S. mining firm Amax owns 30 percent of a non-ferrous mining and smelting complex. This operation, Tsumeb, supplied 8 percent of U.S. arsenic imports in 1975.

In Sweden, workplace and pollution controls were cited as a reason for reduced production of arsenic in 1975 compared with 1974. The Swedish government approved expansion of the Boligen smelter in 1975, so increased output of arsenic may accompany increased copper output. The expansion plan includes $40 million worth of environmental controls.

Thus, it appears that even if Asarco does not close the Tacoma smelter, this sole U.S. source of arsenic will have to reduce its output. High-arsenic residues from other U.S. smelters may be shipped to Mexico for refining, with re-importation of the arsenic trioxide. Imports of arsenic from the Philippines can be expected after 1980, along with increased imports from traditional suppliers (Mexico, France, Sweden), and perhaps from other new sources.

There may also be shifts in manufacturing by firms seeking to escape the New OSHA arsenic regulations. Arsenic is used to make pesticides, herbicides, wood preservatives, and soda-lime glass.

Though U.S. arsenic imports have steadily declined since 1973, domestic demand for arsenic, particularly for making pesticides used on the cotton crop, is again on the increase. In long term forecasts by the Bureau of Mines, both U.S. and world arsenic consumption are slated to increase slightly by the year 2000, with U.S. consumption remaining at roughly half of world consumption.

In a report from the Secretary of Commerce to the President in 1975, the cost of sulfur oxide air pollution controls for copper smelters in the U.S. was compared with the corresponding costs in Canada and in South America (Peru, Chile). The pollution control costs were computed at a cost increase of 6.6 cents per pound of copper in the U.S., 2.5 cents per pound of copper in Canada, and 0.5 cents per pound of copper in South America. As the price of copper then was about 65 cents per pound, the report concluded that control costs would "impair the industry's ability to finance new productive capacity and compete in an expanding world market with relatively unencumbered foreign competitors." In its calculations, the Department of Commerce did not take account of additional control costs for particulate air pollutant emissions, occupational exposure to arsenic, and water pollution—which are substantial in the U.S.

EPA closed a Kennecott copper smelter in Nevada in 1976 after rejecting the company's plans for meeting air emission standards. The plant was not reopened until 6 months later, after a preliminary injunction against the EPA ruling was granted by a federal district judge.

The Bureau of Mines considered the effect of air pollution regulations a critical factor in limiting U.S. smelter output during a period of high demand for copper.

"The 1972 and 1973 shortage of capacity to process available concentrates at several smelters appeared to be partly due to a curtailment of maximum operation to comply with existing pollution control regulations and to delays in expansion of facilities owing to uncertainties regarding resolution of the pollution problem."

Smelted copper is called blister copper. It is further processed into refined copper. A small but growing amount of copper is produced directly from ores in electrolytic refineries. Some copper is also reclaimed from scrap. However, in order to assess U.S. dependence on foreign sources of copper smeltered from ore, the best indicator is net imports of refined plus blister copper. This indicator peaked at 392 thousand tons in 1974, 2 to 3 times the volumes recorded in preceding years. Recovering from the economic downturn of 1975, net U.S. imports of refined and blister copper reached over 300 thousand tons in 1976. That year, one third of record U.S. imports of refined copper, 120 thousand tons, came from Zambia. It is too early to say whether there is any trend toward increased U.S. dependence on foreign copper smelters, however.

One nickel-copper mining and smelting complex in Botswana, partly owned by the U.S.-based Amax, is now being expanded. Amax's 25 percent share is backed with political risk insurance from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Careless initial planning has led to costly delays in the project, extended shutdown of the sulfur recovery unit, and unanticipated heat stress among workers mining the chemically unstable ore. The Botswana government had to go to great expense to build the infrastructure (roads and a town) needed to operate this smelter at its remote location. The position of the new town relative to the smelter was designed to minimize the potential

air pollution hazard to the town. Unfortunately, this planning, which was done by the World Bank and the U.S. Agency for International Development, utilized wind direction data from a place 80 miles away—where the winds were not the same as the winds at the smelter location. The result is that in late 1977, the town was needlessly exposed to air pollution from the smelter, whose sulfur recovery unit was still not working.

MERCURY MINING

Pollution control regulations have led to a worldwide reduction in demand for mercury, increased recycling of the metal, and a steep decline in price. Between 1969 and 1976 the number of producing mercury mines in the U.S. went from 109 to 4. Domestic demand for mercury refined from ore bottomed out in 1972, was carried down by the economic downturn of 1975, but is rising again. Extremely depressed prices probably account for the shift in sources of U.S. imports since 1974, away from Canada and Mexico where large reserves exist. Most of the imports for 1975 and 1976 were from Italy, Algeria, Yugoslavia, and Spain. Industries in most if not all of these countries are nationalized and have accumulated stockpiles while operating at a loss. In 1976, though domestic mine output was spurred by the opening of a large new mine in Nevada, imports accounted for 69 percent of domestic consumption.

In the U.S., mercury was designated as a hazardous air pollutant in 1971, and national emission standards for mercury ore-processing plants were promulgated in 1973. Small mercury producers, once numerous, are not expected to expend the capital costs necessary to control their air pollution, and barring major price increases for mercury, small producers in the U.S. will never again be an important factor in the market.

LEAD SMELTERS AND BATTERY PLANTS

The major U.S. lead industries will experience a great economic impact after OSHA promulgates and enforces its new standard (expected in early 1978). Primary smelters (extraction of metal from ores), secondary smelters (scrap recycling/refining), and lead acid battery plants are mostly old, and many cannot even achieve compliance with the existing workplace standard.

NIOSH surveys in late 1975 at the Bunker Hill lead and zinc smelting complex revealed widespread violation of existing workplace standards for lead and cadmium. A clinical study of workers in two Indianapolis secondary lead smelters (NL Industries and RSR Quemetco) in 1976 revealed that most of the workers had a history of elevated blood lead levels and many had taken chelation drugs to be able to work at all. Lead poisoning has also been reported among children of lead-exposed workers, caused by household contamination by dust brought home on workers' clothes and shoes.

In January 1976, the State of California fined a Prestolite auto battery plant $45,000, prompting the firm's attorney to tell the New York Times that the company "is within half an inch" of leaving the state. Since then, the fine was reduced and the firm spent about $500,000 to achieve compliance with the state standard. Of 40 lead acid battery plants visited in 1975–76 by southern California health authorities, 28 (including all of the large plants) exceeded state standards. In general, these plants are trying to comply with the state standards, but are not so well controlled that they could meet the standard proposed by OSHA.

The California lead standard (maximum allowable lead concentration in workplace air) adopted in 1975 is 50 percent higher than the national limit proposed by OSHA in October 1975. The standards are: OSHA, 200 micrograms per cubic meter of air; California, 150; and OSHA proposed, 100. It is apparent from the medical literature on lead that even the limit proposed by OSHA will eventually have to be replaced by a still stricter standard. The standard for lead in the workplace air has been 50 micrograms per cubic meter for many years in Japan and Czechoslovakia. The 1966 Soviet Union standard is 10 micrograms per cubic meter; however, it is widely doubted that the USSR actually enforces its stringent workplace standards.

In its January 1976 response to OSHA's lead proposal, the Lead Industries Association claimed the proposed standard is not feasible and would have an adverse effect on the U.S. economy. The trade group noted that industry members already face "enormous" financial burdens in complying with other health-related standards, and many companies would be forced out of business if the proposed OSHA standard is adopted. The standard would encourage investment by U.S. companies in lead smelters in foreign countries, contribute to general inflation, adversely affect competition, cause severe local unemployment problems, and adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments, the industry claimed. On the other hand, the United Steelworkers' health representative, George Becker, has criticized the proposed OSHA lead standard as inadequate, noting that even half the proposed limit would endanger the health of large subgroups of the workforce that are especially susceptible to the toxicity of lead.

"A survey of smelters by EPA in 1973 found that the Bunker Hill smelter complex exposed its neighbors in Kellogg, Idaho, to high levels of lead and arsenic air pollution. The Asarco El Paso lead smelter's air pollution has been cited by the Center for Disease Control as a cause of neuropsychological dysfunction in community children. Asarco was forced to spend $60 million for control and new process equipment now being installed. On December 14, 1977, EPA proposed an ambient air standard for lead of 1.5 ug/cm, taken as a continuous monthly average measurement. This standard, if adopted, would require stringent control for lead air pollution at lead smelters and other major sources that are not already well controlled. EPA estimated that the cost of installing the necessary controls would be $600 million.

The U.S. has about 35 percent of the world's known lead reserves. Net annual imports of refined lead have been declining through 1976, with imports furnishing 10 to 15 percent of domestic consumption. Major foreign sources are Canada, Mexico, and Peru. Domestic consumption has been increasing, along with increasing supplies from primary and secondary U.S. smelters. Most lead is used in storage batteries. U.S. production of storage batteries has been adequate to supply domestic demand through 1976.

The cost of transporting lead ores out of the U.S. for refining and battery manufacture would severely limit the geographic choices of firms seeking to use U.S. lead ores and still escape U.S. regulations. However, some shift in smelting and battery manufacture to Mexico and Canada may occur in the future. Facilities in these and other countries may be able to supply refined lead and batteries to the U.S. from locally available ores and scrap at lower prices than some plants in the U.S. can offer.

PRIMARY REFINED ZINC

The Bureau of Mines notes that although U.S. demand has increased for zinc metal over the past 10 years, U.S. metal-producing capacity declined almost 50 percent from 1968–1975. "Plants closed because they were obsolete, could not meet environmental standards, or could not compete for concentrate feed. Consequently, metal has replaced (ore) concentrates as the major import form."

In 1976, imports of zinc metal exceeded domestic production (714,000 tons against 536,000 tons). Canada has been the main supplier of both ores and zinc metal imports, and Canada will be refining more of its own ores in the future. Second behind Canada's 313,000 tons of zinc metal shipments to the U.S. was Mexico, at 63,000 tons, for 1976. Zaire joined traditional suppliers West Germany, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Finland, Australia, and Italy in the 30–50,000 ton range. Spain began to export significant amounts of zinc metal to the U.S. in 1975 and has continued to do so in 1976 (30,000 tons). Japan, a major supplier as late as 1974, apparently no longer has excess capacity to refine zinc for export to the U.S.

Industrial Minera Mexico negotiated loans from a consortium of U.S. banks in 1975 to construct a new electrolytic zinc refinery at San Luis Potosi. New Jersey Zinc is constructing a smelter near its subsidiary's zinc mine in Thailand. About half of the product will be exported. Smelters being built by the governments of Bolivia and Peru have relatively low capital cost: capacity ratios, suggesting that there may have been minimal outlays for pollution and workplace controls.

The Bureau of Mines expects U.S. zinc smelting capacity to increase slightly between 1974 and 1980. A new zinc refinery complex is being built in Tennessee by New Jersey Zinc, "the first totally new zinc plant to be constructed in the U.S. since 1941." U.S. zinc mining is expected to fall short of demand for the rest of this century, through smelting capacity is expected to increase sufficiently to process mine production between 1980 and 2000.

MINERAL INDUSTRIES IN GENERAL

Mining as well as refining of ores is economically attractive in countries with lax environmental and workplace regulations. In the U.S. mining is subject to standards governing air and water pollution, worker health and safety, solid waste disposal, and land reclamation. In many cases, an environmental impact analysis is required before a permit to undertake mining can be granted by the government. There is increasing pressure on the U.S. government to restrict mineral exploitation on certain public lands, such as the national parks. Competing demands for land use raise formidable obstacles to mining: in the western states with large coal reserves, large areas now used for raising cattle and sheep will be ruined for that permanently if coal mining is allowed.

The refining of most minerals presents major additional problems for mining companies, as the preceding chapters indicate. It is illustrative to compare the sections on domestic and foreign investments in Asarco's 1975 report to stockholders. The section on U.S. smelters is densely packed with figures for pollution control and worker health expenses being forced on the company. The part of foreign investments, in contrast, mentions only the construction of two tall stacks for the expansion of a smelter in Peru.

Due to the risky nature of the mining business, it is dominated by global corporations that can spread their risk over many projects and raise the large sums needed to finance mineral development. Though mineral exploration has until now been concentrated mainly in developed nations, this is bound to change shortly.

Relatively expensive environmental controls in the U.S. may be crucial in discouraging global mineral companies and banks from exploiting some mineral deposits in the U.S. Already, the day of building smelters in the U.S. to refine imported ore is nearly over. There are no increased transportation costs for refining foreign ore near the mine rather than near the market. Many mineral-rich

nations today have embarked on programs to develop their own refining capacities, and some accept or ignore substantial worker health hazards and pollution as the price of economic development.

PESTICIDES

The manufacture of pesticides by U.S.-based firms has generally been done in the U.S., although in some cases the manufacture of pesticides for export has caused widespread central nervous system disease among U.S. chemical workers and death among foreign users.

The pesticide kepone was manufactured in Virginia until 1975 for Allied Chemical Corporation by Life Science Products Company for sale to banana growers in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This pesticide has caused sterility and apparently permanent nervous disorders among 75 Life Science employees, has severely polluted the James River and wreaked havoc on the local seafood industry. Allied and Life Science were indicted for over 1,000 violations of federal water pollution control laws, and criminal charges were filed against Life Science owners. Employees and their families sued Allied for over $150 million. EPA and the Corps of Engineers have estimated that clean-up of the James River will cost $50 to $100 million. Allied was fined $13.2 million, the maximum fine allowed by law, in federal court. After Allied set up an $8 million fund to clean up the James River, the fine was reduced to $5 million, still the largest criminal penalty ever levied in a federal pollution case. In 1976, the National Cancer Institute reported that kepone caused excessive rates of liver cancer in rats and mice in lifetime feeding studies.

Another pesticide, leptophos, was manufactured until 1976 by Velsicol Chemical Company in Texas. It was granted a tolerance by EPA for residues on tomatoes and lettuce, but in May 1975, EPA announced its intention to revoke the tolerance. EPA apparently was alarmed by an article about water buffalo deaths and human injuries associated with the use of the pesticide in Egypt. When Velsicol appealed the decision, EPA appointed a panel of experts to review the matter. The panel asked Velsicol whether any of its employees manufacturing leptophos were showing signs of nerve diseases. Despite a subsequent attempt by Velsicol to drop its appeal to retain the tolerance for leptophos on crops, the investigation was followed through and serious nerve damage was discovered among Velsicol's Texas workers. One former supervisor at the plant who quit in protest over unsafe working conditions told of seeing a man with leptophos in his mustache eating a sandwich.

The revocation of leptophos tolerances in November 1976 caused consternation in Mexico, where the pesticide was used on tomatoes grown for export to the U.S. Residues of leptophos were found on some shipments of Mexican tomatoes.

The next development in the story was the revelation that, as part of U.S. foreign assistance programs, the Agency for International Development (AID) had sent tons of loptophos to Indonesia and other countries in recent years. Other pesticides that were either banned or were being banned in the U.S. that AID had shipped to developing countries include heptachlor, chlordane, and DDT.

The U.S. pesticide industry is a $2.6 billion-a-year business, and is growing rapidly, despite increased costs for pre-market research and declining numbers of firms that are still developing new products. The industry produces 1 billion pounds per year of pesticides for domestic use and 600 million pounds for export. The global market for these chemicals is a $7 billion-per-year business. Since 1957, AID has financed the export of over $500 million worth of pesticide chemicals.

AID was sued by a coalition of environmental groups in 1975, and in early 1976 announced that it would no longer sponsor the export of pesticides that are not allowed to be used in the U.S. for health or environmental reasons. In May 1977, AID went on to announce that its basic pesticide policies would be reversed. Less money would be given to developing countries to buy U.S. pesticides, and instead AID would help end indiscriminate use of pesticides. AID may have been influenced by a 1976 tragedy when malathion, incorrectly applied to Pakistan crops, caused 5 deaths and illness in 2,900 people.

Dibromochloropropane (DBCP) is a soil fumigant that has been produced and formulated for field applications since the mid-1950s, at about 80 U.S. plants. In 1977, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union discovered that many of the operators in Occidental Chemical Company's DBCP formulation plant had become sterile. This finding was widely publicized, and the State of California ordered a halt to DBCP production and formulation. Sterility was soon found also at plants producing DBCP in Alabama (Shell Chemical) and Arkansas (Dow Chemical). Federal health officials estimated that as many as 3,000 DBCP workers may have become sterile or nearly sterile. Dow announced a worldwide recall of distributors' stocks. At the urging of the union, OSHA established a stringent emergency workplace standard for DBCP. In addition, other U.S. regulatory agencies suspended the use of DBCP on 19 food crops and banned the sale of foods containing residues of DBCP.

Research done by Dow and Shell at the time they introduced DBCP, which was published in 1961, showed that the pesticide caused damage to sperm cells, as well as other effects, when administered to test animals. Some workers have sued these firms for damages, in light of the companies' failure to inform them of and protect them from the documented sterility hazard.

OSHA's emergency standard for DBCP was the first U.S. workplace standard for a pesticide. Cessation of kepone and leptophos production had obviated the need for worker protection rules for those pesticides. OSHA has announced that a general practice standard will be issued this year for formulators of all pesticides. The rules will cover medical monitoring, safe work practices, engineering controls, and informing workers of potential hazards. OSHA will also be writing standards for specific pesticides that will include numerical limits for worker exposure.

EPA has responsibility for the way new pesticides are applied. In September 1977, EPA proposed that some or all uses of 23 pesticide ingredients—most of them important to farmers and ranchers—be restricted to those users who have completed state-administered training on safe use, storage, and disposal. Pesticides containing these ingredients will continue to be freely exported, however.

Pesticides thus present a range of potential "hazard export" problems. However, the new policy of AID, coupled with OSHA's regulations and EPA's attempts to re-register pesticides, are likely to have the effect of displacing pesticide manufacture from the U.S. to developing nations, where incidents as bad or worse than those discovered in the U.S. might occur. It certainly cannot be ruled out that unscrupulous firms might move some of their more questionable pesticide-for-export operations to non-regulating countries, or even manufacture pesticides for the U.S. market at plants in non-regulating countries.

BENZIDINE DYES

The manufacture of dyes from benzidine has been banned in a number of countries, including Sweden, England, Italy, Japan, and Switzerland, due to the extremely high rate of cancer of the bladder observed in benzidine workers since before the turn of the century. A retrospecitve study of Allied Chemical benzidine dye workers showed that by the time of follow-up, 17 out of 76 workmen (22%) had developed bladder cancer. In Italy, 13 families of dead and sick workers recently charged a dye plant's management with multiple manslaughter, claiming that 132 workers had died from confirmed or suspected bladder cancer over the past 20 years. Three plant owners, the general manager, and the company doctor were jailed for terms of 3 to 6 years each.

Benzidine dyes are still made in the U.S. only by a small firm called Fabricolor. However, about three-fourths of the benzidine dyes made in the U.S. until recently were made by Allied Chemical, and Allied discontinued operations in 1976. Some of Allied's former customers may have switched to substitutes for benzidine dyes; others may have turned to GAF and Fabricolor, increasing output by these domestic firms. But it is apparent that some of the textile, paper, and leather firms formerly supplied by Allied have turned to foreign sources of these dyes. U.S. imports of 3 benzidine dyes discontinued by Allied rose five-fold in 1976, and will in all likelihood be higher in 1977. Romania supplied half of the imported material, followed by Poland and India.

GAF Corporation had been second to Allied Chemical in U.S. production of benzidine dyes. Yet Allied's withdrawal did not leave GAF a lucrative business. GAF announced in July 1977 that, as part of a move to eliminate the company's less profitable enterprises, the firm's dye works would be put up for sale. Later that year, GAF stopped making benzidine dyes. It is now obvious that any firm that wants to make benzidine dyes in the U.S. will be expected to provide lifetime medical follow-up for every worker.

One result of a shift from domestic to foreign sources of benzidine dyes may be increased workplace and pollution dangers in U.S. dye-using industries. Allied and GAF used process controls to limit the amount of free benzidine[6] in their benzidine dyes to less than 20 parts per million (ppm). Benzidine dyes from other countries have been analyzed as having 500 ppm free benzidine content.

A large, new benzidine dye plant in South Korea reportedly supplies Europe with popular Direct Black 38 dye. Attempts to identify the ownership of this plant and major markets for its products have been unsuccessful.

In 1965, Dr. R. A. M. Case of England noted that England had stopped making benzidine but was importing it instead. He proposed that benzidine be manufactured in extremely well-designed plants under international agreements. England still imports textiles colored with benzidine dyes, and most likely imports the dyes themselves, though not the deadly intermediate benzidine.

Dr. D. B. Clayson expressed the opinion that benzidine can eventually be replaced by safer substitutes in all its applications, but he seemed to think that it would be a long time before industrial use of benzidine would be abandoned worldwide. At an occupational cancer conference in March 1975, he said:

"[O]nly recently has the British chemical industry been able to relinquish completely the manufacture and use of this chemical. The Italian chemical industry has introduced a range of alternatives to benzidine dyes for cotton. They are more expensive than the dyes they replace, but not excessively so (Saffiotti, personal communication). I have no information on how carefully the toxicology of these alternatives has been studied."

[6] Free benzidine is the unconverted benzidine remaining in the dyes.

The U.S. chemical industry has felt the pressure of imports in the general category of benezenoid dyes and pigments, of which benzidine-based colors are a sub-class. Months before a fire precipitated Allied's decision to stop making benzidine dyes, a spokesman for five U.S. chemical industry trade associations asked the International Trade Commission to exempt foreign producers of benzenoid dyes and pigments from "most favored nation" tariff preference. The industry also requested a rule to deny duty-free status to any article that increases in quantity imported by 5 percent or more over the previous year, unless an affirmative decision is made to continue favored trade status for the article:

"Such a rule would give the domestic industry time to adjust to increased import penetration and would stem under-developed countries being used as pollution havens by corporations seeking to evade the anti-pollution laws of the U.S. and other industrialized nations.

About 8 million pounds of benzidine dyes were used in the U.S. in 1976. Use of these dyes has been steadily declining, and U.S. consumption was probably 50 percent more in 1972 than in 1976. Roughly half of the benzidine dye produced is Direct Black 38.

Current research by NIOSH and the National Cancer Institute suggest that pure benzidine dyes are themselves carcinogenic. These findings should lead to increased regulation of industries using benzidine dyes, and a further drop in the market for benzidine dyes in industrial nations. At the same time, benzidine dye production and use may even increase in other countries that make cotton goods for export to industrial nations.

Beta-naphthylamine, benzidine's notorious cousin, is also a potent bladder carcinogen once widely used as a dye intermediate. Fortunately, routes of dye synthesis have been developed that do not require beta-naphthylamine. The manufacture of this chemical was discontinued in Switzerland in 1938 and its use was banned in Great Britain in 1967 and in the United States in 1972. However, dyes are still made from beta-naphthylamine in India.

Benzidine dyes formerly manufactured by Allied Chemical in the U.S.

Acid Red 85.
Acid Orange 45.
Direct Orange 1.
Direct Orange 8.
Direct Red 1.
Direct Red 13.
Direct Red 28.
Direct Red 37.
Direct Blue 2.
Direct Blue 6.
Direct Green 1.
Direct Green 6.
Direct Brown 2.
Direct Brown 31.
Direct Brown 74.
Direct Brown 95.
Direct Brown 154.
Direct Black 4.
Direct Black 38.

U.S. imports of these dyes

Principal sources*

	1974	1975	1976
Direct black 38--	0	0	70,053
Direct blue 2----	0	11,023	38,478
Direct brown 2--	0	2,205	24,251
The 16 others---	20,353	12,520	15,906
Total ----	20,353	25,748	149,388

*Romania, Poland, India, and France.

SOURCE: U.S. International Trade Commission.

VINYL CHLORIDE INDUSTRIES

In 1974, when B. F. Goodrich Company announced that vinyl chloride has caused liver cancer in workers exposed to the gas, it was claimed that workplace and pollution control regulations would cause the closing of plants and the curtailment of expansion of the industry in the U.S. However, despite initial industry claims that the OSHA standard promulgated in October 1974 was not feasible, compliance with the standard was achieved in virtually all plants.

There are three types of plants where vinyl chloride (VC) is present: VC manufacture; polymerization of VC gas to make polyvinyl chloride (PVC) resin; and fabrication of PVC resins into various consumer products. Production of VC would be cheaper in non-regulating countries, but added costs and difficulties in shipping VC from abroad might offset any advantage in production cost of the flammable gas. The U.S. Department of Transportation is preparing to write regulations for packaging and shipping of carcinogens, and increased costs and limitations on VC are likely.

For PVC operations to escape U.S. regulations, the polymerization as well as the fabrication would have to be done abroad. In order to comply with the 1974 OSHA standard in polymerization plants, manufacturers employed improved stripping in polymerization reactors. This lowered the amount of residual VC that remained in the polymer leaving the reactors. Improved stripping not only reduced VC concentrations throughout polymerization plants, but also produced PVC resins with much lower residual VC content than had previously been the case. The U.S. customers of the PVC producers, thousands of PVC fabrication plants, also had to meet the OSHA standard of not more than 1 part per million of VC in workplace air. Now that these plants, which melt the PVC resins and cast them into records, garden hose, and hundreds of other products, were able to buy resins with 10 ppm and less of residual VC, they were able to comply with the OSHA standard without installing expensive ventilation and monomer capture equipment.[7] Fabrication plants making PVC food packaging were especially concerned about getting the resins with the lowest possible residual VC content. As a result, domestic PVC fabricators were forced to continue to buy resins from domestic polymerization plants rather than turn to imports from non-regulating countries. Resins made in plants without improved stripping would be too high in residual VC content to be attractive to domestic PVC fabricators.

Recent promulgation of long-expected EPA regulations on vinyl chloride air pollution have been calmly accepted by domestic manufacturers of PVC resins; much of the cost of air pollution controls had already been incurred on improved stripping and control of fugitive emissions in PVC plants to meet the OSHA standard.

U.S. production of VC and PVC has recovered from a weak year in 1975, and the "OSHA problem" has been "solved . . . without inflating production costs to the point where PVC's growth might be stunted," in the words of Chemical Week. A Chemical Week article of September 15, 1976 tells of major new plant investment in domestic VC and PVC production. The industry looks for a 5–11 percent annual growth rate in the years ahead. Domestic capacity is expected to be adequate to meet demand, as it has in the past. The U.S. consumption of 5 billion pounds per year of VC dwarfs exports and imports, and the U.S. petrochemical industry has been a net seller of VC and PVC to other countries. In the future, as more countries develop petrochemical industries, U.S. producers will become less dominant in some export markets.

The possibility that VC and PVC manufacturing will be displaced by health-related regulations is greater elsewhere in the world than in the U.S. The U.S., unlike many other industrial nations, has vast domestic petroleum resources. It is more likely that VC and PVC industries will be stunted in some petroleum-poor industrial countries, as they import increasing amount of VC-based plastic products from non-regulating countries.

STEEL INDUSTRY

Steelmaking is a highly polluting industry. Making coal into coke for blast furnaces is one of the most polluting steel-making processes. It has been well documented that coke oven workers incur excessive rates of lung and kidney cancer. On October 22, 1976, OSHA issued a standard for occupational exposure to coke oven emissions. The estimated annualized cost to the steel industry to comply with the standard was $200 million to over $1 billion, and the industry immediately went to court to challenge the standard. However, implementation of the rules would only increase the price of coke 1 to 3 percent, and control costs would at most amount to only 2 to 3 percent of planned capital expenditures by the domestic steel industry over the next 8 years.

In 1973, U.S. supply of coke was "curtailed by the inability of producers to meet environmental standards," according to the Bureau of Mines, so that it was exceeded by the enormous domestic demand in that year. But because of the high price and poor quality of imported coke, the fragility of coke to powdering in transit, and the fact that both the deposits of coking coal and markets for the coke are abundant in the U.S., it is unlikely that there will be any long term trend to ship more coke in from abroad. There might be far more favorable conditions for the export of coke production to non-regulating countries from other industrial nations where coke is now made from imported coal.

In Japan, the high density of polluting industries has already led to pollution export. Several years ago, Kawasaki Steel attempted to expand production at its steel mill in the polluted city of Chiba, Japan. Faced with opposition from local citizens, Kawasaki decided to build a new blast furnace in Chiba and build a sintering plant to serve it in Mindanao, in the Philippines. The sintering plant, which has just started to operate, converts iron ore dusts from Australia and Brazil to larger iron pellets in a process using coke and limestone. This product is shipped to the blast furnaces at Chiba. Pollutants from the process include trace element impurities from the ore as well as coke and iron ore dust and gases which are predominantly oxides of sulfur and nitrogen. Particulate emissions from part of the process are controlled to some extent by cyclone collectors, and there are no controls for the gases. There are no pollution standards and the government does not monitor the pollution from the plant.

A Manila newspaper responded favorably when the agreement between Kawasaki and the Philippine government was being negotiated:

"This is a case of a "dirty' industry that can no longer be located in Japan because of pollution concerns. But the Philippine authorities have no objection to its installation in the under-polluted southern island."

Reportedly, 1,500 families were displaced to make way for this plant and its 6 kilometer "pollution zone." The farmers and fishermen displaced by the plant were not hired to construct it, because they were considered too unskilled and uneducated. The plant employs 600–700 workers.

OTHER CASES

On July 10, 1976, a chemical reaction went out of control and the products vented to the

[7] Prior to 1974, PVC resins with as much as 1,000 ppm of residual VC were common.

atmosphere included one of the most toxic and teratogenic of manmade substances—2,3,7,8-tetrachlordibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD). The resulting contamination in Seveso, Italy, led to the evacuation of 700 plant neighbors, many of whom may never be able to return to their homes. About 90 pregnant women who were exposed to the toxic release had abortions, despite stern opposition by the Catholic Church. The plant manufactured trichlorophenol, which was sent to Switzerland and the U.S. for the manufacture of the antibacterial product, hexachlorophene. The Italian, Swiss, and the U.S. plants were all owned by the Swiss-based Givaudan Corporation, a subsidiary of the giant pharmaceutical firm, Hoffman-LaRoche.

It was well known that TCDD was a contaminant in the process of making trichlorophenol, and that the amount of TCDD formed increases at high reaction temperatures. The formation of TCDD in this process was a recognized hazard in the event of a runaway reaction, an accident in which there is an excessive build-up of heat in the reactor, usually leading to an explosion. Such accidents had occurred in a number of countries since 1949, and in the U.S. a heat control mechanism and a holding tank back-up system are standard safety features. The Seveso plant did not have these safety devices. The workers in the plant were not even told about dioxin hazards. The Seveso incident was the first TCDD explosion to expose plant neighbors, in previous accidents the contamination had been confined to within the plants. TCDD has penetrated the soil to a depth of 12 inches in Seveso.

The Seveso disaster led local journalists to refer to the dense, mostly foreign-owned, chemical industry in northern Italy as "the Italian Colony." It is highly doubtful that this Swiss-owned plant would have been allowed to operate in Switzerland. It is certain that no one from the headquarters of Hoffman-LaRoche will ever be sent to an Italian jail. And it is possible that a similar accident might occur again, as long as there are places where trichlorophenol plants are still designed like dioxin time bombs.

There have been street demonstrations in Tokyo against several Japanese companies that were charged with exporting pollution: Toyama Chemical over closing a mercurochrome plant in Japan and planning to move to South Korea; Nihon Kagaku over shifting chromium refining and plating to South Korea, following a long history of severe chromium air pollution and high worker lung cancer mortality in Japan; and Asahi Glass over water pollution from its mercury cell chloralkali plant in Thailand.[8]

It is not known how much mercury-cell alkali Japan imports from Thailand or other countries. However, in some industries, like rayon manufacture, mercury cell alkali is preferred over alkali from the other conventional process (the diaphragm cell process). Japan has suffered the great Minamata disaster and leads the world in regulating mercury water pollution. These regulations may have displaced mercury cell alkali production that serves the Japanese economy to other nations.

Over the past three years in the U.S., there have been mounting reports that foundation stones for our rubber, plastics, and other chemical industries are causes of occupational diseases. Frightening human and animal data have recently emerged on carcinogenicity of chromates, chloroform, trichloroethylene, benzene, acrylonitrile, cutting oils, 2-nitropropane, 4,4-diaminodiphenylmethane, ethylene dibromide, beryllium, and cadmium. NIOSH has urged that an emergency workplace standard be used for chromium. On May 3, 1977, OSHA published an emergency standard for benzene, lowering the standard 10-fold to 1 ppm, in response to reports of leukemia among benzene-exposed workers. An emergency standard for acrylonitrile was issued January 17, 1978, reducing the allowable workplace limits 10-fold to 2 ppm. The permanent standard for this widely used carcinogen will probably be lower than 1 ppm. The emergency standards for benzene and acrylonitrile had been demanded by U.S. labor unions. More emergency standards were promised by Dr. Eula Bingham, the new OSHA Administrator. Similarly, stringent air and water pollution control standards for newly-recognized carcinogens will also be issued by EPA in the next few years.

Obvious analogies between the chemical structures of some of the newly established carcinogens and other commonly used substances cast a shadow over large segments of the chemical industry. Epidemiological and experimental reports continue to reveal the carcinogenic properties of many high-volume, industrial chemicals. In a short time, many chemicals will have to be far more carefully handled in the U.S. than they are today. Some export of hazardous manufacturing must be anticipated in the affected industries.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT HAZARD EXPORT, AND WHY?

Peter Bommarito, International President of the United Rubber Workers, has said that it is the basic right of every worker and every union to be informed about the health hazards on the job. Workers have the right to a full explanation of the job hazards they face and means they can use to minimize those hazards, and this warning should be issued at the time of hire. That way, a worker has the chance to reject hazardous employment before jeopardizing his health or that of his family, and before becoming economically dependent on the job. Those employed in hazardous work have the right to at least be warned from time to time about job hazards and means available for their control. These warnings should be expressed in language the workers can understand.

Governments in industrial nations as well as many developing nations find it necessary to require more than just employee notification, where hazardous substances are handled. New plants may be held to higher standards than existing plants since process control is cheaper and more efficient in the design of a new plant than in the retrofit of an existing plant.

There is also increasing emphasis on environmental appraisal before permits are granted for plants to be built. The host country may be quite committed to a new industrial project, financially and politically, by the time a plant is constructed. Once a plant has opened and families depend on it for their livelihood, once the workers have already incurred considerable risk of cancer or other serious diseases from working under hazardous conditions—at this stage, there may be little that can be done for those people.

Clearly, all nations need to develop expertise in toxic substances control, so that they are prepared to protect their people from the time that new industrial projects are planned, as well as later, in the course of their operation. Unfortunately, few nations have so far set up regulatory agencies with sufficient resources, expertise, and authority to provide much protection to workers and communities from the dangers of operating plants. This underlines the need for careful analysis prior to construction of new plants. Requiring good process control in the design of a plant is crucial to assure that it can and will be safely operated.

There is urgent need for ongoing and competent appraisal of the worldwide movements of hazardous industries. This hazard export information service would have to be run by a respected international organization. Its goals would be:

1. to disseminate current knowledge about health risks and their control to industrial workers everywhere, directly and through governments and unions;
2. to assist interested governments and affected individuals in appraising industrial project plans and setting standards;
3. to gather and distribute knowledge about the movements of hazardous industries around the world; and
4. to keep track of other aspects of hazard export, primarily the movements of banned foods, drugs, consumer products and pesticides to other nations from the nation where they were banned.

Further details on how this hazard export information service would operate are contained in the Appendix.

Trade unionists have taken stock of the high toll of occupational disease and accidents, and the prevailing view now is that the abatement of job hazards is preferable to "hazard pay." The International Metalworkers' Federation has attached top priority to seeking, through both laws and collective bargaining, to ensure that workers are guaranteed the right to refuse hazardous work without reprisal. The trade unions have called for regulations to protect workers' health to the same degree everywhere, "[in order to prevent employers] from gaining competitive advantages at the cost of workers' lives."

The moral and medical arguments for worldwide standards to protect humans from toxic substances are persuasive, but they pale before the bleak alternatives to hazardous work in much of the world today. The establishment of international standards is a lofty goal, but it will not be within reach until a serious, widespread effort is made to turn away from historic dependence on discredited technologies. The growing awareness of the need for clean, simple technologies, appropriate for local needs and capabilities, offers hope that models for development will arise that discriminate against polluting, hazardous industries to the extent possible.

Dr. R. A. M. Case of England, noting that his country was importing benzidine as a result of domestic plant closings in 1965, said:

"Now I think that most humane men will agree that it is obviously improper to expect men in other countries to face a risk which a firm considers unacceptable in its own factories; but, on the other hand, if the substances concerned are really vital to human well-being, then the solution might be to have one extremely well-designed plant which could serve the world demand, and so reduce the risk to an absolute minimum."

Benzidine dye manufacture, which is widely banned and of no military importance, would be a good candidate for the implementation of a multilateral agreement as outlined by Dr. Case.

The fundamental objection to the idea of controlling hazard export is the claim that very poor people are better off with hazardous factories and goods than they would be without these things. It is of utmost importance to respect the right of people and their governments to choose what is best for them, and to recognize that in some cases they would accept recognized mortal risks with full knowledge, and with full justification. It would seem to follow that all that needs to be done to justify hazard export is to assure from the outset that all parties involved are told and are able to understand what is at stake. Once this is done, it follows that hazard export becomes a legitimate way of distributing the world's hazards and resources to places where they are "needed."

[8] A chlor-alkali plant manufactures chlorine and sodium hydroxide from salt as the starting material. Sodium hydroxide is also called alkali, lye, and caustic soda.

This line of reasoning rests on the assumptions that the recipients of hazard export would be fully informed, and that they would be able to fully understand the nature of the hazards—these are both highly questionable, as a practical matter, at least in today's world. But there are other disturbing questions raised by the notion that hazard export with informed consent is a legitimate way to do business. For example, what's at stake may be the destruction of the environment's capacity to continue to bring forth food that is not poisoned, and a starving man might accept a polluting factory even at great peril to future generations of man and other living things. He could hardly be blamed for that, but can the same be said for those who wish to profit from his misery to the extent that they will offer him no better a bargain for putting food in his mouth? And might the hazard exporters offer the poor man more if the course of hazard export was barred?

The long term prospects for following this line of reasoning are ominous. Industrial nations are increasingly confronted with discoveries that existing technologies are far more hazardous to workers and the environment than was ever imagined. If industry is to be expected to develop innovative solutions to these problems, if banks are to be expected to finance a new generation of technologies, something will have to be done to make exporting the hazards of current technology less attractive. Worldwide, the pollution and worker health hazard problems posed by asbestos, benzidine, mercury, and the like are largely determined by price. As long as hazardous processes can operate without the expense of controls, their products will be cheap to manufacture and will remain competitive with other products made by safer processes. Demand for the hazardously-manufactured product will remain high, rather than declining in favor of safer alternatives. The resulting pollution and worker disease will be concentrated in the hazard-importing countries, it will not be evenly distributed around the world.

We are at a crossroads. At this time, some manufacturers are trying to hold on to established markets and develop improved technologies. Other manufacturers have gotten out of certain hazardous businesses, because they cannot compete with plants using hazardous technologies in non-regulating countries. Still others have essentially gone into the hazard export business, recognizing that there is money to be made by exploiting the disparity in pollution and worker health regulations around the world. Meanwhile, developing nations are seeking ways to utilize their resources and choose technologies that will provide their people with needed goods, employment, education, and a healthful environment. The class of problems called hazard export constitutes a growing threat to the world environment, health, and international relations.

The United States is in a good position to provide conditions for the development of safe, clean technologies. The U.S. can improve its import-export and securities record-keeping so that hazard export components of its economy can be monitored. The U.S. can see to it that its direct foreign assistance programs do not export workplace and environmental hazards to other nations. The U.S. can, through its representatives, insist that thorough environmental assessments be made by international organizations that finance development projects with U.S. aid.[9] The U.S. can provide sanctions to make the hazard export business less attractive to the directors of U.S.-based firms. The U.S. can also play a leading role in setting up a world information service on hazard export, and in seeking international solutions such as the one suggested 12 years ago by Dr. Case.

U.S. Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall has recently proposed that nations' relative workplace health and safety standards be used as a factor in negotiating international trade agreements. However, it would take much more information than anyone has today to develop the terms for trade agreements.●

[9] Development financing institutions have a long way to go, when it comes to giving competent evaluations of environmental impact. See *Multilateral Aid and the Environment/A Study of the Environmental Procedures and Practices of Nine Development Financing Agencies*, International Institute for Environment and Development, Washington, D.C., 1977.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF AMERICAN FARMLAND—AGRICULTURAL LAND: OUR NATION'S MOST VALUABLE RESOURCE

HON. JOHN KREBS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, more than ever, present decisions regarding land ownership have the capacity to shape our society and determine our Nation's productive capacity for generations to come. Daniel Webster once said, "Let us never forget that the cultivation of the Earth is the most important labor of man." It is in this spirit that we today discuss the future care of our Nation's most valuable resource, agricultural land.

The control of this resource has been at the heart of the world's great revolutions, and in this country, has led to tremendous controversy throughout our history, from the land rushes of the 18th century to the current debate over reclamation law. Most likely, land controversies will only intensify as the true value of farmland is realized and as our Nation increases its reliance on the agricultural system to supply essential commodities for domestic consumption and international trade.

There are 12,000 acres in Illinois, 10,000 acres in Texas, 23,000 acres in Wyoming, and 5,500 acres in California * * * these are but a few of the much-publicized sales of farmland to foreign interests that have filled our newspaper recently and heralded new controversy over agricultural land. While hard data is difficult to obtain, some real estate sales people in California now estimate that 40 percent or more of their sales are being made to foreigners. In the San Joaquin Valley's delta region, over 17,000 acres of farmland have been purchased by foreign buyers since June 1976. These include purchases of 5,500 acres for $6.8 million by French interests and 5,000 acres for $12 million by Italian investors. In the latter case, the purchase price was around $2,400 per acre, generally considered to be some $600 and $800 above the market price. This works out to a 25- to 50-percent increase over current market rates. Surely, such sales prices have contributed to the 13 percent overall increase in the price of California farmland which occurred during the past year.

Are these isolated cases of foreign investment in our Nation's 340 million acres of farmland? Or, do they represent only the most visible signals of a significant shift now occurring in the control of a vital resource? As those most familiar with the issue will probably admit, there is no definitive answer to these questions.

IMPACT OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT ON AGRICULTURE

Even more perplexing, however, is the possible impact such investment may have on American agriculture. Some argue that foreign investment is beneficial since it provides new sources of capital for the expansion of farm operations, helps reduce the U.S. balance of payments problem, and allows for the creation of a true world economic order.

Others contend such investment poses several serious problems for farmers and rural communities. The question of increasing land prices immediately comes to mind. On one hand, agricultural land is a limited resource, with only 3 percent of the total coming onto the market every year. At the same time, foreign buyers, often assisted by tax breaks and attracted by relatively high rates of return on a secure investment, are willing to pay prices above market rates. The result? Inflated land prices that fuel the existing trend of ever increasing farmland values.

In turn, these prices force sharply higher property taxes and reduce the ability of young farmers to purchase farmland and existing family farm operations to expand. These factors are bound to disrupt the traditional owner-operator relationship which has been such an integral part of our family farms. As land prices escalate, farm ownership will be replaced by leasing. This will increase the danger of abstentee landownership and contribute to even more concentrated farm operations in the hands of the few.

There are additional dangers as foreign ownership increases. The fiber of rural communities will necessarily suffer as rents from land ownership leave this country. Also, foreign investors would most likely have little incentive to participate in land conservation programs, so essential to the long-term productivity of our soils.

Finally, there is a real danger that concentrated investment could permit foreign interests to have a controlling voice in the production and marketing of specialized crops with a small geographical growing range and limited production, such as raisins, walnuts, olives, and almonds. One study, conducted by USDA agricultural economist Charles V. Moore, indicated that a foreign investment fund of only $100 million could buy 41 percent of all California farmland sold in 1 year. Thus, the implications for certain commodities are indeed ominous.

Certainly, these arguments raise serious and complex questions that require sophisticated analysis. However, our ability to proceed with such an analysis is based upon one key input: reliable data on the ownership of farmland by foreign interests.

INFORMATION GAP

As the title of the June 12, 1978, General Accounting Office report indicates, foreign ownership of U.S. farmland—much concern, little data, there is a sig-

nificant lack of information concerning foreign investment in American agricultural land. Unfortunately, every existing source of information on foreign ownership provides data that is either unreliable, inadequate, or untimely.

Supposedly, the most useful data may be found in county land records. An investigation of these records in numerous States has indicated that this information source is misleading, difficult to interpret, inaccessible, and noncomprehensive. First, even though nearly all land purchasers presently have their property transfers recorded, the laws of most States do not require them to do so. Second, since county land records do not require purchasers to reveal their citizenship, such information is generally not included in the records. Third, sales prices are usually not recorded on the property deeds, thereby making it difficult to determine property values. Fourth, the documents generally do not show the names, addresses, or residences of stockholders or beneficiaries, information which is essential in determining foreign ownerhip. Worse still, the local land records can even be misleading as to the actual owner of the land. For example, in the case of a corporation that has been taken over by another entity, the original name would remain since those maintaining the county records would have no reason or means to identify and record such changes unless specific notification were given.

Even if the information supplied by county land records were reliable, it would still be quite inaccessible, being locked up in each county courthouse throughout the Nation. Furthermore, the GAO has commented that if it were not for the tips received from other sources, it would have been nearly impossible to identify foreign sales in the nearly overwhelming mass of county records. For all these reasons, the GAO concluded that checking the county records to determine foreign ownership "was not a feasible or productive approach".

Other sources of information, such as tax assessors, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Federal land banks, private agencies, and corporate reports all possessed information on foreign ownership that was deficient and undependable. There are a few States which do have reporting requirements providing data on foreign interests, but various definitions of foreign ownership are used and, as the GAO reported, "there is little or no assurance that the data is complete and reliable."

At the Federal level, the Agricultural Census conducted every 5 years does not seem suitable as a timely reporting instrument since results take several years to be tabulated and many farmers simply refuse to supply requested information. Finally, there are several foreign investment surveys being conducted by both the Department of Agriculture and Commerce Department. However, the USDA admits that its sampling is quite limited and the Commerce Department has not been willing to isolate agricultural land for special study or specifically analyze the impact of foreign investment on farmland.

It is, therefore, quite understandable that following its investigation of existing reporting systems, the GAO concluded that:

There is virtually unanimous agreement among persons at all levels of government and in the private sector that, currently, there is no reliable data on the amount of U.S. farmland owned by nonresident aliens or on recent trends of such ownership.

NECESSITY OF A NEW APPROACH: NATIONAL REGISTRATION

Clearly, there is a need for a comprehensive, reliable inexpensive reporting system if we are to fully understand the degree of foreign investment in agricultural land. Consequently, Representatives NOLAN, GRASSLEY, and myself have sponsored a bill which will meet these goals. H.R. 13128 and H.R. 13132 (identical bills) establish a nationwide registration system for foreign owners of U.S. agricultural land. I was pleased to note that the GAO has recently completed an investigation of alternative reporting systems and has concluded that such a system would be "the most feasible and simplest approach" in obtaining much-needed data on foreign investment in agricultural land.

Essentially, the bill would require that all nonresident aliens, or "foreign persons", who hold, acquire or transfer interests in American farmland to file a report with the Secretary of Agriculture within 90 days of purchase, sale, or transfer. "Foreign persons" 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 will have data on all foreign land ownership, from the date this legislation is enacted and into the future.

Rather than requiring annual land ownership reports, the legislation reduces redtape by requiring that a report only be submitted if ownership of the land is transferred. The filed document would include the legal name, citizenship, and address of the landholder, the nature of the interest held, the location and price paid for the land, and any other information the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary. In addition, the legislation empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to go beyond the veil of corporate control to seek detailed information on the actual ownership by foreign interests.

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 percentage penalties would provide strong incentives for both small and large foreign landholders to register.

Finally, the legislation requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit annual reports to the Congress which would provide data on land ownership by foreigners as well as an analysis of the impact of such ownership on our Nation's farms and rural communities. In addition, an interim report will be required 9 months after enactment of the legislation, thereby providing an immediate picture of foreign control of agricultural land.

I believe this bill will establish a low-cost, comprehensive system of reporting that will not require an expensive Federal bureaucracy to administer. No burden will be placed on local governments and the Secretary of Agriculture will be given discretion to make decisions in several significant areas. Furthermore, the system is flexible enough to be coordinated with results obtained from the USDA feasibility study of alternative methods for collecting nationwide data on land ownership, as well as the Commerce Department's current survey of foreign investment.

In conclusion, I believe this legislation will provide the hard data needed to make the difficult policy decisions regarding the future of our agricultural land.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the legislation to which I have just referred:

H.R. 13356 AND H.R. 13357

A bill, to require foreign persons who acquire, transfer, or hold interests in agricultural land to report such transactions and holdings to the Secretary of Agriculture and to direct the Secretary to analyze information contained in such reports and determine the effects such transactions and holdings have, particularly on family farms and rural communities, and for other purposes

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978".

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Any foreign person who acquires or transfers any interest, other than a security interest, in agricultural land shall submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture not later than 90 days after the date of such acquisition or transfer. Such report shall be submitted in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary may require and shall contain—

(1) the legal name and the address of such foreign person;

(2) in any case in which such foreign person is an individual, the citizenship of such foreign person;

(3) in any case in which such foreign person is not an individual or a government, the country in which such foreign person is created or organized and the principal place of business of such foreign person;

(4) the type of interest in agricultural land which such foreign person acquired or transferred;

(5) a legal description of such agricultural land;

(6) the purchase price paid for, or any other consideration given for, such interest;

(7) in any case in which such foreign person transfers such interest, the legal name and the address of the person to whom such interest is transferred and—

(A) in any case in which such transferee is an individual, the citizenship of such transferee; and

(B) in any case in which such transferee is not an individual or a government, the country in which such transferee is created or organized and the principal place of business of such transferee; and

(8) such other information as the Secretary may require by regulation.

(b) Any foreign person who holds any interest, other than a security interest, in agricultural land on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act shall submit a report to the Secretary not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such report shall be submitted in such form and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary may require and shall contain—

(1) the legal name and the address of such foreign person;

(2) in any case in which such foreign person is an individual, the citizenship of such foreign person;

(3) in any case in which such foreign person is not an individual or a government, the country in which such foreign person is created or organized and the principal place of business of such foreign person;

(4) the type of interest in agricultural land which is held by such foreign person;

(5) a legal description of such agricultural land;

(6) the purchase price paid for, or any other consideration given for, such interest; and

(7) such other information as the Secretary may require by regulation.

(c) (1) With respect to any foreign person, other than an individual or a government, who is required to submit a report by subsection (a) or (b), the Secretary may, in addition, require such foreign person to submit a report to the Secretary containing—

(A) the legal name and the address of each person who holds any interest in such foreign person;

(B) in any case in which the holder of such interest is an individual, the citizenship of such holder; and

(C) in any case in which the holder of such interest is not an individual or a government, the country in which such holder is created or organized and the principal place of business of such holder.

(2) With respect to any person whose legal name is contained in any report submitted under paragraph (1), the Secretary may take such actions as the Secretary considers necessary to determine—

(A) the legal name and the address of any person who holds any interest in any person whose legal name is contained in such report;

(B) in any case in which the holder of such interest is an individual, the citizenship of such holder; and

(C) in any case in which the holder of such interest is not an individual or a government, the country in which such holder is created or organized and the principal place of business of such holder.

(3) (A) The Secretary shall not require any foreign person to submit any information in any report under paragraph (1) if the submission of such information is prohibited by the laws of the country involved.

(B) The Secretary shall not take any action under paragraph (2) if such action is prohibited by the laws of the country involved.

CIVIL PENALTY

SEC. 3. (a) Whoever violates any provision of section 2(a), 2(b), or 2(c)(1) of this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty imposed by the Secretary. The amount of any such civil penalty shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section. Any such civil penalty shall be recoverable in a civil action brought by the Attorney General of the United States in an appropriate district court of the United States.

(b) With respect to any person who violates any provision of section 2(a), 2(b), or 2(c)(1), any civil penalty imposed by the Secretary shall not exceed 25 percent of the fair market value, on the date of the assessment of such penalty, of the interest in agricultural land with respect to which such violation occurred.

REPORTS

SEC. 4. (a) In accordance with the schedule set forth in subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) with respect to each period set forth in such subsection, analyze information obtained by the Secretary under section 2 and determine the effects of foreign persons' acquiring, transferring, and holding agricultural land, particularly the effects of such acquisitions, transfers, and holdings on family farms and rural communities; and

(2) transmit to the President and each House of the Congress a report on the Secretary's findings and conclusions regarding each analysis and determination made under paragraph (1).

(b) An analysis and determination shall be made, and a report on the Secretary's findings and conclusions regarding such analysis and determination transmitted, pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) with respect to information obtained by the Secretary under section 2 during the 6-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, within 9 months after such date of enactment;

(2) with respect to information obtained by the Secretary under section 2 during the 12-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, within 15 months after such date of enactment; and

(3) with respect to each calendar year following the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), within 90 days after the end of such calendar year.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 5. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "agricultural land" means any land used for agricultural purposes as determined by the Secretary under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary;

(2) the term "foreign country" means any country other than the United States;

(3) the term "foreign person" means—

(A) any individual who is not a citizen of the United States and who has not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act;

(B) any person, other than an individual or a government, which is created or organized under the laws of a foreign country or which has its principal place of business in a foreign country;

(C) any person, other than an individual or a government, which is created or organized under the laws of a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, or a territory, possession, or commonwealth of the United States and which, as determined by the Secretary under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, is substantially controlled by any individual referred to in subparagraph (A), any person referred to in subparagraph (B), any government of a foreign country, or any combination of such individuals, persons, or governments; and

(D) any government of a foreign country;

(4) the term "person" includes any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, trust, estate, or any other similar organization;

(5) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(6) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.●

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. FARMLAND

HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 14, two of my colleagues and I—the gentleman from California (Mr. KREBS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), chairman of the Family Farms, Rural Development and Special Studies Subcommittee on which I serve as ranking minority member, introduced legislation to require reporting of foreign ownership, acquisition, or transfer of U.S. agricultural land.

These two bills, H.R. 13128 and H.R. 13132, would make it necessary for foreign individuals, partnerships, corporations, trusts, or other groups who own, acquire, or transfer U.S. farmland or an interest in such farmland, to report their holdings and transactions to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary would, in turn, analyze this information to determine the effects of such holdings, acquisitions, and transfers, especially on family farms and rural communities, and report his findings to the President and the Congress.

We hope that this kind of reporting requirement will give us the information we presently lack on the extent of current foreign ownership of farmland and the rate at which our farms are going into the hands of foreign buyers.

Although a number of States have imposed various types of restrictions and reporting requirements on foreign ownership and purchase of farmland, and others are in the process of considering legislation, our biggest handicap right now in dealing with this whole issue is that there are no solid statistics on a nationwide basis to give us a good picture of what is actually happening across the country.

This lack of information—both as to the scope and the impact of foreign ownership—was underscored by witnesses at our Family Farms Subcommittee hearing on this subject on Tuesday, June 20. Many questions were raised for which few answers are available.

Today, I am pleased to join in the reintroduction of H.R. 13128 and H.R. 13132 with cosponsors. On Wednesday, July 19, our Family Farms Subcommittee will hold another hearing on this issue. This time we will narrow our focus to the relative merits of H.R. 13128, H.R. 13132, and other legislation dealing with foreign investment in U.S. farmland. We hope to determine from this hearing just what legislative approach is most feasible and appropriate under the present circumstances.

We need to know what is happening before we can deal intelligently with it, and that is the basic purpose of the legislation we have introduced. We are hopeful that enactment of legislation of this type will put the whole issue of foreign

investment in U.S. farmland into better perspective.●

CIVIC LEADERSHIP AWARD TO WILLIAM MATTHEWS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1978, I had the privilege of presenting the first annual Memphis Business, Labor, and Civic Leadership Award to Mr. William Matthews, chairman of the board of the Union Planters National Bank. This award, which I initiated on behalf of better business, will be presented annually to an outstanding member of the community who has exhibited unusual leadership qualities and abilities in the furtherance of civic efforts.

I was particularly pleased to present this precursor award to Mr. Matthews in light of significant contributions he has made to the city of Memphis during the past year, primarily in his work in downtown redevelopment. As you may know, Memphis has recently poured its energies into this downtown project—renovating old, wornout buildings, encouraging businesses, and culminating with the $7 million Mid-America Mall, the longest of its kind in the United States. As an active member of the Memphis Development Foundation, Mr. Matthews has been instrumental in getting financial support from Union Planters for downtown restoration. Because of his interest, Memphis has successfully restored its oldest existing theater, now the Orpheum Theater, which, once again, renders a broad range of entertainment (arts and music) in an effort to encourage people to come back downtown. With congressional interest currently turned toward urban redevelopment, as evidenced in the Housing and Community Development Act amendments (H.R. 12433), it is important that we express our appreciation to business leaders such as Mr. Matthews, who not only encourage urban growth, but plan the development process and stand behind important decisions.

As a member of the Citizens Energy Study Committee, Mr. Matthews has led Union Planters in an awareness campaign to inform and educate the Memphis community on individual means of energy conservation. Via television, radio and newspaper advertisements, they have dispersed tips throughout the community on how individuals can help to save energy. Also, through the awareness campaign, a $1,000-a-week drawing has been initiated, the winner of which must use the money to purchase energy-saving devices, that is, storm windows.

Mr. Matthews is to be commended for work he has done in addressing the prevailing problem of discrimination. Under his leadership, Union Planters has placed priority on affirmative action in its hiring policies to insure equal pay, equal working conditions, and unbiased hiring policies.

Mr. Matthews is to be commended for his interest in national, as well as community problems. He has expressed consternation with the country's deficit trade problem and has plans for Memphis' future as the hub of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you agree that any community would profit by a citizen such as Mr. William Matthews. I am glad that you were present to see the first annual presentation of this award to such a fine individual.●

NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING—WHY NOBODY IS FOLLOWING THE LEADER

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON, wrote to President Carter to express his concern over the administration's policy on nuclear fuel reprocessing. JOHN ANDERSON is uniquely qualified to comment on the successes or failure of our policy in this area and the President should heed his advice. He points out that the present hard-line policy by the administration against reprocessing has accelerated the spread of national reprocessing plants, rather than slowed it down as intended. In the process, we have increased the risk of nuclear proliferation rather than reduced it. Other nations are clearly not following our misguided lead.

Mr. Speaker, I have been calling attention to the failure of this nonpolicy for over a year now. Fortunately, congressional leaders in the House and Senate have recently become more aware that we must carry out domestic reprocessing activities if we are to influence international decisions or nuclear safeguards and waste management. In addition, it is becoming more evident that reprocessing represents an important energy resource, one which our Nation can ill afford to ignore. For example:

The spent fuel discharged by each nuclear reactor per year, if reprocessed, would provide an additional energy content equivalent to approximately 6-million barrels of oil.

One reprocessing plant, which can handle the needs of 50 nuclear reactors, can provide the equivalent of about 300 million barrels of oil each year in the form of fresh nuclear fuel.

The energy content in all U.S. spent fuel through the year 2000 will be equivalent to 19-billion barrels of oil. The free world's spent fuel over the same period will be equivalent to 97-billion barrels, or six times the free world's oil production in 1975.

It is inconceivable to me, as I believe it is to Representative ANDERSON, that the United States can ignore this domestic energy resource, which is worth hundreds of billions of dollars. Yet that is exactly what our present policy entails. This policy is all the more ironic when one considers that the United States has a largely completed reprocessing plant sitting idle in South Carolina, but which is not permitted to operate because it conflicts with the "moral" code on energy followed by this administration. I, for one, fail to see the morality, let alone the commonsense, in letting this vast energy resource go to waste.

For this reason, I am in complete sympathy with the arguments presented in JOHN ANDERSON's letter to the President, and commend this letter to my colleagues. The text of the letter follows:

JUNE 16, 1978.

Hon. JIMMY CARTER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to convey my concern over the Administration's policy on nuclear fuel reprocessing and its implications overseas.

The purpose for your April 7, 1977, statement of deferral was, as I understand it, to get other nuclear nations to pause in their programs while the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) proceeded and certain institutional safeguard mechanisms were put into place. As you are well aware, this pause from our foreign friends has not been forthcoming. Rather, we are seeing an accelerated movement to gain reprocessing technology, capacity, and services in a number of countries.

I believe the reason for this accelerated movement is obvious. Although the current stated U.S. position is one of indefinite deferral. Administration spokesmen are interpreting this policy to mean that reprocessing should be abolished. Domestically, much to my alarm, your policy is having a serious impact. For instance, the owners of the Barnwell plant have publicly stated they see no prospect for commercial operation. Also, other potential entries into the commercial reprocessing field have withdrawn. This development poses a serious barrier to effective involvement of the U.S. in the INFCE since Barnwell is the only facility in the world which could be effectively utilized by the INFCE or any international body to test and prove proliferation-resistant fuel cycle technologies on a commercial scale.

Because of this inflexible, hard-line position, foreign nations have lost faith that they will ever get any reprocessing services from us or any serious commitment to implementing positions agreed to by the INFCE. This attitude could be changed if it were made clear by the Administration that we have not completely ruled out reprocessing at some future date, probably under multigovernment auspices or under conditions designed to implement the results of the INFCE. Such a statement of clarification should also reflect a more open attitude toward the possibility of using Barnwell in some mode, at some future date.

I firmly believe that the more open policy just described would cause foreign nations to observe your pause and work with us rather than against us. Such a pause overseas might also cause recent commitments to be reevaluated in light of the clarification of U.S. policy as one of flexibility rather than rigidity and rejection of reprocessing forever.

I would be pleased to discuss these matters with you and other senior Administration officials if you determine that is desirable.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.●

H.R. 11986—A BILL TO CHANGE TAXES ON AIR TRAVEL TO PROVIDE PORTIONS OF SUCH TAXES FOR THE RETROFIT OR REPLACEMENT OF NOISY AIRCRAFT

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, fast approaching consideration by the full House is H.R. 11986, the Noisy Aircraft Revenue and Credit Act of 1978. If passed, it will divert more than $3 billion over 5 years from the Airport and Airways Trust Fund to private airlines to assist them in meeting Government-imposed noise regulations. I am addressing you today because I feel this bill has not caught the attention and concern of enough Members. It is a bad bill. It is unwise and dangerous legislation which, if passed, would constitute bad tax policy and reflect poorly upon the House.

Here are four reasons why I oppose this bill:

First. If enacted, the bill would set a bad precedent which could potentially haunt us in years to come. This would be the first instance where the Federal Government would impose regulations on an industry for environmental reasons, then levy a tax on industry-users for the purpose of helping the industry itself comply with the regulations. Specifically, the taxes collected in this bill are passed through to the private airline for the retrofit of engines, new engines, or entirely new airplanes as they see fit—an arrangement few airlines will turn down. And there is no reason to believe that this disturbing precedent may not be applied to other industries as well. For instance, General Motors could argue that part of the Highway Trust Fund should be passed through to them to be used as they see fit to comply with Government-imposed auto emission regulations. The purpose for establishing the Airport and Airway Trust Fund or the Highway Trust Fund or other similar trust funds was to raise revenues to be spent by Government entities for publicly owned and operated facilities, not for private use. Truly, this bill would set a dangerous precedent.

Second. The bill is impractical and even arbitrary in its actual benefit to the aviation industry. The tax mechanism allocates funds without regard to the actual number of noisy aircraft which must be modified or replaced in order to meet the FAA regulations; there is no formula to distribute dollars to equitably meet the needs. To the contrary, under title III, each airline is entitled to spend no more than the total amount of tax revenues it has generated. Hence, moneys would be allocated on the basis of an airlines share of the market—its popularity—and not its contribution to the noise problem. Impracticality is compounded when one considers that the oldest and noisest planes are owned in disproportionately high numbers by American, TWA, and United. Their planes constitute 40 percent of the U.S. fleet, and 68 percent of the noisiest aircraft; yet, title III would raise for them only 40 percent of the fund. It fails to recognize that some airlines are more unsuccessfully meeting noise standards than others. The bill is impractical.

Third. Inflation must be a consideration in this bill and clearly, this measure is inflationary. It requires a 2-percent tax on airline tickets. Without this program there is every reason to believe that this tax would disappear and the cost of air travel would drop by a like amount. This would be beneficial both to the traveler, who would be paying less, and to the airlines, which would probably find once again that lower fares result in higher load factors and ultimately, greater profits. This bill is inflationary.

Fourth. The public is demanding accountability in our actions—requiring us to investigate the real necessity of any Federal action. On that premise, it is difficult to agree with the argument that there is a clear need in the airline industry for this legislation. First, when the FAA imposed the new antinoise regulations in 1976, the FAA made a specific finding that the new regulations were economically feasible. Obviously, airlines do not share that opinion but it today remains the official position of the Federal Government. There is substantial factual support for such an opinion when one reflects on the fact that airline industry sources say that better than $2½ billion of the money provided would be used to replace aging 707's and DC–8's which are already, on average, more than 11 years old, and will be 18 years old by the time the noise regulations are fully effective in 1985. It is hard to believe that any airline which intends to remain in business in 1985 would not already be planning to replace 18-year-old equipment by that time for other good reasons. It is even harder to believe that we would pass a bill to allow the airlines the use of this money not only for quieter engines, but also for the remaining components of their planes. I remain unconvinced that our prospering airlines cannot comply with these Federal regulations without the Federal Government footing much of the bill. This bill is unnecessary.

Aircraft noise is a serious problem and the noise regulations are needed. Airports do need assistance to help them create a quieter environment for the people who live and work around them. But H.R. 11986 is a bad bill. It sets a bad precedent; it is impractical in its nature; it is inflationary; and it is unnecessary. Please join me in opposing the Noisy Aircraft Revenue and Credit Act of 1978.●

TEACHING FREE ENTERPRISE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, each year the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association sponsors an economics essay contest for youth between the ages of 14 and 18.

The 1978 first place winner is Dayton S. Sloat of Highmore, S. Dak., and policymakers would do well to heed his excellent thoughts:

The essay follows:

WHY THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOL

(By Dayton S. Sloat)

Throughout the history of the United States, the basis for its economy has been the free enterprise system. This system employs the practical application of the belief that each person knows what is best for himself or herself, and that the freedom to practice this knowledge produces the best economic system for everyone. In such a system people must decide for themselves how they will earn and spend their money. They also possess the freedom to raise themselves above their original financial status.

The founding fathers of our nation recognized the importance of the concept of a free economy from its use in England and the colonies. They incorporated this system into the cornerstone of the new nation's economy. Although not a pure free enterprise system, the United State's system of economy and government gave more freedoms and liberties than any system before. Our nation's history is full of examples of great men who used the freedom given them in the constitution to start and operate businesses and gain great wealth. Because of such examples, our land was given the nickname, "The Land of Opportunity."

As more and more people were attracted to the United States, the nation grew, both in size and population. The original thirteen colonies began to grow into a continent spanning the nation. The driving force behind the great western expansion was the opportunity and possibility of getting rich in the new lands to the west. The nation's free enterprise system survived the Gold Rush, the Civil War, and eventually the depression. When poor investments and unwise economic practices produced the great stock market crash of 1929, the Federal Government had to step in with gigantic public works projects and massive stimulations.

The economy fully recovered only after the outbreak of World War II, but the free enterprise system never again regained as large a degree of independence from governmental control as it had before the depression. Nonetheless, it has survived and proved to be a durable and practical servant for the United States throughout the years.

America's free enterprise system affects each and every one of her citizens every day of their lives. Everyone who buys food, clothing, and manufactured goods, is participating in the principles of the free enterprise system. Every worker and employer is operating under its influences. It affects our career choices, our working conditions and our costs of living. As workers, Americans use the system to get demands for better working conditions, better pay and fairer markets for their products. Organized labor, if truly reflecting the needs and the desires of the working men it represents, is a valuable tool for protecting and preserving the freedom of choice needed in the free enterprise system.

Currently, two major and historic work forces are striking for better economic treatment. This proves that the principles behind free enterprise are alive and well today. Principles, being what they may, the economy of the system isn't as healthy and vibrant right now as it could be. Inflation, though not as rampant as it once was, is still on the rise at an almost constant rate. The stock market has steadily been dropping in prices and interest rates have recently jumped. Perhaps the most alarming indicator however, is the American dollar's swift and distressing devaluation in comparison to foreign currencies. This devaluation comes at a time when the world economy can ill afford it.

Fortunately, indications are not completely bad. The economy is growing, however sluggishly, employment rates are up, unemployment down, and the first steps to bolster the sagging dollar have been taken. The new governmental budget includes plans for correcting the trade deficit which is almost directly responsible for the dollar's devaluation. New tax cuts are in the works, and stimulations for American businesses are planned.

In spite of its good aspects, this budget also takes a larger portion of each American's paychecks. This record-setting budget is also running up a record-breaking deficit. Paramount in contributing to this huge American debt are Social Security payments, unemployment benefits and aid to businesses in the form of subsidies. In the ideal capitalistic system, the average working man wouldn't be footing the bill for people on welfare, but we must achieve the delicate balance between the general welfare of all the citizens of the United States, and the free enterprise system.

Achieving this balance, and thus preserving the free enterprise system so essential to our society would be made much easier if the free enterprise system were taught in our public schools. In addition, education of the free enterprise system would accomplish many other benefits. It would increase our understanding of our country. Because of the inherent role this system played in the formation of our country and society, it is imperative to possess an understanding of it, to begin to understand our nation and its history. The formative role of the free enterprise system continues today and is evident in today's society.

Thus, an understanding of the system and its role in our lives as consumers, workers, employers, and providers is necessary to prepare today's youth for their later adult lives.

It could give students the knowledge that they will need to cope with all intricate aspects of our economic system of supply and demand and of their future roles to play in the system. Such an understanding could help young adults to make the right decisions so important to them early in life. Such choices as occupations and careers, investments and future security could be made with more confidence if students had an adequate understanding of the free enterprise system. Such a study will also help them with the all-too-vital decisions concerning governmental control over their wages and jobs, the control of overseas trade, the control of inflation, and other decisions affecting them and their nation. They must learn that, as consumers, they have a powerful voice, and they must be taught to use it constructively.

The basis for the free enterprise concept and the basis for our society is the voice of the public. When the people are given the freedom and the power to make their own decisions, as they are in America, it is foolish not to also teach them how to make these decisions wisely. They must be taught the wisdom of seeking employment and fulfillment rather than seeking welfare benefits and government handouts.

Given the wisdom of how to use and preserve the free enterprise system, the youth of today can make the world of tomorrow a brighter place. By teaching them the free enterprise system today, we can help them to find their place in that future.●

A TRIBUTE TO CENTELLA MAIESE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1978

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Winslow Township Southern New Jersey Democrat Club in honoring Centella Maiese for her dedication to her community. As wife of Winslow Township's Mayor Dominic Maiese, Centella has maintained an active profile through both the church and club, to the benefit of many others. Certainly, an outstanding woman such as this deserves recognition. As such, I would like to join her family and friends on June 30 in honoring her. May Centella continue to succeed in all her endeavors.●

THE NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY FOOD RESERVES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on International Relations completed hearings on legislation to establish an international emergency food reserve.

Among those proposals considered by the committees was legislation I have introduced, H.R. 11439, which would amend the Agricultural Trade and Development Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, by providing for a 6-million metric ton reserve stock which may be used when sufficient quantities of these commondities are not otherwise available to carry out Public Law 480 agreements.

Since it is anticipated that in the near future these committees will be recommending legislation establishing an emergency food reserve, I wish to share with my colleagues my thoughts and findings concerning the exigent need to pass legislation for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a Public Law 480 administered international emergency food reserve.

Accordingly, I request that my testimony of June 13, 1978, before the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on International Relations be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY REP. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, 26TH DISTRICT N.Y.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to appear today before the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on International Relations during these joint hearings on legislation to establish an International emergency food reserve.

During these hearings several measures have been discussed which, while differing in terms of what amounts and what types of commodities should be included in the reserve, and in what administrative framework should characterize the reserve, all seek to fulfill the increasingly apparent need to create a system of reserve stocks for responding to emergency food needs abroad.

Among these proposals is legislation I have introduced, H.R. 11439, which would amend the Agricultural Trade and Development Assistance Act of 1954 (PL–480) by providing for a six million metric ton reserve stock which may be used when sufficient quantities of these commodities are not otherwise available to carry out PL–480 agreements.

In essence, this measure plugs into PL–480, thus providing a backup within our existing food aid administrative system, for meeting current and future PL–480 commitments.

Before turning to a more detailed examination of this legislation I wish to first briefly survey those conditions giving rise to the exigent need to establish an international emergency food reserve.

In testimony before the House Committee on International Relations on February 23, 1978, Secretary Bob Bergland asserted:

A priority concern for U.S. policy the past year has been to develop a workable reserves program—one that would avoid any repetition of 1974, when a U.S. crop shortfall caught us with storage bins already depleted by the 1972 world crop failure.

Indeed, many of us have recognized that if emergency food relief efforts are to be as successful in times of widespread crop shortfalls as in times of abundant food production, a food reserve must be established with commodities available to be targeted to areas of urgent need when other sources of these commodities are exhausted.

However, before the early 1970's, discussions of food aid reserves were largely academic, given the lack of an international agreement on the subject, the market distortions of commodity prices due in part to the absence of an international agreement—and the relative availability of stocks which could be incorporated as needed into such a reserve.

The calamitous world food production shortfalls of 1973–74, however, reduced U.S. and world food stocks to minimal levels, with the estimated 75 days of world consumption carry over, sharply falling to just over 40 days by 1975. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that the grain stock carry over of 19 percent in the crop year ending in 1972, was reduced to 12 percent by the end of 1975.

Those long arguing for emergency food reserves as a hedge against the inherent vicissitudes of world crop production were bolstered in their efforts by the official recognition of a myriad of governments that if the world food assistance program was not to be found again with "bare shelves" when faced with a global food crisis, exacerbating the already grim plight of hundreds of millions of the world's hungry and malnourished, determined deliberations to establish such reserves was an urgent priority of the highest concern.

Since 1974, reserves of one form or another have been high on the agenda in a number of international fora, including the 1974 World Food Conference and subsequent meetings of its executive body the World Food Council, the Seventh Special Session of the UN General Assembly, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and the International Wheat Council.

The Seventh Special Session and the World Food Council called for an emergency grain reserve of 500,000 tons, to which 350,000 tons have been pledged, including a U.S. commitment of 125,000 tons. Presently, International Wheat Council negotiations have progressed to the stage where previously termed insurmountable problems appear closer to being resolved as negotiating efforts to establish an emergency grain reserve intensify.

Thus, while we still lack an international emergency reserve system, recent developments encourage us to anticipate that a reserve system convention might soon be concluded. And while we are still without a national emergency food reserve, recent Senate hearings, as well as these we are undertaking in the House on legislation to establish such reserves, underscores Congressional concern for creating these reserves.

As I indicated earlier, there are several measures authorizing establishment of an international food reserve. One of these

measures, H.R. 12087, introduced at Administration request by our distinguished Chairman of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Zablocki, authorizes establishment of an international emergency wheat reserve of up to six million metric tons, but which could be increased if the President deemed it necessary. A second bill, H.R. 9573, introduced by my neighbor and fellow New Yorker, Matt McHugh, would authorize a reserve of various agricultural commodities in an amount of no less than two million tons and no greater than six million tons. I am a cosponsor of Mr. McHugh's bill, and I commend both gentlemen for their deep and sincere concern for combatting hunger and malnutrition and for their diligent work on behalf of establishing a much needed emergency reserve.

In weighing the merits of both measures, however, I deemed it both appropriate and necessary to provide for consideration at these hearings of a proposal somewhat operationally different from the two bills to which I have referred.

Precisely stated, my measure would become an integral part of this nation's existing food assistance program, providing a backstop, as it were, for those various agricultural commodities currently comprising our PL 480 commitments. While I recognize the arguments in support of a reserve consisting solely of wheat because this commodity is widely traded and easy to store, I nevertheless believe that our PL 480 experiences have taught us that wheat is not universally suitable to all emergency relief operations.

I am hopeful that by plugging this reserve into the existing administrative framework of Public Law 480, the concept of an emergency food reserve can more quickly become a reality than if our task were establishing new and more complicated institutional apparatus to administer such a reserve.

My measure also anticipates the possible emergence from the current International Wheat Council talks of a wheat agreement calling for the establishment of an international wheat reserve. Contained in the legislation I am proposing, is a provision affording the United States the opportunity to initially fulfill its commitment to this international reserve following Congressional approval of the international agreement.

PL–480 is a comprehensive food assistance program which for twenty-four years has enabled this nation to assist millions of hungry and malnourished throughout the world. It has provided us a common framework enabling the Congress and the President to build a responsible food assistance program responding to the needs of new international environments by incorporating within the PL–480 framework, forward-looking proposals which will best assist us in effectively meeting the food needs of millions.

While other proposed emergency food reserve legislation envisions working in conjunction with the PL–480 program, it is my contention that any such reserve initially should be incorporated into the tested administrative framework of the PL–480 system.

If my proposal seems on the surface more modest than those measures offered by my colleagues, it is not because I do not share with them to the utmost their commitment to the concept of an emergency reserve as a vitally necessary tool to combat world hunger and malnutrition. My concern, however, turns also on the realization that such a reserve is a new undertaking for this nation and thus, our initial efforts should be as circumspect as possible so that our early endeavors will provide us a successful experience, with the wisdom of lessons learned incorporated into future reserve proposals if market conditions and an atmosphere of international cooperation promise their feasibility.

I recall here these words of the 1974 World Food Conference held in Rome which bravely declared that by 1985, "No child will go to bed hungry. . . . no human being's future and capacities will be stunted by malnutrition." Unfortunately, there are already those summarily rejecting the claim that this ambitious goal can be achieved.

I admit that there are few—if any—who would predict with any degree of certainty whether this supremely commendable goal can be achieved. I submit, however, that all responsible efforts in that direction will in any event, put us closer to realizing the ago old hope of all civilized men that the scourge of hunger and malnutrition will be eradicated.

We currently enjoy a propitious opportunity to erect our strategy for securing this noble goal. It is my hope that we can take the necessary initial steps to assure that during this period of relative abundance our food stocks will be such that unanticipated shortfalls in the future will not spell the magnitude of calamity they have in the past.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to present this statement in support of legislation I have proposed establishing an emergency international food reserve. I am hopeful that both the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on International Relations will act favorably on this legislation.●

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE URGES FREEDOM FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a resolution introduced by Senator William G. Zinkil, Sr., in the Florida State Senate, and passed by that body and the Florida House of Representatives this month.

Senate Memorial No. 738 urges Congress to use every peaceful means available to seek freedom for Jews being held against their will in the Soviet Union. I applaud this commendable action taken by the Florida Legislature on behalf of the many Soviet Jews who have endured the hardships brought by applying for emigration:

SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 738

A memorial to the Congress of the United States, urging the use of all available peaceful means to seek freedom of Jews being held against their will in the Soviet Union

Whereas, we as Americans have an interest in the human rights of all people, and

Whereas, the Soviet Union endorsed the United Nations declaration of human rights in 1966, which allowed for immigration to country of origin of any of its citizens, and

Whereas, Soviet citizens of Greek extraction were allowed to return to Greece, of Polish extraction to Poland, of Korean extraction to Korea, of Spanish extraction to Spain and many other nationalities to their homelands, and

Whereas, the U.S.S.R. was a party to the Helsinki Agreement (1975) which, among other things, allowed for the human rights of all people, and

Whereas, the Jewish people of the U.S.S.R. have not been allowed to return to their homeland, and

Whereas, the Jewish people in Florida, and the Jewish population throughout the United States, have demonstrated their good faith to the United States Constitution and have formed public opinion which has been for the well-being of our country in the eyes of the world, now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is requested to use all available peaceful means to seek the freedom of Jews being held against their will in the U.S.S.R.

Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

HOUSE SUMMARY

Requests the United States Congress to use all available peaceful means to seek the freedom of Jews being held against their will in the Soviet Union.●

GREGORY HYDROELECTRIC DAM AND RESERVOIR

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my South Dakota colleague, Representative JAMES ABDNOR, for his efforts to get an authorization for the construction of a pumped-storage hydroelectric facility along the Missouri River in Gregory County, S. Dak.

This project, if authorized, would provide for the construction of a much-needed hydroelectric dam and reservoir in Gregory County. In light of President Carter's water policy statement which urged the construction of hydroelectric facilities, I believe Congress should support projects like the Gregory County unit.

I strongly support the development of the Gregory County pumped-storage hydroelectric project, and as a measure of my support I am today introducing a measure calling for the authorization of this facility. I testified along with Congressman ABDNOR in support of this measure. I have been and will continue to contact Members in support of it. I want this body to know how strongly I support this legislation.

H.R. —

The bill follows:

A bill to authorize construction of the Gregory pumped-storage hydroelectric dam and reservoir

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) as amended, is hereby further amended to authorize the Secretary of the

Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct and to hydraulically, electrically and financially integrate with the existing Missouri River basin Federal power system for operation and marketing of power, an adjacent-type pumped-storage hydroelectric facility with an estimated total capacity of 1,180 megawatts as part of the Fort Randall Dam-Lake Francis Case project, South Dakota, with multiple-purpose use of forebay waters under conditions which the Secretary of the Army may subsequently determine, at an estimated cost of $257,900,000.●

HONORING OUR COLLEAGUE TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in a tribute to our colleague, TIMOTHY E. WIRTH of Colorado, in recognition of his service as chairman of the 94th Caucus. It gives me great pleasure to associate myself with the expression of appreciation in the statement of our former chairmen OTTINGER, HUBBARD, MINETA, AMBRO, RICHMOND, BEDELL, and PATTISON.

Their statement follows:

This week, our distinguished colleague, Timothy E. Wirth of Colorado, completes a six-month term as Chairman of the 94th Caucus. We would like to take this opportunity to express our respect and appreciation for his outstanding service to his 94th colleagues and to the House of Representatives.

Tim was an early leader among the Class of 1974. He took the initiative to organize the Democratic Members-elect during the November and December before the convening of the 94th Congress. Temporary staff and offices were arranged in Washington and channels of communication developed so that, when we arrived for the organizing sessions of the Democratic Caucus, we could immediately begin working together for the promotion of our mutual interests. It was largely as the result of these early foundation-building activities that the Class of 1974 developed its group identity and remains active in working for our common goals.

Last January, Tim was elected to serve as Chairman of the 94th Caucus. The numerous activities he has initiated and the benefits for all of us are difficult to summarize. In January, he put together an "Intersession Seminars" program—two days of sessions on legislative priorities and economic issues. Included were meetings with President Carter and Speaker O'Neill and seminars with leading economists representing various perspectives. Throughout his tenure, Tim has continued meetings with Administration officials, Congressional leaders and issue experts to expand our knowledge and working relationships and roundtable discussions to improve our effectiveness as individual Members and, collectively, as a legislative body.

As past chairmen of the 94th Caucus, we can especially appreciate Tim's efforts. A dynamic, bright and effective Congressman, Tim is a leader and a model among our Class. For years to come, we shall all benefit from his contributions to the 94th Caucus and to the House of Representatives.●

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSITION 13

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written on the ramifications of proposition 13 in California. In that the sentiments expressed by the voters of my district and the State are apparently spreading nationwide, a complete and thorough understanding of the significance of this measure seems valuable. It is becoming increasingly clear that the furor over wasteful Government spending is not a passing fad, but a definite trend in American attitudes toward an ever-enlarging Government. Thus, I am taking this opportunity to submit Mr. Kristol's article on proposition 13 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 28, 1978]

THE MEANING OF PROPOSITION 13

(By Irving Kristol)

Having just spent a couple of weeks in a California suburb, I had a ringside seat from which to observe the turmoil created by the passage of Proposition 13. It was a fascinating experience. For the first time one could witness a direct confrontation between middle-class Americans and the politicians who preside over the ever-expanding public sector. The politicians, utterly confident they had been riding the "wave of the future," lost badly and gracelessly. They still cannot understand why or how it happened.

I also find, on returning to New York, that many of our professional interpreters of the social scene don't quite understand it either. They see little more than a self-serving rebellion of the "affluent" against government spending which favors the poor and unfortunate. But that is not what Proposition 13 was about at all.

To begin with, it is ridiculous to talk as if all government services were of primary benefit to the poor. Summer schools, for instance, now closed in California, may be useful to some poor kids, but they are no less useful to children of the middle class, and they are beyond all doubt profitable to middle-class teachers. There are precious few social programs that do not massively benefit middle-class professionals of all kinds—which is hardly surprising, since it is these professionals who devised those programs in the first place.

WHO IS 'POOR'?

Moreover, there are far fewer truly poor people in this country than the conventional statistics suggest. The greatest distortion results from neglecting the factor of age. A couple of married graduate students who are "making do" on an income, say, of $4,000 a year may frequently be broke, but they are in no sense "poor"—nor do they so regard themselves. Poverty in a society such as ours is not merely a function of money income. Prospects are at least equally important.

And so are what might be called "retrospects." An elderly couple on Social Security is not necessarily poor. They may have modest savings which they can draw on to supplement Social Security. They may own a house, mortgage-free, on which they can borrow. Or, and above all, they may have children who contribute to their support. This last is a possibility that liberals regard as distasteful, since they see it as a private usurpation of a public responsibility. But not all children or parents are of this opinion.

Similarly, a household with an income of $30,000–$40,000 a year, as a result of husband and wife both working, is not necessarily "affluent." There are taxes to be paid, mortgage payments to make, two cars to support, and perhaps a child (or two or three) who is going (or will soon go) to college. Such a household has to struggle to make ends meet. That is not what "affluence" is supposed to mean.

Having said that, one must quickly add that there are indisputably people in this country who can fairly be called "rich" or "poor." But their combined electoral significance is negligible. The overwhelming majority of Americans are—actually, prospectively or retrospectively—middle class. And the reason Proposition 13 was passed so enthusiastically, in a state with a liberal governor and legislature, is because the politicians, bemused by fantasies of "small is beautiful" or "fair shares for the underprivileged," forgot that home ownership is a central passion of this middle class.

Most Californians (like most Americans) own their own homes or aspire to do so as soon as possible. But inflation, combined with a series of "no-growth" measures by the state and various localities, have sent real estate values soaring. The ironic, indeed absurd result was that Californians found themselves so house-rich that they could no longer afford to live in their own homes!

It worked this way. A house purchased for $45,000 10 years ago might today, as a result of inflation, have a marketable value of $125,000. Real estate taxes, based on current valuation (as they should be), will have increased from $1,000 annually to $3,000. But the after-tax income of the homeowner has surely not trebled—the progressive income tax, Federal and State, plus increased Social Security taxes, see to that. So what is the homeowner to do?

From a purely "economic" point of view, the rational thing for him to do is to sell his house, realize his capital gain, and live elsewhere more cheaply. But where is elsewhere? It is not in California, where he can no more afford to buy (or rent) than he could support his original residence. He can, it is true, migrate along with his money to South Dakota, where real estate values are much lower. But for some reason or other Californians seem strongly disinclined to move to South Dakota. They prefer something like Proposition 13.

In a sense, then, Proposition 13 was a vote against inflation—and especially the unholy alliance of inflation, deficit spending and increased taxation. A cynic would note that, had specific cuts in government spending been defined, that majority could easily have fallen apart. But the voters knew that well enough—which is why they left it to the politicians to make the hard and controversial decisions. Isn't that what politicans are for?

What is really astonishing is that California's state government did not see this tax rebellion coming or do something to forestall it. It was sitting on a $5 billion surplus, after all, so it was in a comfortable position to cut the income tax, or the sales tax, or the property tax, or some combination of all three. It had plenty of time to contemplate a more "finely-tuned" tax cut than Proposition 13. But there was little talk of tax cuts—only of new ways of "distributing" the surplus to this group or that program. If there was going to be any tax cut at all, it was evident that only a "meat ax" could do the job.

Once passage of Proposition 13 became a possibility, politicians reacted with a fury matched by their own demagogy. Dismissal notices were sent to all teachers, contingent on the outcome of the referendum. Libraries and hospitals put up closing notices, with the same contingency clause. Rarely has there been such a disgusting episode in American state politics—one in which politicians, fighting for control over their constituents' money, lied and threatened and lobbied without scruple. It was a new kind of class war—the people as citizens versus the politicians and their clients in the public sector. And the people won.

Now that Proposition 13 is law and the politicians are having to live with it, it is becoming clear that the effects will not be nearly as painful as had been predicted. The welfare population will be but minimally affected, suffering only the loss of a cost-of-living increase to welfare rates that are the nation's highest. The major groups that will be adversely affected are the public employes, whose unions had been granted high wages and exceedingly generous pension agreements. (Half of Los Angeles real estate taxes go to pay for such pensions.) There is no way in which the politicians could be persuaded to stand up to those unions without something like Proposition 13 to provide the necessary backbone. There will be some turmoil, even a few strikes—but if the money simply isn't there, the politicians cannot spend it.

CHANGING THE CLIMATE OF OPINION

In the end, there is the most important possible effect of all: a change in the climate of opinion affecting the issue of economic growth. One has to put the matter in so qualified a way because an awful lot of important people in California who don't like the idea of economic growth believe that Californians would all be happier if only existing "affluence" were more equally shared. As a consequence, there will certainly be efforts to raise taxes on business, to "compensate" local governments for lost revenues. San Francisco has already moved in this direction—which will hasten the decline that city is already experiencing, and be a further stimulus to now-booming Reno, not far across the state border.

The enemies of growth—in high office and out—are still well entrenched in California. They will work very hard to nullify the intent of Proposition 13, since they see larger political and ideological implications in it, with further efforts to restrict the size of the public sector along with further efforts to encourage private savings and investment. I think they are right about this, if about nothing else. That is indeed what Proposition 13 was ultimately about: economic growth in a free society vs. the allocation of income and wealth by government in a stagnant economy.●

A MAJORITY IN HOUSE SUPPORTS HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 963

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report that House Joint Resolution 963 has received the required number of cosponsors in order to be considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. As of this moment, House Joint Resolution 963, which would designate July 18, 1979, as "National POW–MIA Recognition Day," has received 228 cosponsors. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those of my fellow Members who agreed to join with me in this resolution. I believe that a "National POW–MIA Recognition Day" is important because it will honor those American veterans of all wars who made special sacrifices on behalf of their country, sacrifices which, in this time of peace, are perhaps not appreciated to the extent they should. A "National POW–MIA Recognition Day," as a one-time observance, would rekindle the memory of these sacrifices and symbolize America's continuing indebtedness to her POW's and MIA's.

I welcome any of my fellow Members who would like to cosponsor this resolution to do so. House Joint Resolution 963 will be introduced once more shortly after the recess and any Member interested in cosponsoring should notify me or Norm Shapiro of my staff at x52301. ●

THE AGRICULTURAL FOREIGN INVESTMENT DISLOSURE ACT

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, my good friend from California, Mr. KREBS, and Mr. GRASSLEY, of Iowa, ranking minority members of the Subcommittee on Family Farms and Rural Development, which I am privileged to chair, in cosponsoring the Agriculture Foreign Investment Disclosure Act. This legislation deals with a critical issue, the ownership of American farmland, a subject of long-standing concern to the subcommittee.

Thomas Jefferson once cautioned our new Republic that, "the small landowners—are the most precious part of the State." In truth, the American family farm system has been the backbone of American society. It has been both a social and economic system where the vast natural resources of our Nation were equitably distributed to the maximum possible number of our citizens. Small towns and rural America thrived and were well served by this institution.

It is my personal opinion, however, and perhaps the opinion of a growing number of others as well, that we have virtually ignored the plight of the small family farmer in the last few decades. By failing to support his economic position in the marketplace, we have forced his costs beyond his earnings and driven him from the land.

For the farmers who remain, the only way to reduce relative costs per acre and remain solvent is to buy more land. The advent of large-scale capital intensive technology and generous tax incentives have heightened the competitive advantages of the larger farming enterprises and have accelerated this trend. Without continuing to expand in size, the large farm of yesterday is the small farm of today and is soon overtaken by rising per acre production costs.

This increased competition for land has propelled the market price for land by 300 percent in the last 5 years. Assuming no major reforms in our Nation's basic price-support system, we can expect the continued low market, cost-price squeeze to force farmers to expand and keep land competition and farmland prices very high for years to come. Farmland, as a scarce raw material, has therefore, become a very good investment at this time.

American corporations, wealthy nonfarm professionals, and other outside investors have recently entered the farm real estate market at an ever-growing rate. It is estimated that nearly 12 percent of all current farm sales nationally go to nonfarm investors.

In the last few months, we have seen the advent of a new class of nonfarm investor, the nonresident alien. Foreign investment, principally from Western European nations, has by varying estimates accounted for 20 to 50 percent of land sales in certain parts of this country.

The concern that has arisen throughout the rural sector to this development has brought national attention. Recent hearings on this issue by the subcommittee I chair was widely covered in the national news media and especially in the agriculture press. The lack of substantial and reliable statistics on the extent and source of foreign investment clearly emerged from those hearings as the single most critical impediment to a reasoned and rational government response. The Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act will address this issue in a manner I believe is thorough, efficient, and timely.

In the final analysis, no one knows what the impact of rising foreign investment will be on the American family farm. Prime Minnesota-Iowa farmland now sells for less than half of the price of similar land in Western Europe, and therefore as an international commodity is underpriced and most likely to rise dramatically. American investors may also recognize this trend and are likely to sizably increase their investment activity in years to come.

Without a similar increase in farm prices and farmer income, very few farmers will find they are able to acquire additional farmland, and still fewer new farmers will be able to get started in agriculture. Consolidation of farmland holdings and an emerging new class of tenant farmers may forever change the face of agriculture and the viability of the family farm.

In the process, small rural communities will suffer greatly. It has been shown that as farmland investment increases in a local community, a greater portion of the wealth from the land is passed on to absentee landowners and bypasses the local community economy. With fewer farm families, less wealth per family, fewer nonfarm employment opportunities and less local capital for investment, the future of many small towns will be in great jeopardy.

The Congress needs to take a very, very close look at the impact of these emerging trends in farmland ownership. Foreign investment is a critical feature of this trend, and the need for accurate and timely data is unquestioned. I urge my colleagues to support and urge early adoption of the Agriculture Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978.

Thank you.●

CHANGES NEEDED

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, it was my privilege to join several of my colleagues from the Select Committee on Aging in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

We urged an expansion of home health care as a means of cutting medicare costs and preserving the independence and dignity of elderly Americans.

My statement before the committee follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ABDNOR

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee today.

Last Friday's Washington Post carried this headline: "Shortage of Space in Nursing Homes Plagues Elderly."

The article pointed out the plight of elderly citizens in the District of Columbia who are occupying hospital beds unnecessarily because they cannot be accommodated in nursing homes. Statistics were cited comparing the costs of such hospital care, with the cost of care in local nursing homes. It is foolish to believe the situation in Washington is an isolated instance.

Mr. Chairman, a similar article might be written concerning the number of elderly now residing in nursing homes who might otherwise still be living in their own homes if only some of our Medicare-Medicaid regulations were revised and if appropriate health services were available.

We are all familiar with the Report of the Comptroller General stating: "Until older people become greatly or extremely impaired, the cost for home services, including the large portion provided by families and friends, is less than the cost of putting these people in institutions."

The cost of home care versus nursing home care cannot be measured in terms of dollars alone. There are few in nursing homes today who would not prefer, by far, to be in their own homes if they had a little help.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse the resolution of the Select Committee on Aging reiterating its support for expansion of home health benefits as an alternative for institutionalization and calling on this Committee to consider legislation addressing these goals.

Such legislation could help assure those elderly truly needing nursing home care a bed in the home rather than in the hospital. Such legislation also could forestall—perhaps indefinitely—the need for institutional care for many, who today have little choice but to seek nursing home care in their later years.

Mr. Chairman, we have here a rare opportunity to be both compassionate and economical.●

KEEP TITLE I SCHOOL AID FOR THE NEEDY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a lead editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe this week. This thoughtful editorial opposes the anticipated effort to undermine the $400 million concentration program endorsed by the House Education and Labor Committee, to aid school districts with a heavy concentration of poor children. The proposed amendment would shift funds from the poorest urban and rural areas to districts with little or no poverty. As the editorial dramatizes, such an amendment has great political appeal, but it would constitute bad national policy. Educational problems are most acute in districts with heavy concentrations of poor children, and those districts are the least able to provide extra services from a tax base, which is meager and which is overburdened by other services. In my own district, Chelsea has one of the highest tax rates in the State—three times the statewide average—and its poor children represent an astounding 42 percent of its total student population.

The committee's proposal would effectively target funds to such needy impoverished districts. Chelsea, for example, could draw upon a $3 million allocation from the county. By contrast, the amended formula would slash the funds available to that county almost in half.

If the Congress is serious about eliminating illiteracy, youth crime, and structural unemployment, it would follow the wise advice of the Globe editorial and should rebuff any attempt to amend the concentration program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA):

SCHOOL AID OR POLITICAL AID

While the general unemployment rate has gradually but steadily dropped over the last year and a half, the persistence of pockets of extremely high joblessness—particularly among inner-city youths—remains one of the nation's most troubling social problems. In the short run, it can be attacked by sharply focused public-job programs and hiring incentives for private industry. Over the long haul, however, the remedy lies in part in upgrading the educational programs offered to the children of poor families concentrated in the nation's cities. As the skills required for even entry-level jobs rise, the need to impart basic skills increases concurrently.

It is therefore essential that the House defeat a move that has substantial momentum behind it to dilute a proposal by President Carter to target an extra $400 million of federal aid to school districts with a high concentration or a high number of poor children.

As the proposal was approved by the House Education and Labor Committee, the money would go to school systems in which either 20 percent of the students or 5000 students are from poverty-level families. However, Rep. John Ashbrook, the arch-conservative from Ohio, has promised to lead a fight on the House floor early next month to send that money to any school district in which at least 2 percent of the students are from poor families. The measure has considerable political appeal because virtually every school district in every congressional district would qualify. Six Massachusetts congressional districts that would get no money under the Carter plan would receive aid under the Ashbrook formulation. Urban districts would, by contrast, lose. Boston's share of the $400 million would drop from $3 million to $1.9 million.

Certainly much of the current taxpayer frustration is due to the failure of government programs to consistently produce the desired results. That is in part because programs have either been ill-conceived or oversold; but in part it is because the original objectives have been undercut by political considerations.

The House vote on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this summer will be a measure of whether Congress now wishes to address the long-range problems of the urban poor or only the immediate politics of re-election.●

SLEEP, SOLDIER BOY

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, in May I had the honor of speaking at the Memorial Day services at the Johnson County Memorial Gardens. Liberty, I said, is not something that can be taken for granted. Many brave men and women died to preserve our freedom. Without their valiant efforts and those of the POW's and MIA's, the United States might not be at peace today.

I paid tribute to these courageous individuals and their families on Memorial Day, and I would like to do so again now. "Sleep, Soldier Boy," a song sung by Ms. Peggy Whipple at the Memorial Day services, illustrates the great sacrifices made by these individuals and their families. Her touching rendition of this VFW Memorial Song was a strong reminder of the cost of liberty. I would like to share the words written by Dorothy Alexander with my colleagues. "Sleep, Soldier Boy" is dedicated to those who served on land or sea:

SLEEP, SOLDIER BOY

The battle's o'er and peace is all around you,
Sleep soldier boy sleep on the cannon's roar,
Can never more disturb you,
Sleep soldier boy sleep on
Your journey is ended your work here is done
Sleep soldier boy and rest,
Your flag you defended, the vict'ry you won
Sleep on among the blest.
The sun's gone down and darkness has enclosed you,
Sleep soldier boy sleep on
A mother's arms, are waiting to enfold you
Sleep soldier boy sleep on,
The time is not long when the bugle will sound forth must 'ring you back again,
You'll wake with the dawning, and answer to roll call,
Sleep soldier boy till then.

TAPS

Sleep in peace soldier boy till the bugle calls you with the dawn,
Sleep and rest, God is nigh, soldier boy.●

COST CONTAINMENT IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, as you know the Congress is very concerned with the problem of how to control the rapidly rising rate of hospital costs. Various proposals have been suggested focusing on heavy regulation. On the other hand, a number of efforts are being made in the private sector to reduce hospital costs through such alternatives as shared group services and cooperation between institutions.

One of the endeavors in this area that I am familiar with is the effort of the Joint Purchasing Corp., an affiliate of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropy, which is located in New York City. The assistant director of the Joint Purchasing Corp., Barry Novick, has prepared a policy statement concerning shared group services that I would like to share with my colleagues at this time. The statement follows:

POLICY STATEMENT

Cost containment in the health care industry has become a necessity. Shared group services are a major catalyst to effectuating economies in health care.

Health Care Institutions, as we know them today, cannot sustain themselves in a vacuum and must take the necessary voluntary steps to insure they will remain independent. The American Hospital Association's cost containment efforts have, at best, been mild stimuli. Individual institutions still tend to operate in this area with little concern for the ultimate consequences of more stringent regulations that could possibly have deleterious long term effects on the quality of health care to the patient.

Institutions must continue to help with regionalization efforts and direct their energies to services that are presently available.

Third party payers have already indicated that cost associated with shared group services are reimbursable, and that these costs are negligible compared to the potential total dollars that can be saved, not so much on an individual basis, but on the basis of the industry as a whole. Regionalization, as a concept, has traditionally been mandated through legislation, and although it has been demonstrated to be effective, the result has largely been due to the voluntary efforts rather than the legislative approach.

The estimated inflation rate of the health care industry is more than twice that of the United States. True commitment to shared services demonstrates the concern of the voluntary health care system and that affirmative action rather than passive resistance is what is needed to protect the integrity of the health care industry. Large and small institutions must work together to help each other maximize their effectiveness and efficiency.

Group purchasing is one area of shared services that meets this requirement. There is a not-for-profit group purchasing program in effect in the New York metropolitan area that is already servicing most of the voluntary health care institutions on the same geographic basis as the New York City Health Systems Agency.

While it has not been an easy undertaking, this group has learned through many years of experience that good cooperative purchasing takes more than a few Directors of Purchasing getting together on a somewhat regular basis. Group purchasing entails constant evaluation of programs, a continuous flow of data to the various committees involved in advising the group, as well as a forum where the group can meet to exchange ideas and information.

The Joint Purchasing Corp. was organized over 50 years ago under the auspices of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. It was intended as another benefit to the community through economical purchasing of services and commodities for the member agencies. Four years ago they opened their doors to all voluntary institutions at the request of The Greater New York Hospital Association. Joint Purchasing Corp. has successfully initiated joint contracts that have effectuated large economies to hospitals and simultaneously serves as a conduit for information and a "think tank" for new ideas and programs.

Occasionally, highly qualified purchasing professionals, in an expression of independence and competence, need to prove their ability to "beat" the group contract on specific items. Rather than joining forces with the other institutions and lending their expertise to the group, they felt that by reinventing the wheel, they would bring themselves the recognition they felt they deserved, but in doing so detracted from the group's total impact for future programs. Good planning dictates that the system is more important than an individual, and that each individual must lend his talents and resources to the group to effectuate economies and maintain consistency. What is called for is not increased expenditures or competition between individuals and groups, but cooperation and commitment to the group purchasing concept.

Commitment to agreements, rather than using them for individual leverage, is a necessity. That is what shared group services exemplifies.

Individuals and institutions who adopt a *laissez faire* attitude toward shared services, and specifically toward group purchasing, escalate inflationary tendencies not only to the health care industry, but to the economy as a whole. Thus, a snow-balling effect is created and the cost to the consumer/patient reflects this trend.●

H.R. 1609, THE COAL PIPELINE ACT OF 1978

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 28, 1978, the Rules Committee granted a rule to H.R. 1609, the Coal Pipeline Act of 1978. This bill had been jointly referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works and Transportation Committee, both of which reported the bill favorably earlier this year. The rule granted makes in order a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1978, page 19434, which I will offer, and which will be read as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

This substitute is a consensus bill agreed on between myself, as chairman of the Interior Committee, and Representative JOHNSON of California, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Joining with me in offering this substitute are Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. LUJAN.

I urge my colleagues to study this issue carefully in the next 2 weeks, and I encourage their support of a bill to make available an alternative, supplemental technology for the transport of coal. H.R. 1609 would allow those carriers of coal by pipeline certified by the Secretary of the Interior to be in the national interest to exercise the power of eminent domain. H.R. 1609 is important to the energy and transportation needs of this country, as I think my colleagues will agree.●

THE BIA AND THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. MICHAEL T. BLOUIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. BLOUIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to cosponsor with my colleague from Texas, the Honorable JACK BROOKS, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, legislation calling for the creation of a separate Department of Education.

I believe in a Department of Education and have been a proponent of its creation for some time. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing my colleagues today, is not to state the various reasons why such a Department is needed—and there are many—but rather, to call to the attention of the Members, a concern, an observation, if you will—on one of the components which will make up the new Department, that being, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs educational programs.

My comments are meant to bring to the attention of both the Members of the House and Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, the fact that the question of whether the Bureau of Indian Affairs education functions should be included in the proposed Department of Education should be fully evaluated and any transfer should be handled with extreme caution.

At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a precipitate transfer and I make that statement with the confidence of knowing that I have a working knowledge of the Bureau of Indian Affairs educational functions. I say this because I do not think all of the ramifications of such a transfer have been considered, and because I feel that unless time and care are taken in this matter, great and irrevocable harm may be done.

My knowledge of Indian education is based upon the work I have done over

the last 16 months as chairman of the Advisory Study Group on Indian Education, a task force created by the Committee on Education and Labor, to conduct research into, and propose needed legislation for, the field of Indian education. Over the last 16 months, we have visited over 104 public, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and tribally controlled schools serving Indian students in all parts of the country, including Alaska.

I could go on at great length over the legislative work of the Advisory Study Group, but let me just say that we have done much to provide a meaningful structure for the Bureau of Indian Affairs educational component, as currently there is no question that the present BIA educational program is in need of overhaul. My major concern and that which must be emphasized as the bottom line—the real question to be raised in any discussion over the creation of a Department of Education—is that the political relationship which now exists between the Federal Government and the governments of federally recognized Indian tribes must be maintained. The trust relationship which now exists within the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Affairs—which is very much understood by that Department, and which is perceived by Indian tribes of this country to reside in that Department—must, and I wish to emphasize this point, must be recognized by the Department of Education. And in addition, that contracting authority as granted in Public Law 93-638—the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act—must be transferred intact to the new Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, at this point in time I seriously question the wisdom of the transfer of the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Affairs education programs to the new Department. My reasons for concern are based on the above and on the perception of these points by the administration, Office of Management and Budget, and others supporting the inclusion of the BIA education programs into the new Department of Education.

Underlying all my concerns is the fact that I want to improve the education of Indian children as I do all of our Nation's population. I do feel a Department of Education will improve the quality of education for the Nation as a whole. I also believe that the legislation embodied in H.R. 15, the reauthorization bill for elementary and secondary education, in particular title XI of that legislation, will improve the education of Indian children. What is contained in title XI is certainly not incompatible with a new Department of Education. My only concern, and I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for being repetitive, is that what is incompatible is the fact that, at the present, I seriously question whether those who would administer and develop the structure of the new Department of Education fully comprehend the tribal perception of their relationship with the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Affairs. Until the tribes of this Nation feel that the trust relationship is reflected in the Department of Education structure and goals, I will continue to question the transfer and oppose any precipitate action.●

JACKSON CITIZEN-PATRIOT COMMENTS ON SOLZHENITSYN

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, when we think of the great national newspapers we think of such big city publications as the New York Times and the Washington Post. In most cases, we can count on "prestige" publications such as these to provide the most well-informed and well-written commentary on the events of the day, whether we agree with them or not.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have a surprise for you. In my opinion, the most perceptive commentary on Mr. Solzhenitsyn's Harvard speech was written, not by any of these eminent organs, but by the Jackson Citizen-Patriot, a small but, as you will see, highly capable publication based in my Sixth District of Michigan.

I suggest the Citizen-Patriot has hit the nail on the head, and done it in an eminently literate manner. Mr. Solzhenitsyn is one of the world's greatest authorities on the defects of Soviet Government and society. But he appears to be one of the world's least knowledgeable people on any question involving the operation of a free society.

He wishes not only to transform the Soviet Union from one form of dictatorship into another form of dictatorship, but also to transform the United States into this second type of dictatorship which appears to be one in which autocratic rulers justify their acts by divine right: more or less what we were revolted by and revolted against in 1776.

While Sozhenitsyn's security precautions may be neurotic and bizarre, I do not fault him for keeping to himself. I understand he is writing 7 or 8 hours a day, working on his account of the Russian Revolution. This is his finest work, it has earned him his place in history. If he wants to closet himself away, ignoring the swirl of free life around him, so be it.

But the very fact that his eyes have seen little beyond his typewriter keys and some television commercials disqualifies him as a commentator on American life and American Government. This is particularly true since he has never participated in a free society and approaches the question with zero background.

Perhaps at some point he will feel the need to take a sabbatical from his writing. If he should then learn our language, dismiss his retinue, mix with his Vermont neighbors, and travel around the United States for a few years relating to Americans on a one-to-one basis, I for one would be very interested in his observations. Perhaps he could become a second de Tocqueville. But at present, it is impossible to see why anyone should take seriously his observations on matters about which he knows nothing.

I insert in the RECORD, the editorial titled "Advice Lacks Understanding," from the Jackson Citizen-Patriot of June 13, 1978.

The editorial follows:

ADVICE LACKS UNDERSTANDING

When Soviet author Alexander Solzhenitsyn wrote the "The Gulag Archipelago," the denunciation of the Russian political prison system, he did so with first-hand knowledge.

The book won him the 1970 Nobel Prize for literature, the enmity of the Soviet bosses and a one-way trip out of Russia

When the same Alexander Solzhenitsyn spoke to the Harvard graduating class last week, he lacked the expertise on which he based his denunciation of the United States system.

After leaving Russia, Solzhenitsyn lived in near-seclusion in Switzerland. Since coming to this country, he has spent most of his time in self-imposed isolation behind high fences on a Vermont estate.

His words at Harvard clearly indicate he cannot relate to a free society.

The West, he said, over-emphasizes individual rights. "The defense of those rights," he said, "has reached such extremes as to make society as a whole defenseless against certain individuals (terrorists)."

Western politicians are cowardly, said the Nobel winner. "A decline in courage may be the most striking feature which an outside observer notices in the West these days," he said.

The most striking feature of Solzhenitsyn's criticism sems to be a lack of knowledge of the subject.

He has peered through fences that protect him and had bodyguards at his side when he ventures out, so his major contact with life in these United States is the television of which he thinks so little, and a selection of books, magazines and newspapers.

There's nothing inherently wrong with newspapers, magazines, books or TV. However, they are only reflections of life. They contain no blood of their own, no brain cells, no original emotions.

It takes more than a view of life through a fence or hedge-row to understand it. It also takes more than association with a small group of friends who can pass security and language barriers.

The approach Solzhenitsyn takes is not unlike the group of blind men who examined an elephant for the first time. Each touched a different portion and decided the whole animal was just like that part.

Liberty, freedom of all kinds, is foreign to Solzhenitsyn. He obviously is having a difficult time grasping the ramifications.

If he's read the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the latter with its unparalleled Bill of Rights, he obviously cannot translate those words into a life-style because he remains conditioned to the totalitarian methods.

That is not an unusual state of mind for new arrivals to these shores. Things which we take for granted (and shouldn't) are almost beyond the ability of many newcomers to grasp.

After all, we've had the Bill of Rights since 1791 and as late as last week, the U.S. Supreme Court was telling us what a portion of it means.

What Solzhenitsyn overlooked in telling us we paid too much attention to individual rights is that they are the building blocks upon which our whole form of government is constructed.

His remarks made flamboyant reading, but little else.●

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION ENDORSES KEMP-ROTH TAX RATE REDUCTION ACT IN MAJOR PRESS CONFERENCE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues, today's endorsement of the Kemp-Roth Tax Rate Reduction Act by the National Taxpayers Union. That endorsement constitutes a welcomed advance in the most important grassroots movement in America today—the movement to lower the people's tax rates and help restore incentive to the economy for working, saving, and investing Americans.

The National Taxpayers Union is the Nation's largest taxpayer organization and certainly one of the most active, visible, and effective in Washington and the State capitals around the country. The organizational support their endorsement brings to the campaign to enact Kemp-Roth this year adds greatly to that likelihood, for the NTU is represented in every State and every congressional district through its 65,000 members.

This is the people's cause. People should not be working for government. We must make government work for the people.

What we are seeing today is a chain reaction of the American people's rejection of ever-increasing, inflation-stimulated tax increases at the Federal, State and local levels. It is also a reflection of their impatience with congressional and White House procrastinations on enactment of meaningful tax rate reductions.

As we made clear at the press conference this afternoon with Charles S. Crawford, the NTU's director, the endorsement by this nonpartisan, nonprofit group is another illustration that this movement for permanent tax rate reductions is neither a Republican nor a Democrat issue, nor is it a liberal or conservative issue. I fully share the sentiments of Senator SAM NUNN of Georgia, who recently said the Federal Government must not only put the brakes on the growth of Federal taxes but must also reverse them.

The Tax Rate Reduction Act now has 176 cosponsors in Congress—151 in the House and 25 in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, although I recently announced the incorporation of a national, nonprofit, section 501(c)(4) structured organization, called the Coalition for Economic Growth, I see no reason why the NTU, the coalition, and many other organizations cannot work in tandem to achieve the mutually shared objective here. We must all work together if we are to persuade the country's opinion leaders of the necessity of reducing Federal income tax rates to help restore real growth and jobs to the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are interested in which Members are for lower tax rates and which are for higher, we plan to give them more opportunity to see who is on the side of the people.●

REFLECTIONS ON U.N. DISARMAMENT SESSION

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the Special United Nations Session on Disarmament, the first one in 46 years, concludes. During the past month 16 heads of state and Prime Ministers and 22 Foreign Ministers participated. Regrettably, the President made the decision, apparently at the last minute, not to address the session. There is general agreement that as a result, the spirit in which discussion occurred was thwarted.

Another unfortunate result of the rather passive and nonconstructive position of the United States was that the media, following the example of the administration, also avoided dealing with the issues that the Disarmament Conference raised. One bit of news coverage during the period that the Conference met illustrates the rather incredible inattention of the media to what surely has to be an overriding concern of us all. When the first gambling casino on the east coast opened in Atlantic City, the story became front page news. Yet the far greater gambling story—the gamble over life and death that is involved in the more than $400 billion arms race this year—hardly received attention at all.

The story of the arms race and the urgent need to reverse it before it is too late ought to have received front page attention. Why? Because it, indeed, represents the biggest gamble that humankind is involved in. The gamble involves the following and much more:

The 50,000 strategic and tactical nuclear weapons that we and the Russians possess, a number that has more than doubled in the past 8 years.

The 7 nations that already possess a nuclear capability and the 20 or so that will in the new decade.

The 18 tons of plutonium that already exist as the by-product of nuclear processes and the estimated 450 tons that will exist by 1990 which we know of no way to dispose of.

The 36 million men under arms worldwide, and the additional 21 million in reserves.

The $70 billion that Third World countries now spend on armaments, which is a 700-percent increase in 20 years.

The current world expenditure of $400 billion on weaponry, a figure that has doubled in the last 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, we all really need to be brought to our senses about the urgency of putting a stop to the arms race. It is for this reason that, as the U.N. Disarmament Session draws to a close, many of us are saddened that another extraordinary opportunity was missed to confront this issue honestly and constructively.

On June 13 Adm. Gene R. La Rocque, retired rear admiral of the U.S. Navy, addressed the U.N. Disarmanent Assembly. Admiral La Rocque was an assistant director of strategic planning in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations and a member of the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In his years of service, which included the command of nuclear ships, he became a specialist in nuclear strategy. Currently, director of the Center for Defense Information, his remarks to the disarmament session deserve close reading, and I commend them to my colleagues.

The address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY REAR ADM. GENE R. LA ROCQUE

It is an honor to address this unprecedented gathering of the world community on the most urgent issue of our time: survival. The United Nations' Special Session on Disarmament is taken seriously by all who are aware of the menacing turn the arms race is taking. I congratulate those nations and individuals who persevered in bringing this session about.

Nuclear war is an unrelenting and growing threat to hundreds of millions of people. World War III with nuclear weapons *can* happen and almost certainly *will* happen unless all governments confront this most uncomfortable reality.

I am a citizen of the United States and a career military officer. I served in the Navy of my country for thirty-one years. I have fought in combat and held command posts at sea and on land and participated in strategic and nuclear planning. I have experienced at first hand the impact nuclear weapons have had on military affairs.

Since retiring from active duty, I have been the director of a non-governmental research organization, the Center for Defense Information. We are a source of independent, objective analysis of military developments. Our Center is particularly active in providing factual information about the nuclear arms race and the consequences of nuclear war.

The traditional role of the military in all countries, in case of war, is to win. The military profession, to be blunt, has always sought superiority. Military men tend to be uncomfortable with notions of military balance or equilibrium. We military men constantly seek to strengthen the defense of our countries and maintain our advantages. I believe the military in all countries share this impulse. We are not diplomats; we are soldiers, sailors and airmen. We feel reassured by big military establishments, we believe the security of our people is enhanced by spending for additional war-fighting and war-winning capabilities.

There may be places in the world where warfare can occur on a limited scale without threatening wider destruction. But those areas are few and shrinking. My experience in the United States military has convinced me that nuclear weapons have changed the traditional rules of warfare. To use an American phrase, "it's a whole new ball game."

I am, of course, speaking primarily of the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective military alliances. Despite the constant friction and conflicts of interest that have occurred over many decades, there has never been a war between our two countries. But today as irrational as it may seem, Soviet and American leaders are planning and arming for nuclear war.

A recent top level U.S. government study concluded that, at a minimum, 140 million people in the U.S., and 113 million people in the U.S.S.R. would be killed in a major nuclear war. Almost three-quarters of their economies would be destroyed. In such a conflict, the analysis concluded, "neither side could conceivably be described as a winner."

Nor would those in the rest of the world

be safe. Radiation would poison vast stretches of the planet not directly involved in the war. And the threat of ozone damage and ecological disruption leaves us no assurance that the earth would remain habitable for life as we know it.

Despite this, the United States and the Soviet Union continue to approach the accumulation of military power in the nuclear age very much as they have in the past. Both countries constantly seek to improve their nuclear and conventional forces.

Many of us are shocked and sobered by the mad nuclear scramble of the superpowers. It seems so obvious that they have diminished their own security in the nuclear competition. We all know that a balance of terror provides a precarious peace.

The Soviet Union and the United States are, in part, victims of modern military technology. Advances in weaponry, particularly better delivery systems, have dramatically compressed time and space. Thus, military leaders believe they must maintain large forces on a close-to-war status. In a nuclear war, each nation could destroy the other in 30 minutes. Nuclear missiles launched from submarines could land within 15 minutes. There is no defense, regardless of who strikes first.

The prospect of immediate mass destruction seems to compel high states of military readiness; this situation inspires mutual suspicion and rhetorical harshness.

The continuation of the nuclear arms race is also made possible by widespread apathy about the danger of nuclear war. Many people believe nuclear weapons will never be used. But as someone who has been directly involved in U.S. nuclear planning, I can tell you my country has plans and forces for actually fighting nuclear war. Our military field manuals detail the use of nuclear weapons. Our troops, airmen, and navy men train and practice for nuclear war. Nuclear war is an integral part of American military planning and the U.S. is prepared to use nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. I believe the Soviet Union is as nuclear-oriented in its military preparations as the United States. The military in both countries see nuclear weapons as a central instrument of military power. They are prepared to use them right now in many contingencies.

As a citizen of the United States, I do not hesitate to point out that my country has generally taken the lead in the nuclear arms race. The United States is a rich country with vast technological resources. We have been, on the average, five years ahead of the Soviet Union in introducing new nuclear weapons. We were the first to develop the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, the intercontinental bomber, effective intercontinental ballistic missiles, modern nuclear-powered strategic submarines, and multiple-warheads (MIRVs) for missiles. The United States continues to maintain, as President Carter recently asserted, a significant edge over the Soviet Union in the effectiveness of our strategic weapons as measured by such factors as missile accuracy and numbers of nuclear weapons.

In recent years, the United States has not been sitting on its hands in the nuclear competition. The U.S. has added more nuclear weapons to its arsenal than the Soviet Union, going from 4,000 strategic nuclear weapons in 1970 to 9,000 in 1978. During this same period, the Soviet Union increased from 1,800 to 4,500 strategic nuclear weapons. The U.S. has maintained a two-to-one edge in deliverable nuclear weapons throughout the period 1970 to 1978.

This discrepancy in numbers, however, makes no difference as each country can obliterate the entire urban and industrial complex of the other regardless of who strikes first. The United States has 35 strategic nuclear weapons for every Soviet city over 100,000. The Soviet Union has 28 strategic weapons for every U.S. city over 100,000.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown asserted in his annual report on the fiscal 1979 military budget that U.S. nuclear war plans include "destruction of a minimum of 200 major Soviet cities." [1]

The greater danger is that both countries are moving toward a first strike. Improvements in the accuracy of missiles, particularly land-based missiles, stimulate fears about the adequacy of existing nuclear forces in the Soviet Union and the United States.

If everyone, including military officials, were more conscious of the tremendous destructive potential of nuclear weapons we might stop worrying about questions of "advantage" in the nuclear arms race. For example, two U.S. Poseidon submarines which carry 320 nuclear weapons can destroy all the 200 major Soviet cities with the destructive potential of 1,000 Hiroshima size weapons.

Today the U.S., with 41 strategic submarines, has more than 21 such submarines at sea constantly. The U.S. now maintains round-the-clock some 3,000 strategic nuclear weapons at sea in submarines off the coast of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, normally deploying far fewer strategic submarines at sea, keeps a formidable force of approximately 200 sea-based nuclear weapons constantly targeted on the U.S.

The U.S. is now deploying a more powerful warhead, the Mark 12A, on its Minuteman III land-based missiles. Just one of these missiles will contain the destructive power of 80 Hiroshima size weapons. Individual Soviet missiles contain an even larger destructive potential.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are now stepping up their nuclear weapons developments. The Soviet Union, following the path of the United States, is substantially increasing its intercontinental nuclear weapons by putting more than one nuclear weapon on its strategic missiles.

Under the present U.S. administration, funding for the production of new nuclear warheads has risen 70 percent, to produce warheads for Trident missiles, Minuteman III missiles, air-launched cruise missiles, artillery shells, and other nuclear weapons. Military secrecy in the Soviet Union prevents us from knowing the new weapons that may be planned in that country.

The recital of the details of the nuclear competition could go on endlessly. It can be numbing. It is certainly depressing. However, no serious disarmament measures can take place in the absence of full information about military forces. There is widespread ignorance by both citizens and government officials about world military activity. I have often been struck by the lack of awareness even on the part of military officers of the enormous size of nuclear arsenals.

This matter of information brings me to the suggestions which I would offer for consideration by this Special Session. What should be done? I cannot offer a broad-scale program of action, nor the magic solution to the nuclear maze. I do have a few thoughts about practical steps that can be taken.

U.N. INFORMATION ROLE

First, the role of the United Nations as a repository of information on world military activity should be strengthened. All governments should submit a report each year on their military spending and force levels, and the U.N. should publish this information in an annual military yearbook. The U.N. Centre for Disarmament Studies could be the appropriate agency to collect and publish this material.

[1] Accordingly, the 201st largest Soviet city of Mayok might be "safe" while the city of Chirchik, with only 1,000 more inhabitants, would be targeted for destruction.

Article 47 of the U.N. Charter charges the U.N. Military Staff Committee to "advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to . . . the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament." This Committee, with a more representative membership, could serve as a source of information and analysis of disarmament efforts. As a beginning the Military Staff Committee should report to this Fall's General Assembly on its performance to date in fulfilling the Charter's charge.

STOPPING NUCLEAR EXPANSION

Secondly, both the United States and the Soviet Union should adopt measures that are crucial to the control of nuclear proliferation. Peventing the spread of nuclear weapons is essential for the survival of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. It has been estimated that in twenty years, 100 countries will possess the materials and the knowledge necessary to produce nuclear weapons. By the year 2000, the total plutonium produced as a by-product of global nuclear power will be the equivalent of 1 million atomic bombs.

They should pledge their commitment never to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. I can think of no military utility in the use of nuclear weapons by the superpowers against non-nuclear countries.

Stopping production of fissionable materials for weapons has been proposed by previous U.S. administrations and is more feasible today than ever. The United States and the Soviet Union have enormous stocks of nuclear weapons and weapons material and have no military need to continue the production of fissionable material. They now have more than they will ever need. This step could be followed by a complete moratorium on all manufacture of nuclear weapons, as both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. now have more weapons than they will ever need.

The ending of all nuclear weapons testing is feasible right now. The U.S. has tested more than 600 nuclear weapons. The U.S.S.R. has tested more than 350 nuclear weapons. Both should now have learned all that is necessary. This Special Session should urge all nations to stop producing fissionable material, stop making nuclear weapons, and stop testing nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS OFF SURFACE SHIPS

Third, without significantly reducing their military capabilities, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. could eliminate most, if not all, nuclear weapons from their naval surface ships. With the ships of both navies roaming the far reaches of the world's oceans, the potential for nuclear war rising out of naval incidents grows. Both navies are extensively nuclearized, with several thousand nuclear weapons aboard surface ships of the U.S. Navy.

The military need for nuclear weapons on surface ships has been much diminished in recent years because both the Soviet and U.S. navies have more accurate missile systems which can use high explosive rather than nuclear warheads.

SCRAPPING ICBM'S

Fourth, we should begin reducing the huge strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union by dismantling over a 5 year period land-based missiles (ICBM's).

The U.S. has about 1,000 ICBMs and the U.S.S.R. has about 1,400. Scrapping ICBMs would solve many of the problems that presently preoccupy the military and the press, particularly in the United States. Both the U.S. and the Soviet Union are becoming increasingly worried about the vulnerability of their ICBMs. I consider such attacks to be implausible in the extreme, but by giving up the traditional attachment to ICBMs, both countries would feel safer. It seems clear that ICBMs are today causing more trouble than they are worth.

Elimination of ICBMs is easier for the U.S. than for the Soviet Union, as the Soviet

Union today has a much smaller proportion of its strategic weapons on bombers and submarines. However, it is expected that the Soviet Union will shortly begin putting multiple warheads on its many sea-based missiles and will become much less reliant on ICBMs. Nuclear deterrence can be accomplished without ICBMs.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Special Session on Disarmament with 149 countries present demonstrates the realization on the part of all countries that their territory could provide the spark that could ignite nuclear war. Knowledgeable military men are aware that there will be world-wide consequences from a nuclear war. There is no defense and nowhere to hide.

The governments of the United States and the Soviet Union have carelessly let their relations deteriorate to an alarming extent. Political leaders must take control of events and not permit the military or technology to control them. The non-nuclear countries can act as the burr under the saddle to push the nuclear powers in the direction of reason. There can be no excuses for failure to make immediate and substantial progress in stopping the nuclear arms race.

If we are to survive on this planet, the arms race must be slowed, stopped, and reversed. The time to start is now.●

THE SOVIET BEAR SHOWS ITS MUSCLE

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as the cat and mouse games between Moscow and Washington continue, the Soviet Union has again proved that it can flagrantly ignore international agreements, and international public opinion at whatever costs to its own citizens. Within a few hours, the Soviet authorities tried and sentenced Moscow Jewish "refuseniks" Ida Nudel and Vladimir Slepak in two separate courtrooms on the absurd charge of "malicious hooliganism." For those unfamiliar with such a "vicious crime"—which carries with it a sentence of 5 years internal exile for Slepak and 4 years for Nudel—the two "hooligans" had the audacity to plead with the Soviet Government, in the only desperate way left them, to grant their simple request to rejoin their son and husband in Israel. Mr. Slepak, who has been struggling for 8 years to live with his son again, hung a banner outside his Moscow apartment asking that the authorities "Let Us Go To Our Son In Israel"—a "crime" the Soviets obviously greatly feared, because the police immediately broke into their apartment, tore the banner into pieces, and arrested both Mr. and Mrs. Slepak. Mr. Slepak will now remain out of sight for 5 years so he can no longer perpetuate such treacherous actions as asking for rights guaranteed in several international agreements the Soviet Union has signed or ratified. Mrs. Nudel is guilty of the same treachery. Frustrated by the 7 long years she has continually been refused exit permission to reunite with her husband and sister in Israel, Ida Nudel participated in a demonstration with other "refuseniks" asking for their right to emigrate. When the demonstration was quickly stifled by the police, Ms. Nudel reportedly hung a protest poster outside her window and was immediately arrested and charged with "malicious hooliganism."

If "humanitarianism" is what the Helsinki Accord's Third Basket is all about, these malicious Soviet actions only reconfirm Soviet intentions to ignore any shred of humanitarianism and any commitments they have promised to uphold. While the Helsinki Accord pledges its signatories to respect human rights, to "confirm the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights," and to "deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family," the Soviet Government has continually and capriciously refused Mr. Slepak's and Ms. Nudel's request to emigrate to their family, and has banished them to Siberia for daring to ask publicly that their requests be met.

If the Soviets want to show the world how tough they are in defying domestic and world opinion, they have succeeded; and I and my colleagues only hope that others do not have to suffer again just to prove that childish point.●

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE OF REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN FOR 1977

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe deeply that elected officials must observe the highest standards of honesty.

One of the best ways of insuring integrity in government is to provide the voters with the facts regarding each Representative's financial dealings—so that the voters can prevent dishonesty and conflict of interest when they go to the polls.

For this reason, I am making the following financial disclosure, as I have done each year since first being elected in 1973. I believe it will help enable the voters of my district to judge how I have discharged my public trust.

I also want to add that I resigned from my law practice before I took my seat in Congress. I have not resumed law practice since that time and will not do so while I am a Representative.

The material follows:

FINANCIAL STATUS

NONCONGRESSIONAL INCOME

In 1977 my income from noncongressional sources in lecture fees was $16,600 from colleges and other educational institutions, temples, and eleemosynary organizations.

UNSECURED LOANS

I had no unsecured debts in 1977.

NONCONGRESSIONAL REIMBURSEMENTS

Reimbursements to me for expenditures in excess of $50.00 other than from the U.S. Government in 1977 totalled $1,507.08. These reimbursements were for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with speaking engagements and incurred in connection with attending meetings of the Harvard University Board of Overseers of which I am a member.

SECURITIES

I own no stocks and bonds with a value of more than $25.00.

INCOME TAXES

The personal income taxes I paid for 1977—contained in my tax returns as filed on June 14, 1978—totalled $30,891.00 and were divided as follows: U.S. Government, $21,438.00; New York State, $7,281.00; New York City, $2,172.00.

BUSINESS AFFILIATES

During 1977 I did not serve as a director, officer, or partner—or adviser or manager—of any business entity, foundation or professional organization of a noneleemosynary or noneducational nature.●

HOUSE COLLEAGUES FINDLEY AND WHITEHURST HONORED BY THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at a ceremony held at Ambassador Berndt von Staden's residence, June 22, 1978, our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WHITEHURST) were honored by the Federal Republic of Germany. They were presented with the commander's Cross of the Order of Merit for their work in behalf of close relations between the United States and West Germany.

In his remarks of presentation, Ambassador von Staden noted that—

Without a strong Western defense alliance, which NATO stands for, a policy or détente and cooperation would be unthinkable.

I share the Ambassador's view. NATO is our most important military alliance.

In his remarks, Ambassador von Staden catalogs the efforts of our colleagues to strengthen the Western alliance and to make our relations with West Germany fruitful.

The United States-West Germany relationship determines, to a considerable extent, what sort of organization NATO is. It is for their efforts to maintain a close and meaningful relationship between the United States and West Germany that our colleagues were honored by the West German nation.

Ambassador von Staden's remarks at the awards ceremony follow:

AMBASSADOR VON STADEN'S REMARKS

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great honor and pleasure for me to present two prominent members of the Congress of the United States the Commander's Cross of the Order of Merit bestowed on them by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany in recognition of their outstanding merits for the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America.

My dear Congressman Findley, in order of seniority I should like first to address you.

As a Member of the House of Representatives since 1960, you have devoted much dedication and personal effort to the further improvement of the relation between your great country and Europe of which Germany is a part, as well as to the more specific problems of the Atlantic Alliance. At the time I was in Washington as political counselor from 1963 to 1968 dealing with NATO-questions, I already learned that among your

colleagues you were considered one of the most active proponents of idea of Atlantic partnership and within the framework of close cooperation between the United States and Germany.

During the very first years of your congressional activity, you became a member of your party's working group for questions relating to NATO. From 1965 to 1968 you chaired the Republican Committee on Western Alliances. You were one of the regular participants of the many conferences of NATO-parliamentarians and up to this day you are a member of the American delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly. In the course of the regular meetings between delegations of American and European parliamentarians, you have been playing an ever increasing active and positive role. Your regular participation at the "Wehrkundetagung" in Munich has repeatedly been noted with great satisfaction by my government.

For your personal commitment to the Atlantic Alliance we feel the deepest gratitude. NATO remains the basis of our security and freedom and a cornerstone of peace in our changing world. Without a strong Western defense alliance, which NATO stands for, a policy of detente and cooperation would be unthinkable. No country could be more aware of this, than the Federal Republic with its geographic situation at the crossroads of Europe.

In honoring you today Congressman Findley, we honor an outstanding American citizen who has always fully understood the German political and military position, its specific problems like the Berlin question, who has always been helpful in widening this understanding within his own country and who has significantly contributed to the furthering of American-German friendship.

My dear Congressman Whitehurst, in turning to you, I should like to recall first that your district in Virginia happens to be the home of NATO's naval headquarters SACLANT. Problems related to NATO and to maritime defense have always been one of your major preoccupations. Congressman Whitehurst has unfailingly been working for strengthening the effectiveness of our Alliance. In doing so he furthered American-German relations in vital fields of our common interest. As ranking Republican Member in the Subcommittee on "Military Installations and Facilities", you have been active since many years for a deeper understanding of NATO's problems. In this context your interest for and your understanding of the particular problems of the Northern flank of NATO as well as of the Germany Navy, your readiness to give your whole support to an ever closer cooperation between the naval forces of our two countries is recognized with satisfaction and gratitude in the Federal Republic. As a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, you entertain very close personal contacts to its German members, which is in many ways the key to solving difficult problems.

In honoring you today, Congressman Whitehurst, we honor an outstanding citizen of your country who for many years has significantly contributed to the strengthening of the friendship between our two countries and to the cooperation between them in fields of vital common interest.●

TRIBUTE TO THE DELAWARE VALLEY SYMPHONIC BAND

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements of the 80-member Delaware Valley Symphonic Band. These young people, all students ranging in age from junior high school to college level, have been chosen through placement auditions for their exceptional talent and their willingness to devote long hours to study and practice Since 1974, they have brought the pleasure of beautiful sound to the people of Delaware Valley.

Under the dedicated leadership of Miss Bonnie Strang who is known throughout the Delaware Valley for her stage bands, the group will, for a second time, carry their musical talents abroad. On July 11, the Delaware Valley Symphonic Band begins its second goodwill concert tour of Europe under the auspices of the American Youth Symphony and Chorus. In addition to a full 3-week schedule of performances in England, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, these young ambassadors will study the culture, history, and art of the countries they will be visiting.

The power of music to move, to enchant and to communicate across the boundaries of nations and the barriers of languages has long been recognized. William Shakespeare in "A Midsummer Night's Dream" noted that "the rude sea grew civil at her song; and certain stars shot madly from their spheres; to hear the sea-maid's music." While I do not wish to suggest that the Delaware Valley Symphonic Band is likely to calm the Atlantic or cause cosmic cataclysm, I am delighted that these young people will be applying the power of music to the cause of international goodwill and understanding.

I am proud and happy to invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating this talented group of young musicians and in wishing them a rewarding and successful tour.●

VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN LITHUANIA

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the last 38 years, Lithuania has been denied its freedom and independence by the Soviet Union. This deprivation of human rights began with the Soviet Union's invasion and occupation of that country in June 1940. Today, even after the Helsinki and Belgrade Conferences, Soviet repression continues. Lithuanians who attempt to exercise their basic human rights are still thrown into Soviet prisons. While these prisoners of conscience number in the thousands, only a few of their names ever reach the West.

I would like to cite just four of these prisoners of conscience.

Balys Gajauskas, age 51. Gajauskas was first arrested in 1948 as a Lithuanian partisan and was sentenced to 25 years in Soviet labor camps. Released in 1973, he was subject to constant harassment and interrogation.

On April 20, 1977, Gajauskas was picked up by the KGB as a witness involving the underground publication "Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania." His apartment was searched, and valuable documents were confiscated. Among the documents was historical data about the 1944–52 Lithuanian resistance movement. Gajauskas was detained at the KGB Isolation Prison until his trial in April 1978. That month Gajauskas was sentenced to 10 years in labor camp and 5 years of exile for alleged anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.

Sarunas Zukauskas, age 28. Zukauskas, an outstanding student at Kaunas Medical Institute, joined the dissident movement to combat the injustices in Lithuania. Just prior to his graduation, he was betrayed by one of his colleagues and was arrested for allegedly agitating against the Soviet Union and forming an anti-Soviet organization.

In March 1973, Zukauskas was convicted and sentenced to 6 years in a strict regime labor camp. After 5 years of imprisonment, he suffers from severe malnutrition, and is consistently denied the medical attention he needs. Zukauskas is not allowed to have his family visit him, and letters from his U.S. relatives are returned without explanation.

Viktoras Petkus, age 49. Petkus is a member of the Lithuanian Public Group to promote the implementation of the Helsinki Agreements. He was arrested in August 1977 in connection with the case of Balys Gajauskas. Petkus is still in prison, but has not been tried.

Petras Plumpa, age 39. Plumpa was arrested in November 1973 and was held without trial until December 1974. He was charged with having printed the "Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church." At his trial, which was conducted behind closed doors, evidence was produced that the fingerprints on the "Chronicle" were not Plumpa's. Nevertheless, he was sentenced to 8 years in strict regime prison camps.

Plumpa accepts his imprisonment in a genuinely Christian spirit, forgiving those who have persecuted and betrayed him. He asks only for prayers. Plumpa will not be allowed to receive food packages until he has served 4 years of his sentence. He is permitted to write only two letters a month.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the State Department and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations to publicly deplore these violations of human rights in Lithuania. Our country must not forget these prisoners of conscience, nor the goals of freedom and independence for which these Lithuanians are fighting.●

THE FRADKINS: STILL NO EXIT VISAS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, early last month I brought to the attention of the

House the issue of Jewish immigration from the Soviet Union, and specifically highlighted the case of the Fradkins. My concern is that the Soviets are making minor concessions in the increase in the number of Jews allowed to emigrate. It is my impression, supported by numerous reports, that the number of recent emigrants actually represents only a small fraction of those seeking to leave the U.S.S.R., and that the Soviet Union is continuing its basic policies of persecution toward Jews and other emigrants.

In my last statement I concentrated on the case of the Fradkins. Daniel and Sarah Fradkin and their two children (Shosse Revoluts No. 45, Flat 140, Leningrad, R.S.F.S.R., U.S.S.R.) who have been trying to emigrate since 1972. I regret to report that their position has remained unchanged.

Mr. Fradkin is a mathematician by profession, but because of his efforts to leave the country, he now is forced to work as a postman. The Fradkins' applications have been turned down numerous times on the grounds that Mr. Fradkin had "access to secret documents" in 1963. This reasoning is obviously merely a cover for harrassment, for secrets of such a dated nature would have little value, even if Mr. Fradkin was closely involved with them. But, in fact, he was only peripherally involved with the problems he helped to solve.

Mr. Fradkin's father has already been allowed to leave. Rabbi Abraham Fradkin now lives in Israel, and would like to be reunited with his son, and with his son's family.

Especially relevant to this unfortunate case is the section of the Helsinki Accords concerning human rights. In that section, the signatory nations pledge to "* * * facilitate freer movements and contacts * * *" among persons and groups in their respective countries. In addition, those nations agreed to "* * * deal in a positive humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family * * *"

The Fradkins have obviously not been treated in a "positive humanitarian spirit," as is true of others who have applied for exit permits. The Fradkins' case if only the most recent one of a number of disturbing cases about which I have been approached. All of my colleagues are involved in similar cases where rights guaranteed in the Helsinki Accords have been willfully and deliberately violated.

The Soviet Union was not coerced into signing those accords back in 1975, was not tricked into signing agreements against its will. But it is obvious that the Soviet leaders calculated that only those provisions dealing with boundary settlements and guarantees in Eastern Europe would be taken seriously, and that "human rights" would be quickly and unceremoniously swept under the rug. Now that the Soviet Union is asked to live up to its promises, it declares that this area is "an internal matter."

My contacts with the Soviet Government on this case have been something less than rewarding. Although I did receive confirmation that my message to the emigration authorities in Moscow was received, the letter I wrote to the Fradkins has apparently been lost or deliberately misrouted.

This case is a gross violation of the provisions of the Helsinki Accords and a travesty of human rights. I cannot stress enough the unacceptable status of Soviet immigration policies, and I am most disturbed at recent event in the Soviet Union which concern both American and Soviet citizens. The recent trial of Vladimir Slepak reinforces my prior unfavorable impression of Soviet intentions, and the announcement that two American reporters will actually be put on trial for letting the world know what is happening in the U.S.S.R. will certainly not improve Soviet-American relations. Such actions are an affront to world opinon, and are part of a flagrant campaign to continue the denial of the basic rights of the citizens of the Soviet Union.●

THE 42D COMMENCEMENT OF U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commend to my colleagues the address which was delivered by the Honorable Juanita M. Kreps, Secretary of Commerce, to the graduating class of 1978 of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N.Y., on the occasion of its 42d commencement exercises on June 26, 1978.

The Merchant Marine Academy, located within my congressional district, is ably headed by its superintendent, Rear Adm. Arthur B. Engel, USCG (Ret.). I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate this outstanding class of midshipmen and to express my confidence that they will soon take their places as leaders in the vital U.S. maritime industry.

Secretary Kreps' address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JUANITA M. KREPS

It is a great pleasure to be with you today on this happy occasion.

After four years of hard study and strenuous training, you who are graduating today have reached a major milestone in your lives. Few celebrations can match today's feeling of achievement.

It is a particular joy, too, to note that this year's graduating class has been the target of the heaviest recruitment effort launched by the maritime industry in the past ten years. This suggests that you are embarking on your careers at a propitious time.

At the beginning of this decade the American-flag fleet was in a precarious condition. Two-thirds of the fleet's ships were twenty-five or more years of age. This put us at a disadvantage in competing against the more modern ships of other nations.

Today, an expanded shipbuilding program, stimulated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, is rejuvenating our fleet. New generations of larger, faster, more efficient ships have been coming off the ways to replace our overaged vessels.

For example, the new classes of containerships, barge-carrying vessels and roll-on/roll-off vanships have elevated the United States to world leadership in intermodal ships, with 136 now flying the American flag.

Within the next two years the United States fleet will boast more liquefied natural gas carriers than any other fleet. Three of these highly sophisticated vessels are already in service, and an additional fifteen are under construction.

The U.S. flag tanker fleet has been enlarged and upgraded in recent years by the addition of new vessels ranging in size up to 265,000 deadweight tons. Among the tankers currently under construction are three mammoth vessels of 390,000 tons.

In contrast to the depressed condition of the world tanker fleet, which currently has 353 ships laid up for lack of demand, the U.S. tanker fleet is virtually fully employed, with only two of our 242 tankers presently idle.

In short, by historical standards, and in comparison with the rest of the world, the outlook for the industry is bright.

You have, therefore, every reason to be optimistic about your future. But your optimism should be tempered with the knowledge that shipping depends on trade, and that trade volumes and patterns shift—witness our large current deficits.

Because your future will be so closely tied to it, you will be interested to know that the administration has already taken a step toward boosting American trade. For the first time in our history, the Federal Government has made a firm commitment to develop a national export policy. Our intention is to expand the export consciousness of American industry and remove the barriers to trade that have been raised inadvertently through our regulatory and tax policies. The national export policy should result in a significant expansion of U.S. sales abroad.

A second step is also needed: We should reexamine our system of deliberate barriers to trade—that is our system of export controls.

As Secretary of Commerce, I am charged with administering export restrictions for reasons of national security, foreign policy and short supply. We in the department are working to ensure that these controls protect our national interests with a minimum of interference in the commercial process. I am concerned, therefore, with what I perceive to be a growing tendency for the United States to deny trade as a political gesture—concerned particularly about those instances where availability of the product from alternative sources means that our own producers are those most hurt.

Today, with the Nation running a huge trade deficit, we must ask whom our trade restrictions actually harm and what interest they serve. In some cases their effect has been the transfer of economic opportunity and jobs from this country to our international competitors. This was never a good bargain; today, it is one we can ill afford.

Trade, most of you would agree, fosters closer cultural and political ties between countries. It is clear, for example, that trade has been a positive influence in our mutual efforts to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China. It is far less clear that anything has been gained for either side

as a result of the long absence of commercial relations between our two countries.

Commerce is the common language of the world's peoples. Where ideologies divide, commerce unites. You have chosen for yourselves a career which, in this respect, is a potential force for world unity. For a world of expanding trade and growing economic interdependence, you have selected wisely.

I join you today in looking to a bright future for yourselves and a prosperous growth in world trade.

My congratulations and good wishes to each of you.●

A SALUTE TO LUNENBURG

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the town of Lunenburg, Mass., celebrates this year the 250th anniversary of its incorporation. Over the past two and one-half centuries, Lunenburg has emerged as an annually self-reliant and beautiful community whose citizens can be justifiably proud of their town.

Because they have a keen sense that the town's history must be recorded and preserved, the people of Lunenburg have supported and sustained the work of the Lunenburg Historical Society. In commemoration of the anniversary of incorporation, the historical society has published a most enjoyable and instructive volume, Lunenburg, The Heritage of Turkey Hills 1718–1978. This publication is available for purchase through the town clerk's office or at the Ritter Memorial Library. It contains many eloquent passages, including the following description of 19th century Lunenburg:

The scope and bustle of all this early industry reflects the energetic fledgling nation in its exuberant youth. The rivers ran fast and clean. The mill wheels turned. The work was done. The land and buildings changed hands and occupations. Disasters struck and building began again. Like the water wheels that supplied the power for these early mills, turning, turning, endlessly through time until as the water lessened and the era passed, a new source of power began to appear. Electricity took the place of the mill wheels.

That sense of dynamic optimism and adaptability has lived on in Lunenburg. It is a town where the work ethic has flourished. It is a community at once scenic, vibrant, and alive.

In honor of the 250th anniversary of incorporation, a special committee, chaired by Ray MacCracken and comprised of many other distinguished citizens of the town, has planned a series of events. Many of these activities have already taken place. Among the events scheduled for the future are Old Home Week, which will take place during the first week of August. Old Home Week will be marked by band concerts, tours, a slide show about the town, fireworks, a town luncheon, a block dance, a pageant, and musical entertainment. Throughout the week an information booth set up in the Ritter Memorial Library will provide a rundown on the programs available for all Lunenburg citizens.

Then, on October 1, a parade for the entire town will provide another celebration of the anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to salute the people of Lunenburg for their splendid tradition of community involvement, for the spirit of generosity and selfless participation in voluntary organizations which characterizes the town. Citizens of Lunenburg can be proud not only of the beautiful homes and land which surround them but also of the schools and library and cultural and athletic pursuits to which so many adults and young people contribute in meaningful ways.

Two hundred fifty years after its incorporation, Lunenburg stands as a shining example of the creative possibilities of self-government.●

NGO'S SPEAK OUT FOR DISARMAMENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that during the past several days, my colleagues have had the opportunity to read some of the statements made by the nongovernmental organizations on June 12 at the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament. We cannot afford to ignore the message which these statements have attempted to convey. Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is essential to our very survival.

Today I am concluding with the address of Mr. Mihaly Simai of the World Federation of United Nations Associations.

The address follows:

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SIMAI (World Federation of United Nations Associations): The World Federation of United Nations Associations is a world-wide organization composed of 80 member associations in all the continents of the world and in countries of all social and political systems and stages of economic development. We constitute a people's movement for the United Nations dedicated to achieving the goals of the United Nations.

As a people's movement for the United Nations, we consider it one of our greatest tasks to support and strengthen the world Organization so that it may become a more efficient instrument of global peace, security and co-operation. These designs are interrelated with other vital issues of our age: the elimination of mass poverty, backwardness and the economic consequences of colonialism.

Recognition of this interrelationship was reflected also in the message of the twenty-sixth plenary assembly of our World Federation to this special session of the United Nations, which represented the consensus of all the delegates to our plenary assembly.

We are convinced that the improvement of the international climate, the cessation of the arms race and effective disarmament measures not only would strengthen international security but would allow mankind to deal, on a larger scale and in a more practical way, with the problem of development and to satisfy the acute economic, social and cultural needs of all peoples, particularly in the developing countries.

Therefore we strongly support the efforts of the United Nations system and its Member States, endorsed by world public opinion, to strengthen and extend détente, to expand its geographical scope and to settle disputes and conflicts between States by peaceful means. We welcome also such limited achievements as the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, and we urge their signature and implementation by all States.

The message of the twenty-sixth plenary assembly of the World Federation expresses great concern that the vast accumulation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction constitutes a growing danger to the human race which, through error of judgment, miscalculation, madness or dictatorial ambition, may cause a world holocaust, and recognizes that a new international economic order and the global arms race are incompatible, that disarmament and development are closely interrelated and that neither can achieve their final goals without the other.

Therefore, we express our profound conviction that further progress towards the elimination of international tensions and towards disarmament would create more favorable conditions for broader and closer economic co-operation among nations, for the fuller use of scientific and technological advances for the purpose of development, and for the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

May I reaffirm here our fundamental commitment to general, complete and verified disarmament and may I welcome the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament as an important and constructive initiative. At the same time, may I express the hope of the overwhelming majority of our member associations that a world disarmament conference and other similar initiatives will contribute to further progress towards general and complete disarmament, which should remain a primary concern of the United Nations. That can only be effectively achieved, however, through a series of specific steps, and in this connection we urge a speedy conclusion of the negotiations for the SALT II treaty and the conclusion of a SALT III treaty which will reduce and not merely limit the scale of armaments.

On behalf of the twenty-sixth plenary assembly of our World Federation, I should like to call on the United Nations and its Member States to intensify their efforts to achieve speedy and decisive progress towards disarmament and an end to the arms race, the prohibition of all nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, including such new additions to military arsenals as enhanced radiation warheads—for example, neutron bombs—extremely accurate missiles and other destabilizing weapons, and the complete and general prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, as well as towards the reduction of armed forces, conventional armaments and national military expenditure, with a view to achieving the ultimate goal, general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

We strongly support the idea of general and complete disarmament, and in this context the progress towards the establishment of a permanent United Nations peace-keeping force to maintain and promote international security in a disarming and disarmed world, and the idea of a moratorium on all

research and development projects on all new weapons of any kind, and we urge all scientists to disassociate themselves from inhuman research and development projects.

We are also aware that, even without a new world war which threatens all nations, the economic consequences of the arms race have a devastating effect on the whole of mankind. No country, group or individual can disregard or isolate itself from the global dangers. The aggravation of the existing global problems and the emerging new problems can be solved only by eliminating the greatest waste, the arms race, and by devoting the funds, energies and talents to peaceful purposes. Therefore, we call on the United Nations, its Member States and the bodies involved in the preparation of the international development strategy for the Third Development Decade to be declared in 1980 to submit proposals at the same time for an international disarmament strategy, making explicit provision for linking the two strategies and ensuring that both strategies should contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order.

This task could be considered to be one of the most important joint considerations of the United Nations Disarmament Centre and other United Nations organs to the issues of development and international cooperation, and it should receive more moral and financial support from the Member States. The research and publications activities, however, should be better coordinated within the United Nations system and use should be made of the important channels of communication to the public represented by non-governmental organizations, including the World Federation of United Nations Associations.

Disarmament, being a vital issue, is not an end in itself. The end is human survival, security and progress. After many decades of the arms race it is evident that the true guarantee of these aims for every nation of the world is not the spiralling of new weapons but political détente and a sound and democratic world economy. We are all responsible for the achievements of these goals for the benefit of the future generations. The tasks are not insurmountable. We are sure, however, that they cannot be achieved sponstaneously or at no cost. The World Federation of United Nations Associations is ready to share responsibilities and efforts in the common struggle for human survival, security and progress. Important as the special session is in itself, I am sure that everyone recognizes that it will be the follow-up of the special session which will be of vital importance in achieving the goals to which we are addressing ourselves. In recognition of that, in the future programs of the World Federation, we shall give priority to projects on an international scale which will promote further and meaningful progress in the field of disarmament. We shall recommend that our member associations disseminate more information on the disarmanent activities of the United Nations, prepare educational materials, organize meetings and use the mass media in their respective countries to enhance general public support for the follow-up of the special session. We are convinced that in the world, together with all the peace-loving forces, we have the power and the will to achieve our common goals and to ensure that the opportunities for human survival will not be lost.●

LILLIAN AND BEN AVRECH

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, with the fast pace of the competitive business world in our times, it is hard to find individuals who can combine a successful business enterprise with a fullfilling family life and service to the community. It gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor two such individuals, Ben and Lillian Avrech of San Jose, Calif., who will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary July 2.

I have known Ben Avrech since the days of my participation on the San Jose Human Relations Commission in the early 1960's, when Ben served as its chairman. He was instrumental in creating the commission's forerunner, the mayor's committee on human relations in 1957, the first such city commission in California. Due in large part to the activities of this commission, San Jose was awarded the All-American City designation and remained relatively calm during the turbulent 1960's.

Ben and Lillian Avrech came to San Jose in 1937, and in 1945, Ben became proprietor of the Mayfair department store in East San Jose, a position he held until his retirement in 1971.

In addition to his service on the Human Relations Commission, Ben has served on the advisory committee to the president of San Jose College, as director of the San Jose Medical Research Foundation, and on the board of governors of the Santa Clara County chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Both Mr. and Mrs. Avrech have long been active in the City of Hope and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Lillian Avrech is also active in the San Jose Women's Coordinating Council.

When Ben closed the Mayfair store in 1971, our local San Jose newspaper, the Mercury, noted that "his list of personal awards reflects both his many contributions to improving San Jose as an official to his intense desire to make the world around him a better place for everyone." All of us who have been active in San Jose's civic affairs appreciate this sense of dedication displayed by the Avrechs.

Ben and Lillian Avrech will be joined this weekend by their son, Norman, from Washington, D.C., and by their daughters, Joyce, now living in Massachusetts, and Gloria, of Pasadena. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Ben Avrech on their 50th wedding anniversary and to thank them for their fine contributions to the San Jose community.●

THE NEW JERSEY MARINE SCIENCES CONSORTIUM A DECADE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT IN MARINE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, within a few months, the New Jersey Marine Sciences Consortium will be observing its 10th anniversary. The Marine Sciences Consortium is a remarkable organization with roots in New Jersey and a program benefiting all America. At this time, I would like to pay tribute to the consortium and to the contributions to it made by many private donors, the State of New Jersey and the Federal Government.

The consortium consists of 21 colleges and universities in New Jersey and 1 in Pennsylvania engaged in a cooperative program with the objective of constructively developing and using our marine resources for the benefit of all. To carry out this mission, the consortium and its member institutions engage in three kinds of activity.

The first is to conduct research projects that increase the store of knowledge about our marine and coastal environments and develop ways to apply this knowledge beneficially. The second is to develop and offer educational programs at many levels to make students and the public more knowledgeable about marine affairs and to prepare students for marine-related careers. The third is to provide advisory services that broaden public awareness and interest about our marine resources and supply information and answers to questions asked by those who make their living from our waters and coastal areas or who enjoy the recreational advantages they afford.

The academic members of the consortium currently are: Atlantic Community College, Mays Landing; Brookdale Community College, Lincroft; Cumberland County College, Vineland; Essex County College, Newark; Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, Glassboro State College, Glassboro; Jersey City State College, Jersey City; Kean College of New Jersey, Union; Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.; Monmouth College, W. Long Branch; Montclair State College, Upper Montclair; New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark; Princeton University, Princeton; Ramapo College, Mahwah; Rider College, Lawrenceville; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Seton Hall University, South Orange; Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken; Stockton State College, Pomona; Trenton State College, Trenton; Union College, Cranford; William Paterson College, Wayne.

The consortium has its headquarters at Princeton, N.J. It also operates two field stations for broad-scope research and educational purposes. In addition, it recently received the gift of an island, Leaf Cay, in the Bahamas which affords additional valuable research and educational opportunities.

One field station is at Seaville in Cape May County, in the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress. The property for the Seaville station was deeded to the consortium by the Federal Government in 1974 in recognition of the organization's achievements up to that time and its vast promises for advancing marine science and education.

The second station is at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J., overlooking the entrance to New York Harbor and the New York Bight. The facilities there also have been made available to the consortium by the Federal Government since 1972.

The Marine Sciences Consortium concept for New Jersey was proposed in 1968

and the consortium was formally organized in 1969 to fill a need for more effective education and research in the burgeoning marine science disciplines.

The founders recognized that no one institution had all the essential requirements to conduct a full-scale marine sciences program and that by pooling their physical and intellectual resources they collectively could accomplish more than the sum of their separate efforts. Marine teaching and research programs demand scholars, seaside, and campus laboratories, boats, complex scientific instrumentation to use on water or land, a marine science library and aquaria for preserving specimens for experimental purposes.

The founders of the consortium were: Donald W. Zalusky, Roger Raimist, Robert Renlund, and Joseph Waring, all of Glassboro State College; Robert Ramsdell, of Montclair State College; A. Lee Meyerson, of Newark State College; Albert Eble, of Trenton State College; Thomas A. Henry, of Cumberland County College; and William A. Taylor, a manufacturer.

It was this group of founders, together with some additional early associates, whose magnificent efforts and sacrifices kept the consortium in existence through its first few years. It was only their unstinting devotion of time and talent, without financial compensation, that overcame a series of setbacks and discouraging developments that the organization encountered during that period.

The consortium not only looks at the formal marine sciences and engineering disciplines but also examines practical problems pertaining to commercial and recreational fishing, safe boating, protection of our coast lines and river valleys, and the development of the sea and its energy resources.

The consortium receives annual funding from the Federal Government for acting as manager of the sea grant program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the State of New Jersey. This designation as sea grant manager for the entire State is a signal recognition of the organization's accomplishments and its scholarly resources. For fiscal 1977–78, these grants totaled $340,000 and were supported by non-Federal matching funds of $223,000 provided by the participating institutions.

The State of New Jersey also provides very important support to the consortium through annual appropriations and contracts with the consortium for specific services and projects.

For the year beginning March 1, 1978, 18 research and service projects have been authorized under the sea grant program. These are being conducted by investigators from Brookdale Community College, College of Medicine and Dentistry—New Jersey Medical School, Kean College, Montclair State College, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Princeton University, Rutgers University, Stevens Institute of Technology, and by members of the consortium's own research staff.

The consortium's field stations, boats, and special equipment for marine research play a major role in the conduct of these sea grant projects, which include:

The extraction of heparin, now obtained from hogs and cattle, from marine sources such as fish wastes and so-called trash fish. Heparin is the standard blood-clotting agent widely used in medical and surgical procedures. This study holds promise of reducing the cost of heparin, increasing the sources of income of fishermen and alleviating waste disposal problems and pollution.

Detailed analysis of the growth rates, life spans, and natural mortality of a valuable food resource, the ocean quahog clam, to produce information essential for the scientific managing of the rate of harvesting of these claims so as to safeguard their abundance against a growing fishing intensity. This has practical significance because of surf clams along the Middle Atlantic coast, which have been the backbone of the clam canning industry, are rapidly being depleted and are being replaced by quahogs. The project involves the reading of the growth lines found in clam shells, which can provide chronological and climatological data similar to that produced by the study of tree rings.

Use of extracts derived from skeletal wastes of shrimp and crabs to produce chitosans, which are wound healing substances, antitumor agents, and possible useful food additives.

Development of binding agents that will reduce the cost and increase the efficiency of the commercial feed pellets used in domestic shrimp farming.

A study of the life cycles of a certain group of organisms called dinoflagellates that produce the sporadic, notorious "red tides" along our coasts. The objective is to identify both the inner changes within the organisms themselves and the effect of environmental conditions that may trigger their explosive growth, so that the prediction and control of these outbreaks may become possible.

A massive study, involving seven principal investigators and five major projects, of the sources and effects of pollution in Newark Bay to produce information required for an intensive cleansing program of this body of water, the most polluted estuary in New Jersey.

Since early in 1977, the consortium activities have been directed by a distinguished scientist and educational administrator, Dr. Robert H. Ellis, a microbiologist. Before joining the consortium, Dr. Ellis had served as president of the Travelers Research Center and the Center for Environment and Man, Inc. of Hartford, Conn., and as assistant to the president of the Hartford Graduate Center, affiliated with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. He also recently completed a term as a member of the National Sea Grant Advisory Panel.

The director of the New Jersey sea grant program and the Sandy Hook Research Station is one of the Nation's most eminent marine scientists, Dr. Lionel A. Walford. He had long service with the Federal Government and is the author of many scientific and popular publications on fish and fishing.

The consortium has an excellent and hard-working board of trustees, composed primarily of representatives of the member institutions, all with outstanding reputations as researchers. Five of the original nine founders continue as trustees. The current officers are Professor Thomas A. Henry, a geneticist, president; Dr. Albert Eble, a biologist, vice president; Dr. Robert Ahlert, an engineer, secretary; and Dr. Lois Luedemann, a geochemist, treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the heart of this splendid organization can be found at the Seaville field station in my congressional district. From that point and from the college and university laboratories throughout New Jersey, are coming many new discoveries, such as those I described earlier. Some will advance medical science, some will make our seas, seacoasts, and inland waters more valuable natural resources, creating new wealth and new employment opportunities that will benefit all our citizens and our commercial fishing industry. Others will make our waters cleaner and safer, promoting tourist and recreational businesses and protecting and improving the year-round environment enjoyed by those of us who live close or gravitate to the ocean or waterways.

The Seaville and Sandy Hook stations have been developed as important educational centers, drawing students not only from New Jersey, but from other States as well. These schools-by-the-sea hold the promise of becoming not only intellectual, but also valuable economic assets for their neighboring areas.

The stores of useful knowledge and the vast resources that remain to be wrested from our seas and inland waters are numberless. They must be equal to the number of drops of water that an ocean holds. Neither a shortage of brainpower or determination is restraining the consortium fram attacking all aspects of the tasks and opportunities before it. The limiting factor is money. Funds are needed to provide boats, laboratory, research equipment, and financial support for research professionals, educators, and students.

The consortium is by no means relying solely on funds from public sources to pay for the work it is doing. Because the private sector is the primary beneficiary of the results of its operations, the consortium actively seeks and is obtaining essential support from individuals, corporations, and foundations. From individuals this comes in the form of both cash and gifts in kind—boats, real estate, and equipment which it can either employ in the work of its researchers or convert into cash to purchase badly needed equipment. As the organization and its programs expand, the consortium members are being forced to seek private funds ever more urgently or allow golden opportunities to be wasted.

At the same time, those in this House—and I am proud to be one of them—who are supporters of the sea grant program can derive the greatest satisfaction from returns that are and will be forthcoming from our foresight. This program is creating jobs, putting additional money in the pockets of our constituents who make their living from the sea and bringing into being new, more useful or less costly products for use in

commerce and medicine. It is also helping to protect our waters from many kinds of pollution and danger, both natural and manmade. It is producing a new, larger, and better-prepared generation of marine scientists capable of ever-greater accomplishments in this field of study and discovery that is so important to our Nation.

As the New Jersey Marine Sciences Consortium approaches the end of its first decade, I salute its record. I hope that all my colleagues in this House will join me in giving their full support to the productive marine research and educational programs throughout the land that parallel the pathfinding work of the New Jersey Marine Sciences Consortium.●

FOURTH OF JULY REFLECTIONS ON CHANGING TIMES IN CONGRESS

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, as the Fourth of July draws near, I would like to direct my fellow colleagues' attention to the numerous similarities that exists between the Congress that courageously adopted our Declaration of Independence in 1776 and today's 95th Congress.

Getting a measure through Congress today is not an easy task—nor was it in 1776. When Delegate Richard Henry Lee of Virginia introduced his bold resolution on June 7 demanding "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States," about half of the Colonies were in favor of it. The issue was most controversial. So, Congress postponed a decision, and later recessed for 3 weeks.

Delegate Thomas Jefferson, meanwhile, was commissioned to draft a declaration of independence in case it should be needed. The four pages of this draft that we see today in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol is Jefferson's original draft bearing the corrections made by Benjamin Franklin and John Adams.

However, before the Congress could consider Jefferson's proposed Declaration of Independence, Delegate Lee's Resolution of Independence had to be resolved. Like we do today, the Congress then debated and argued the issue.

After many amendments and after the most momentous and critical debate ever in the history of the Congress, the Resolution of Independence was passed on July 2, 1776. Our bonds with Great Britain were severed. Independence was a fact, and our Nation was born.

However, before the Resolution of Independence could pass, several opponents chose not to attend Congress on July 2 when the critical vote was taken. The result was that 12 States voted in favor, with New York abstaining.

The delegates in the 1776 Continental Congress had to justify their actions to their constituents, to the world, and to future generations. So, with the essential question of independence settled, Congress immediately began to debate Jefferson's proposed Declaration of Independence.

After long hours of debating, arguing, defending, and amending the Declaration, Congress voted in the late afternoon of July 4 to adopt it. The vote again was 12 States for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. New York was still abstaining while awaiting for instructions from their State's authorities.

Just as there is today, there was division and differing of opinion in the United States in 1776. What we enact here in Congress never meets with the complete approval of the American people. Our daily mail reflects that fact. Such was the case with the issue of independence in 1776.

Delegate John Adams in 1776 thought that a third of the colonial population supported the revolution and independence; another third opposed it; and the remaining third tried to be neutral. Of the third that supported independence, about a third of that small group actively got involved. So, even in 1776, congressional actions did not meet with universal approval.

When we vote in Congress, our votes and comments are a matter of public record. The 56 delegates to the Congress in 1776 who signed the Declaration of Independence on August 2 did not have their names released for close to 5 months in fear of reprisals for their actions. Today, in 1978, we are accountable for all votes immediately after they are cast.

The delegates in 1776, in justifying their actions, set forth in the Declaration of Independence, certain principles that are the basis for our Government today. The Declaration makes clear that the Government exists to safeguard the rights of the people. As Jefferson, in the Declaration stated, all people have certain basic rights—namely, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The Bill of Rights later went on to expand these basic rights. Today, much of the legislation we pass, or fail to pass, often affects these basic rights of the American people.

Thomas Jefferson clearly points out in the Declaration that the people, not the Government, are the sovereigns. We here in Congress only represent the people who elect us.

We are here for a period of time only, and we are answerable to the electorate. It is they who pass the judgment on what we do. We renew our mandate to represent the people of our districts every 2 years. When our time is up in Congress, we step aside. This is the basis of our republican form of government.

Perhaps one of the strongest lines Jefferson wrote came as a warning to future generations as well as a reflection on past history:

> That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and institute new Government.

We have seen numerous applications of this principle during the past 202 years of history in other nations. Yet in our own Nation, we have seen changes made in our own institutions to reflect constantly changing needs.

The Bill of Rights added to our Constitution was to protect and to enhance the rights of man. The remaining 16 constitutional amendments reflect the changing demands in each era. The laws enacted by the previous 94 Congresses reflect the needs and changes demanded by the various periods of our history.

Today, we explain our votes and positions to our constituents in a variety of ways—the media, news releases, constituent mail, and in personal meetings with our constituents.

In 1776, the communications media was limited. The delegates in Congress did not have a staff to assist them in communicating. Congress had to wait 1 day before they could get the first complete printed text of the Declaration of Independence they adopted. This first printing, the Dunlap broadside, had to be dispatched to the various States and armies in the field, before it made its way to the newspapers and the public bulletin boards. Congressional news was sent to the States by horse and by ship. Eventually, the people in the Thirteen Colonies received the news of independence in days or weeks, rather than in minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the times have greatly changed for us in Congress since the days of 1776. But despite the changes these similarities and problems remain.

Now, in 202 years, Congress has changed its priorities. We have since settled our continent and have now turned our vision to the limits of the universe.

We are a rich nation—rich in the diversity of our people whose roots spring from every nation on Earth. We, the representatives of the people in Congress, reflect that diversity just as the delegates did in the Congress of 1776.

We are fortunate to have been born and in this great Nation. Here citizens have the opportunity to endeavor to achieve, through diligence and hard work, whatever position or station he or she may desire. Nowhere in the world do human beings have the freedom that we Americans possess. So it is fitting on the Fourth of July, that we take a moment to be thankful for our blessings.

Therefore my distinguished colleagues, may I beg your indulgence by reading to you a lovely poem written by my close friend, the late poet James J. Metcalfe, who phrased it so solemnly and beautifully:

GLORIOUS FOURTH

Today is Independence Day
And all throughout the land
The stars and stripes are flying high
And folks are feeling grand
It is the time to celebrate
Our glory in the sun
From all the fights for human rights
That we have waged and won
We are entitled to be proud
Of every victory
And all our efforts in behalf
Of peace and liberty
By land and sea, and in the air
Against whatever blow
Our good and great United States
Have never ceased to grow
So let us now salute the flag
And cheer the roaring guns
And pray that God will always bless
Our fathers and our sons.●

BAKKE TO SCHOOL

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court, faced with a major test of judgment in the case of Allan Bakke versus the California Medical School at Davis, has produced a fair and balanced decision. It was, in fact, precariously balanced—upon a series of shifting 5 to 4 votes. The issues, therefore, could have come down too far on either side but for the careful and correct judgment of Mr. Justice Powell, whose course stayed in the safe midchannel, clear of the shoals on both sides.

By definition he was constitutionally correct; by instinct he was also politically correct. Few Americans will deny that black, Indian, Chicano, and other ethnic minorities have been at a historical disadvantage gaining admission to medical schools, graduate schools, and other institutions of higher learning. Most Americans would endorse efforts to secure fair treatment for minorities; to recruit, motivate, and prepare candidates from varied ethnic and cultural backgrounds into the mainstream of higher education—and into the responsibilities for service that derive from it. Most will support fair play for minorities.

On the other hand, efforts to disqualify students solely because they are white, or come from a dominant ethnic or cultural tradition will not be regarded as being fair play, but as being reverse discrimination. It would amount to self-flagellation for a majority to support denial of civil and other rights of the majority. It would also be unconstitutional for such reverse discrimination to be based on race. To hold otherwise would be to indulge in judicial fantasy.

This is precisely why most Americans not only favor desegregation, to remove statutory racial barriers against civil rights of education and property ownership, but also oppose that other extreme known as "forced busing." When a false civil right is claimed to compel someone else's children to attend a more distant school clear across the county, for no other reason but race, few regard that as fair or equal treatment, or as being granted by the real Constitution.

The High Court now has rejected quotas which discriminate against an applicant based on race. Those whose political coalitions have advocated racial quotas must now stand aside until they can change the balance of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Meanwhile, admissions committees may continue to consider racial factors among others, such as motivation, leadership, scholarship, one's intended major, and athletic prowess or musical talent. They may continue to look at all that each candidate can bring and contribute to the society on campus as well as to society at large.

In the Bakke case, the Supreme Court has found a better balance than it did in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School busing case. It has now held 5 to 4 that the rights of those in the majority are also protected by the Constitution.●

NATION'S HOUSING PROBLEM

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this Chamber are familiar with the geometric axiom "the whole is equal to the sum of its parts." This profound statement appropriately underscores the nature of our Nation's present housing problem. There are many areas of neglect that contribute to our overall housing or homeownership crisis. Taken individually they appear rather incidental; added together they become quite significant.

Today, I would like to call your attention one such area or part. I am referring to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's continued refusal to implement the loan maturity terms for FHA insured multisection mobile homes—so-called double or triple wides.

You will recall that last year the Congress enacted housing legislation, H.R. 6655, which included provisions for raising both the dollar amounts and loan maturity terms for FHA insured mobile homes. These maximum amounts were increased to $16,000 for single unit homes and to $24,000 for double unit homes. In addition, loan maturity terms were extended to 23 years for the double unit homes.

These increases were seriously considered during debate on the housing bill, both on the floor of the House, as well as in the conference committee. There should be little question, then, as to the "intent" of the Congress in this area.

To date, HUD has seen fit only to come forth with a proposed rule which would increase the maturity period for a "single-wide" mobile home loan from 12 years and 32 days to 15 years and 32 days. The Department still has not announced a proposal on increasing the loan maturity terms on multisection or "double-wide" mobile home loans.

Apparently, the Department of Housing and Urban Development did not get Congress message. Let me refresh HUD's memory: The Congress wants the extension of loan maturity terms for not only FHA-insured "single-wide" mobile homes, but also for multisection or "double-wides" as well. The Congress will not tolerate any regulation or rule which blatantly ignores the needs of lower income families who may look to the manufactured housing industry as a means to homeownership.

Why has not HUD extended the loan maturity terms for multisection houses? Their reasoning centers on the perpetual myth that the multisection unit mobile home will not last for 23 years. I find this position by HUD to be both shocking and ludicrous, especially since all mobile homes are now built to HUD's own standards. Is the Congress to be told now that the Department has implemented such poor construction standards that multisection homes cannot last for the 3 additional years authorized in the housing legislation?

In an extensive HUD-commissioned study of the mobile home industry, conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Prof. Arthur D. Bernhardt summarized the situation. He said:

> Extensive nationwide interviews . . . suggest that the economic life of a mobile home is considerably longer than is commonly assumed and that it may be close to the life of a conventional home.

Data based on research into the question of durability is scarce. However, there is strong evidence that the mobile home structure does have a useful life approaching that of conventional housing.

For example, according to information supplied by the Department of Defense, at a site in North Dakota, the Air Force has 111 mobile homes which have been in use for dependent housing since 1947 and which the Air Force intends to use until at least 1980.

Data drawn from the Bureau of the Census' 1974 "Annual Housing Survey" provides substantial evidence concerning the durability of mobile home structures. According to the survey, there are at least 6,000 mobile homes currently in use as housing which were constructed in 1949 or earlier. While total industry production for the year 1949 was approximately 46,000 units, it must be borne in mind that, at that time, most such units were travel trailers and nothing like the mobile homes of today. Indeed it was not until the 1960's that the industry divided into two separate industries to produce mobile homes (dwellings) and recreational vehicles (travel). Therefore, it appears safe to assume that a substantial portion of units produced in 1949 and earlier, for housing rather than travel trailers, are still in use today.

Last week HUD Secretary Patricia Roberts Harris released the final report by the Task Force on Housing Costs. Among other things, the task force concluded that the price of a newly constructed single-family home is now beyond the reach of most American families. If HUD has such a deep concern for the provision of adequate and affordable shelter for low- and moderate-income American families, then it certainly has a strange method of showing it. By raising FHA dollar ceilings but keeping maturity terms low, the Department is imposing higher monthly payments on those families who can least afford it. The result would be that the families HUD seeks to help are in reality being denied affordable housing by the Government's own policies.

I think it is time that HUD carry out the expressed goals and intent of the Congress by issuing implementing regulations for not only extension of the loan maturity terms for FHA-insured "single-wide" mobile homes, but for multisection homes as well. ●

SOVIET ATTEMPTS TO CENSOR AMERICAN NEWS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the civil suit brought this week against two American correspondents in Moscow is a clear indication of Soviet attempts to intimidate all Western correspondents there and prevent them from transmitting full reports of news in the Soviet Union. Harold Piper of the Baltimore Sun and Craig Whitney of the New York Times have now joined the roster of American journalists who over the past 2 years have been subject to intensified harassment by the Soviet authorities because of Soviet displeasure over their contacts with and reports about human rights activists. This time, the Soviets have taken the new and particularly alarming tactic of filing a defamation suit in a Soviet court against the two correspondents for articles they had written in American newspapers which only a handful of privileged people in the Soviet Union may even see. In initiating the absurd civil suit against Messrs. Piper and Whitney, the Soviet authorities have again demonstrated the disdain in which they hold the pledges they signed in the Helsinki Final Act.

Despite the Final Act's promise "to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds," the Soviet Government still maintains it holds a monopoly over "true" information and may therefore censor through harassment those who do not print the Soviets' exclusive version of what is true. Despite the Final Act's reaffirmation "that the legitimate pursuit of their professional activity will neither render journalists liable to expulsion nor otherwise penalize them," foreign journalists in Moscow must live with the constant fear of arbitrary reprisals against them. And despite the Final Act's pledge to "increase the opportunities for journalists of the participating States to communicate personally with their source," the Soviets have, for the last 2 years, mounted a coordinated campaign to interrupt all unofficial contacts and thus stifle the voices of dissent in their own society.

Such a crude form of censorship is anathema to Western reporting which relies on the freedom to write and the freedom to contact all types of sources. It is also contrary to the basic principles of confidence and mutual understanding on which the tenuous structure of superpower détente rests. A society which closes itself to inquiry from the outside says to the world that it fears impartial scrutiny and is not fit to take part in the global search for a stable peace.

If the case brought against the two correspondents is actually heard in a Moscow court, the outside world will be watching the fairness of the proceedings. Will the defendants be permitted to mount a real, expert, well-advised defense? Will they be given the time they need to prepare their case and a full hearing of their side? Will they be held accountable for the veracity of sources whose views they reported in good faith? Or will their trial, like the ugly spectacles we have already seen this year in the trials of Yuri Orlov, Vladimir Slepak, Pyotr Vins, Mykola Matusevych and other Helsinki watchers, be a drumhead tribunal?

It is not Mr. Piper and Mr. Whitney who are on trial: it is the Soviet Union—the fairness of its judiciary system, the decency of its laws, and the spirit of its international undertakings.

Many American newspapers have already commented on this unprecedented and alarming case. Recent editorials in the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, and the Washington Post are included below and should be of interest to all of us:

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 28, 1978]

A CIVIL SUIT IN MOSCOW

With police state perversity, the Soviet Union seems to be in the process of turning a post-Stalinist liberalizing revision of its legal code into an instrument for harassing American reporters.

Hal Piper of The Sun, the senior U.S. correspondent in Moscow, and Craig R. Whitney, of the New York Times bureau, have been summoned to appear in Kalanchevskaya City Court today. The charge is one of slander probably arising from stories both wrote last month challenging the credibility of a television broadcast in which a well-known Georgian dissident, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, recanted his criticisms of the Soviet system.

The press department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry has informed Mr. Piper and Mr. Whitney that the civil suit has been brought by Gosteleradio, the state television and radio administration, evidently on the ground that it had been defamed. If the situation were not so outrageous, it would be laughable.

According to American experts in Soviet law, a civil slander provision was included in the 1961 fundamental principles of civil law in order to give aggrieved Soviet citizens a chance to sue the state-controlled press. Before, none had recourse against published but unproven condemnations.

Two years ago Alfred Friendly, Jr., then a correspondent for Newsweek magazine, cited this statute in a suit filed against the Moscow Literary Gazette for alleging he was an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency. The suit was not pursued to its conclusion, but the gesture must have rankled.

In the middle of May, according to Mr. Piper's dispatches, Tass quoted Mr. Gamsakhurdia as saying that Mr. Friendly, with whom he was acquainted, had produced "an adverse effect" on him. Then came the nationwide TV program in which the Georgia dissident allegedly confessed his supposed crimes and mistakes. Shortly after, Mr. Piper and Mr. Whitney were in Tbilisi, the Georgia capital, where friends of the dissident noted his changed appearance in the broadcast and speculated the program had been spliced together.

The Sun, of course, deplores this harassment of its Moscow correspondent. Mr. Piper is a careful, probing, highly professional journalist whose work for four years has been relatively free of Soviet attack. Indeed, President Leonid Brezsnev said last October that The Sun's reporting on the new Soviet constitution was "more or less" objective.

It is sad to see the Kremlin converting a liberal provision in its civil code into a bludgeon against the Western press. This not only defies protections for journalists in the Helsinki accords but damages detente. Soviet authorities would be well advised to stop the whole travesty and get on with more positive activities.

[The New York Times, June 29, 1978]

AN ACT OF SOVIET INSECURITY

If "slander" in the Soviet sense of the word is now going to hang as a legal sword over the heads of Western correspondents in the Soviet Union, fair and full reporting on Soviet society will soon become impossible. And if the Soviet Government has really thought through the implications of this new policy, then even more serious speculation is in order about the present course of that society.

To threaten correspondents with fines and jail for what they write—for non-Soviet readers—is to attempt to extend the laws of Soviet totalitarian society to the free institutions of the West. Forget Helsinki and all the pious pledges about facilitating the flow of information and ideas. This kind of bullying will make reporting from Moscow either wholly suspect or useless. It will invite retaliation against Soviet correspondents. It will ruin other forms of communication. It will further endanger relations.

Our concern goes beyond The Time's obvious interest in this matter. One of our correspondents in Moscow, Craig Whitney, and Harold Piper of The Baltimore Sun, were summoned to a civil court yesterday morning by the State Committee for Radio and Television to face a suit for "slander." The charge, as they understand it, is that they bear responsibility for the views of persons they interviewed during a visit to Soviet Georgia. Those persons challenged the authenticity of a televised confession by a convicted Georgian political dissenter and the state committee presumably feels officially libeled. It seeks relief by a published retraction as well as punishment of the correspondents.

Suits of this kind cannot be brought in the Soviet Union without the knowledge and consent of the highest Government authorities. Those authorities have been particularly aggrieved in recent years by the access that Western reporters have had to political dissenters, who have risked severe punishment for the chance to air their grievances to the world.

It is conceivable that these dissenters are in fact the intended targets of the Soviet action and that the new policy of intimidation strikes only incidentally at Western reporters. But whatever its motives, this Soviet move is a step backward toward the darkest hours of the cold war. It is an act of fear and insecurity by a global power that purports to be unafraid of peaceful competition, which surely includes the most elementary contact with the rest of the world. Let us hope it is all a mistake.

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1978]

SPIRAL OF SHIN-KICKING

We are angered as journalists and troubled as citizens by the Soviet Union's apparently unprecedented decision to bring civil slander charges against two American correspondents in Moscow—for reporting they had been told that a dissident's televised "confession" to a charge of anti-Soviet agitation had been falsified. It is an escalation in kind of the "normal" intimidation practiced on the foreign press. It represents an evident effort at censorship. It is a plain violation of the Soviet government's Helsinki pledge to permit journalists to do their professional work. Further, it substantially adds to the queasiness many people feel over Moscow's hosting of the 1980 Olympics. Just what controls do the Russians plan to impose on the Olympic press?

That is, unfortunately, not all. When the

United States last month arrested and held on high bail two Soviet spy suspects (rather than simply expelling them in the usual manner), the Kremlin tersely stated that "two can play at this game" and locked up an American businessman in Moscow. Quiet diplomacy has since gotten all three of these men out of jail, perhaps as prelude to a swap that, however distasteful from a legal standpoint, has a certain political rationale. Just as American officials were hoping that this upward spiral of shin-kicking had been halted, however, the suits were filed against the correspondents of the Baltimore Sun and The New York Times. Between the announcement of the suits on Tuesday and the actual bringing of them Wednesday, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance raised the matter with the Soviet ambassador. The Soviet government nontheless chose to proceed.

Protests are important but, we fear, inadequate. Timely reciprocal action to protect the integrity of the American news-gathering process in Moscow is called for. There should be no action taken against Soviet correspondents for what they write: That is not the American way and, anyway, the American judicial system does not lend itself to the Soviet sort of political manipulation. But retaliatory action should be taken to restrict the ability of Soviet journalists in Washington to do their professional work. For journalistic and other reasons. Moscow values the license to rub shoulders and roam that its correspondents enjoy amply here. While the specter of judcial intimidation hovers over American journalists in the Soviet Union, that license for Soviet press representatives in America should be abridged.●

BILL TANSILL RETIRES FROM LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is about to lose the service of one of the greatest research specialists the Library of Congress has ever employed: Mr. William R. Tansill who is to retire soon.

In an atmosphere of many talents, Bill Tansill stands alone in my judgment for his unfailing professionalism and superb skills. It has been my pleasure and privilege to use the research material provided by Bill Tansill for many years and in each instance his work was invaluable to me and my constituents.

I first encountered Bill in 1950 when he wrote the initial review of Guam by the Library of Congress. Since that time, his interest in all of the territories has remained highly active. As a result, there today exists in the Library a wealth of information about the islands, their development, both economic and political. The contribution he has made to history and a better understanding of the events that transpired between the islands and the Federal Government from 1950 to now will be deeply appreciated by scholars for many decades.

Because no one has a more thorough memory of Federal regulations with all of the territories than has Bill Tansill, his unique abilities will be deeply missed. While I am confident that others who follow Bill at the Library will be of highest qualifications, it has been comforting to know that he was always close at hand to institute some original research and carry it out with an unbeatable degree of expertise.

There is a time, however, when even the most dedicated of workers must find time to enjoy themselves. More than most, Bill Tansill has richly earned his moment in the sun. I wish him every happiness in his retirement and pray that good health will follow him forever. He is one of a kind and may he find retirement as rewarding to his interests as we have found his skills to ours.

Thank you.●

1977 LEGISLATIVE EXPENSE DISCLOSURE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the following figures show what amounts were authorized and spent by expense classification for my legislative duties during 1977.

Recently, the House began publishing actual expenses as vouchered for each Member. The House publication, however, is difficult to understand. I hope the figures below will be more meaningful.

I am not an unrestrained fan of personal disclosures, but I think that discolosure of expenditures of the taxpayers' money is both appropriate and necessary.

Frenzel office expenses, 1977

Allowances	
Communications	$5,000.00
Computer	----------
Equipment lease	9,000.00
District office rent	12,701.25
Official expenses	2,000.00
Postage	211.00
Stationery	6,500.00
Travel	9,101.00
Telecommunications	10,041.67
Subtotal	54,554.92
Transfer from clerk hire	14,540.00
Total	69,094.92
Expenses	
Communications:	
Allowance	5,000.00
Transfer in	4,150.00
Expenses	(9,019.73)
Balance	130.27
Computer:	
Transfer in	8,274.00
Expenses	(6,810.68)
Balance	1,463.32
Equipment lease:	
Allowance	9,000.00
Transfer in	4,266.00
Expenses	(11,454.07)
Balance	1,811.93
District office rent:	
Allowance	12,701.25
Expenses	(11,269.01)
Balance	1,432.24
Official expenses:	
Allowance	$2,000.00
Transfer in	6,100.00
Expenses	(7,573.10)
Balance	526.90
Stationery:	
Allowance	6,500.00
Transfer out	(2,000.00)
Expenses	(3,230.75)
Balance	1,269.25
Telecommunications:	
Allowance	10,041.67
Transfer out	(4,550.00)
Expenses	(5,324.20)
Balance	167.47
Travel:	
Allowance	9,101.00
Transfer out	(1,700.00)
Expenses	(6,288.30)
Balance	1,112.70
Postage:	
Allowance	211.00
Expenses	(130.00)
Balance	81.00
Total allowance	69,094.92
Total expenses	61,099.84
Balance from 1977	7,995.08●

WHY BIG BROTHER IS SUCH AN EXPENSIVE RELATIVE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, now that proposition 13—or, rather soothsaying about what it all means—has become the latest national pastime, anyone with a burp or hiccup about government spending gets into the papers. Among the more intelligent pieces on fiscal responsibility I have seen appear recently in the Seattle newspaper, the Weekly, written by two members of the Washington State Legislature. I commend the article to my colleagues since it points to "a cultural dichotomy between individual support for personal services and government guarantees, and collective outrage and rebellion at the cumulative cost."

I believe the article may overstate the outrage at the level of taxation compared to the growing suspicion among citizens that they are not getting what they pay for. Justified or not, many citizens feel that the more we spend, the worse things get. There is a prevailing feeling among Americans that there must be a lot of waste somewhere in the interstices of government. It is this belief which allows citizens logically to want to cut taxes overall at the same time they want to maintain services.

The lesson I read is not that we must simply cut taxes and services, but that we absolutely must do a better job designing and overseeing programs. People have not turned against govern-

ment, but they certainly have turned a critical eye toward government.

I include the article, "Why Big Brother Is Such an Expensive Relative," in the RECORD at this point:

WHY BIG BROTHER IS SUCH AN EXPENSIVE RELATIVE

(By Helen Sommers and Will Knedlik)

"What government gives, government must first take away."

Few Americans consciously face up to this simple truism. Most citizens willingly accept the myriad government services offered; many expect more; and some actively and effectively demand greater benefits. At the same time, almost all complain about the growing costs of government.

Government has become the greatest of the big spenders. Despite increasing outrage by the paying public, the cost goes up and up. Federal, state, and local spending as a per cent of gross national product has nearly *tripled* since 1930, when it was 12.4 per cent: today it is 32.8 per cent.

Why this upward spiral? Federal, state, and local budgets show that increased costs come from new and expanding programs for the public welfare—programs developed on a vast scale and in an imaginative variety of ways. In 1960, social services were 23 per cent of the federal budget; today the percentage is almost double, or about 45 per cent.

Our general theory of why government costs so much is derived from observation of an evolving "social ethic," or rules of conduct for government.

Government "obligations" now extend far beyond such basics as providing a fair civil code, maintaining order, and protecting against foreign threat. Since 1937, government has increasingly been expected to perform as the grand humanitarian and ultimate provider; to act as the final employer; and to insure against virtually all risks of living.

These are not startling ideas, but rather reflect the dominant cultural and social beliefs of our time. Americans, by and large, do support higher social security benefits, better nursing care for the aged, special education for the mentally and physically handicapped, jobs for the unemployed, and help for the farmer struck by bad weather. This value system has been incorporated in a multitude of laws and programs. Americans like to think of Uncle Sam as a rugged individualist, but we now expect him to demonstrate the pervasive protective characteristics of a "Jewish mother."

Although Americans have developed the attitude that government is responsible for individual and personal welfare, increasingly we are unwilling to pay the price. We have developed a cultural dichotomy between individual support for personal services and government guarantees, and collective outrage and rebellion at the cumulative costs.

Tax rebellion is now turning from rhetoric to action. Within the last two years, several states have imposed lids on spending. New Jersey, Colorado, and Tennessee have enacted such limits. More states will follow in coming months. Last year Washington state voters repealed the sales taxes on food that had been imposed for decades. California voters have just drastically slashed property taxes. Yet if the taxpayer views politicians as rabid spenders the politician may hold an equally caustic view of the citizen. To the elected official, the citizen frequently appears to be the individual who votes for those politicians who promise the most, and then threatens impeachment when the bill is sent.

Rising standards and expectations are also the rule of our society. Consider the example of our changing requirements for housing. The average new house in the 1950s had 900 square feet of floor space, one bath, two bedrooms, a carport, and few kitchen extras. The average house in the 1970s has 1,500 square feet of floor space; two baths; wall-to-wall carpeting; dishwasher, disposal, and frost-free refrigerator; a two-car garage; and probably, air conditioning.

So it is with our expectation of government services. For example, the American concept of taxpayer-funded education has expanded rapidly—and expensively—in the last few decades. California early developed an extensive state system of higher education and the philosophy of a college degree within the reach of all. In the last 15 years, most states have established community college systems offering two years of college work and self-help courses ranging from basket-weaving to stock-market investments.

The community college system enjoys especially strong citizen support. Communities are proud of their colleges and the status and opportunities they afford. But of course they constitute a major new demand for tax money. It is illuminating, for example, to note that in Washington the community college system was developing during the same period that the state's percentage contribution toward total expenditures for the public schools was falling, and the schools were becoming increasingly dependent on local tax levies.

We are next embarking on another new era of education that illustrates both our heightened humanitarianism and our rising expectations of government.

Few new programs involve as much human emotion and genuine compassion as education for the handicapped. In 1971, the Washington State Legislature passed the "Education for all Act," providing specifically for the excess costs of educating the handicapped. The estimated biennial cost of the program ranged between $10 and $20 million. These estimates proved to be absurdly low. State funding for education to the handicapped has grown to $80 million in the present budget.

It is our observation that citizens believe that assisting the handicapped to develop to the best of their ability is an appropriate and long-neglected responsibility of society. But such programs add considerably to the rising cost of government against which those citizens, *as taxpayers*, are rebelling.

In the last decade, federal public employment programs have become another new major element in both state and local budget.

A Treasury Department study shows that federally funded workers now make up 16 per cent of employment in 48 major cities. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) is only five years old, but its annual cost has jumped from $2 billion to $11 billion. Millions of unemployed persons have benefited from these programs, but the addition to the annual tax burden is now $54.30 per capita. Congress would add to present legislation on guaranteed employment if it passed the Humphrey-Hawkins bill now under consideration.

Agriculture is another major example of taxpayer-funded guarantees with government playing the role of guarantor. Subsidies to farmers provide an especially ironic illustration of the conflict between vociferous support for individual benefits and outrage at the cumulative price, since farmers are frequently vocal critics of government costs. Farmers are also effective at reducing their own tax burden. Agriculture, although a major sector of the Washington economy, is totally exempt from the state business tax and enjoys very favorable property tax treatment and a rash of sales tax exemptions.

Agriculture is the one sector of our economy where individual producers openly demand that government guarantee against their personal business risks. The demand for government guarantees has intensified in recent months. Threatening a nationwide strike, farmers have staged tractor parades in states ranging from Florida to Washington and from Texas to Maryland. The taxpayers' burden for farm subsidies is growing: from $575 million in 1975 to more than $7 billion this year. These estimated subsidies will add $33.60 to the tax burden of every man, woman, and child in the country in 1978, all part of the cumulative cost of government causing the collective outrage.

Litigation has played still another key role in making government into the ultimate provider. Within the last decade, a wave of lawsuits brought by civil rights groups and government-funded public defender and legal aid offices has resulted in a pattern of judicial decisions mandating social services to be funded by the taxpayer. Further, some of the resulting judicial orders have added a precedent-setting twist to public charity by writing into case law and bureaucratic mentality the concept that government is liable whether it has the money or not.

Many of these cases have focused on jail services, especially medical services. The most dramatic—and costly—example of a lawsuit over such medical services occurred in San Francisco, where a group of citizen activists charged that inadquate services for prisoners constituted cruel and unusual punishment. In 1973, the group won judgment in the local federal district court. The cost of care for prisoners increased tenfold—from $300,000 per year to $3 million.

Threaded through such judicial mandates to government is an emerging philosophy about taxpayer responsibility: availability of financial resources is not relevant. Judges-turned-budget-writers are saying that the response of "We don't have the money," just doesn't matter.

In March of this year, a King County Superior Court decision directed the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services to provide elective surgery to low-income persons—whether or not the department had the funds available. The court asserted that the right to government-provided surgery to alleviate, prevent, or correct a medical condition is based on both the federal and state constitutions. If requested, even "elective" surgery may not be denied for fiscal reasons.

Newspapers and television also contribute in building the ethic of government's "duty" to provide for the less fortunate. This influence takes different forms, sometimes overt editorializing, but more frequently through focusing on misfortune and, especially on television, a 60-second dramatization of pathos.

Examples abound; flood victims, drought victims, the handicapped, the aged in substandard nursing homes, the poor in subsidized housing. All of these properly appeal to our humanitarian instincts. They are also a message to both bureaucrats and elected officials to do their duty—to provide.

The Seattle-area press has recently urged higher payments for nursing-home care of the aged, improved prison facilities, money for emergency medical services, more funds for education of the handicapped, increased public assistance grants, additional subsidized housing, more money for payments to crime victims, more money for the zoo, and more dog catchers.

A Tacoma daily newspaper raked local legislators for failing to act to expand higher education programs in Pierce County, despite the fact that the state's college and universities already have excess capacity. The paper's editorial policy is vehemently anti-spending and anti-taxes ordinarily, but it ignored questions of expenditure justification in demanding increased programs for its own area.

In this state, the voters themselves have directly created new programs. Exercising initiative powers, which allow citizen-written statutes to be approved at the polls, Wash-

ington voters have imposed additional obligations on government.

A "Shorelines Management Act," significantly expanding land-use management duties at the state and local levels, was approved in 1970. That same year the voters initiated a litter control program, with management and clean-up responsibility imposed on the state. In 1972 citizens wrote a public disclosure law and set up a new state commission charged with collecting vast amounts of data on political campaigns, watchdogging campaign financing, and reviewing the use or abuse of government property. And in 1977 the voters established a program of restrictions on water permits—more administrative work for the state.

How to deal with the rising costs? How to deal with the dichotomy of individual demands and collective refusal to pay?

A visible relationship between costs and benefits is essential as a first step. Few mechanisms now exist to assist taxpayers in this way. Earmarking of taxes has serious drawbacks because it becomes outdated so fast. Nonetheless, we believe that judicious use of earmarking—to tie major program costs to benefits—needs to be reexamined as a possible method to assist taxpayers to better evaluate both what they want and what they are willing to pay for. Our present Social Security system and the proposed national health insurance are programs especially suited to this kind of cost/benefit linkage.

Another mechanism to illustrate the costs of programs is to describe those costs in per capita terms. Would it help voters, and politicians, to better judge the worth of CETA if it were common knowledge that this job program costs each of us $54.30 this year? And how do we feel about farm subsidies adding $33.60 to each and every tax bill?

We also believe that politicians have a major responsibility to continuously inform the public, and to remind the media, that it is the assumption of new responsibilities and the proliferation of programs that are adding to their tax bill. It is estimated that medical costs are 8.8 per cent of GNP. But no advocate of national health care points out this potential addition to the tax level would bring government spending to over 40 per cent of GNP.

Why then does government cost so much?

It costs so much because Americans have changed the rules of conduct for government. We have expanded government responsibilities. We have designated government as the great humanitarian provider of social services, and as a guarantor against risks. And we have applied our rising level of expectations to government services as well as private circumstances. Waste also adds to the cost, of course, but more attention must be directed at increased services as the greatest factor in the rising tax burden.

In all of this, we do not mean to criticize development of the humanitarian ethic about the role of government. No judgment is intended, of right or wrong, helpful or harmful, appropriate or inappropriate. Our purpose is to describe an evolving concept and to draw attention to the inconsistency of "free lunch" expectations. It is our further purpose to stimulate discussion, to invite dialogue and critique. The problem is how to formulate a social ethic that taxpayers can live with, both emotionally and financially.●

BEST WISHES TO MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH C. LYNCH

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by the institution of marriage does not appear to fare as well as it once did. When a couple reaches a wedding anniversary of 50 years, surely we must commend them. Yesterday, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph C. Lynch, currently residing in West Hyannisport, Mass., achieved this milestone.

Joseph was born on March 1, 1903, while his wife, the former Alice M. Coyle, was born on January 22, 1904. They were married in the Sacred Heart Church in their hometown of Taunton, Mass., on this day in 1928. They have lived in various localities over the years, spending many years in the State of Connecticut.

This Saturday, their daughter, Margaret, is having an anniversary party for them at the Dunphy's resort in Hyannis, Mass. Members of the family will be coming from near and far to attend, including their two granddaughters. Best wishes to the Lynches on a most cherished wedding anniversary—the golden one.●

AN UNSUNG HERO OF THE BATAAN DEATH MARCH

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the inspiring story of Mr. Nicholas F. Fryziuk, one of the heroic survivors of the infamous Bataan Death March of World War II. His undying spirit and sense of loyalty under the most trying conditions warrant special recognition, especially on the occasion of the upcoming Fourth of July, when this Nation's attention is focused on patriotic sentiment.

Nick's military service began in 1940, when he enlisted in the Illinois National Guard and was assigned mechanical duties due to prior experience as a maintenance mechanic and millwright at Corn Products Refining Co. in his hometown of Argo, Ill. Later, that same year, Nick became federalized and started training at the First Armored Division School at Fort Knox, Ky. There, he graduated from his training class within 1 week, due to his expertise in advanced mechanical maintenance and was then assigned to B Company of the 192d Tank Battalion with the rank of first-class mechanics specialist.

In 1941, Nick had the honor of being nominated for Officer's Candidate School because of his fine service record and in view of his unique ability to speak numerous foreign languages, such as Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian, which qualified him for intelligence assignments. However, Nick had to refuse the Army's offer since he desired to return to civilian life upon his discharge, which was only 18 months away.

Later, that same year, Nick's life underwent traumatic and turbulent changes in that he was transferred to the Philippine Islands and stationed at Clark Air Field prior to the Japanese air attack on that facility on December 8, 1941. After this initial attack, he was sent to North Luzon to prepare for the impending Japanese invasion. While defending the island, Nick was wounded four times in less than 4 months. Against overwhelming odds, American forces finally fell before the might of the Imperial Japanese Army. Nick himself was captured at Bataan and forced to make the grueling death march, in which many men lost their lives, to Camp O'Donnell, the first POW camp set up by the Japanese.

Nick Fryziuk survived that march and the 3½ years of imprisonment that followed. But he did much more than survive. He carried on the struggle against his Japanese captors by sabotaging and harassing the enemy in every way possible, even though he knew that, should he be caught, the penalty was death.

The following are sworn testimonials from men Nick served with and their stories speak clearly of his brave acts:

William A. Hauser, 192nd Tank Battalion: "On April 12, 1942, while on the Death March, I was wounded by a fragment of a shell Corrigidor had fired at the Japanese batteries dug in at Cabcaben field. Fryziuk, who was walking alongside of me at the time, stopped to give me first aid with bandages and medications he had hid from the Japanese. The guards not only made threats to those who stopped but also to those who went to their aid. The danger of these threats were very real because time and time again I witnessed the killing of those who were hurt or sick and instances where men were killed who attempted to help them."

William A. Hauser: "Late in 1942 and a good part of 1943, Fryziuk was on a work detail driving trucks out of Ft. McKinley. These truckers were supplying Japanese troops as far north as Bagio. With his usual talent, Fryziuk was soon able to accumulate extra food stuffs, petrol and some ammunition. These supplies he managed to smuggle out to guerrilla forces north of Manila. Confirmation of this activity was given to me by a Col. Shia Sheng, whom I met in Manila in 1967. During the war, he was a commissioned officer in the Chinese Army, who had been sent to the Philippines prior to the war to organize the Chinese community into a guerrilla movement if and when the Japanese started a war. They operated in Manila and in the vicinity of Mt. Arat and Clark Air Field."

Sgt. Robert V. Parr (POW), 192nd Tank Battalion, Co. B: "I was in the same unit with Nick Fryziuk in the Philippines on the island of Luzon at the start of World War II in Company B, 192nd Tank Battalion. We were among the first units to engage the Japanese after their landing at Linguen Gulf. I was with units of Company B at the Carmen River, Northern Luzon when Sergeant Fryziuk was wounded by enemy rifle fire as he made repairs on disabled tanks. These tanks would have been lost if emergency repairs had not been made. Although wounded, Sergeant Fryziuk continued to do his duty, rather than go away to safety and medical attention. His devotion to the maintenance of the 192nd Battalion tanks continued during our army's retreat from Northern Luzon and later during the Battle of Bataan.

"I was wounded in the stomach and back, prior to the surrender of Bataan and forced to make the Death March. I would not have survived the ordeal without the aid and assistance of Sergeant Fryziuk, who literally carried me at times. When the other sick and wounded faltered and could not longer go on, the Japanese guards shot or bayonet-

ted them. I escaped that fate, thanks to the courage of Nick Fryziuk.

"Arriving at San Fernando, Pampanga, we were crammed into railroad cattle box cars. Sergeant Fryziuk not only continued to help me, but he also saved another member of our company (Kenneth A. Heinrich), overcome by the heat and lack of water. Sergeant Fryziuk kept us from being crushed and gave us water he had. When we arrived at Capas (illegibile), Nick continued to help me make the march to the POW camp (O'Donnell)."

Ralph W. Cherry, Platoon Sgt., USMC Retired, 4th Marines: "I was sent on quite a few details by the Japanese as a POW. On October 22, I was sent to Camp McKinley in Manila with 69 other Americans. Here I was put as Number 1 in charge. This detail was with the Quartermaster of the Japanese. Our job was to haul supplies to the Japanese units in the Manila area. Here is where I got to know Sgt. Fryziuk, as we were on several details together. I also got to see things Sgt. Fryziuk did in helping the geurrillas, such as dumping supplies at pre-arranged sites where they could pick them up. Nick would do things to the truck so we would break down and while the Japanese were fixing it, he would be dumping food, fuel and anything that would help the guerrillas against the Japanese. If we were caught, we knew we would be in trouble and our lives could end very quickly.

"However, Sgt. Fryziuk would keep his war going against the Japanese just the same. After we accomplished this detail, half of us were sent to the port area in Manila, where we were joined by 400 other Americans under the command of Lt. Cmdr. George G. Harrison, USN. Here, we were on details loading and unloading ships with all kinds of supplies. Sgt. Fryziuk picked up his operations again. We made tools which would help us sabotage equipment of the Japanese. One was a tool to open caps on 55 gallon drums of gas, so when we loaded them, we could turn them upside down so they would leak. By doing this, two ships (tankers) blew up in the harbor after pulling away from the dock.

"Also Sgt. Fryziuk served as a corpsman in helping Lt. Cmdr. Harrison return to health after he was confined to Sandago dungeon for 89 days. When the Japanese let Harrison out, he was so weak he couldn't feed or bathe himself. With the aid of Sgt. Fryziuk, Lt. Comdr. Harrison returned to health and gradually regained his strength.

"At all times, Sgt. Fryziuk knew if he were caught, his punishment would be very hard but this did not stop him from carrying out his missions."

Nick Fryziuk remained a prisoner of the Imperial Japanese Government until August 16, 1945, when he and eight other men escaped and made their way to Yokohama, Japan, where they had the pleasure of meeting, Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his staff, prior to the final peace being signed aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 2, 1945.

After treatment in various hospitals and returning home to the United States, Nick Fryziuk was honorably discharged on May 4, 1946. He then returned to work for his former employer, Corn Products Refining Co., where he worked his way through the ranks to become first line supervisor, overseeing eight foreman in the production of Mazola corn oil and cattlefeed.

In 1973, Nick was forced to retire, due to war wounds and prison camp disabilities. He has been active in numerous organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled Veterans, Ex-Prisoners of War, Bataan-Corregidor, and the Alhambra Group for Retarded Children. Civilian honors include his selection as North Central regional director of Ex-POW's and commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Post 6863, of Summit, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, many of the dangerous and herioc acts Nick undertook demanded courage above and beyond the call of duty. Some of these acts have been officially recognized, as is evident by his receipt of the following decorations:

(1) Distinguished Unit Badge with 1st and 2nd Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters.
(2) Army Commendation Ribbon.
(3) Philippine Defense Ribbon with 1 Bronze Battle Star.
(4) Asiatic Pacific Theater Ribbon with 1 Bronze Battle Star.
(5) American Defense Service Ribbon with Bronze Star.
(6) Purple Heart Medal with 1st Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster.
(7) Good Conduct Medal.
(8) Victory Medal.
(9) American Theater Ribbon.
(10) Service Stripe.
(11) Seven overseas service bars.
(12) Army of Occupation Medal (Japan).

But, without a doubt, the highest recognition given this unsung hero comes not from the Department of the Army, but from the men Nick served with, for I should like to point out that the testimonies related here were sworn to and freely given by Nick's former comrades, who felt that, despite his numerous decorations, sufficient recognition had not been granted this extraordinary soldier and patriot.

Therefore, S. Sgt. Nicholas F. Fryziuk, on the behalf of your former commrades in arms and from the people of the Illinois Fifth Congressional District, I say to you, "Well done."●

ROCHESTER RALLIES AGAINST AMERICAN NAZI PARTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate on Sunday, June 25, in a program with many of my fellow Rochesterians who rallied at Rochester's Liberty Pole to exercise our inalienable right of free speech. I am speaking, of course, about a rally which coincided with similar demonstrations across the country expressing our solidarity with men and women of different religious, national, and ethnic origins. This rally, which took place on a day designated by the Congress as National Brotherhood Day, was our way of telling the world that although the Constitution recognizes the right of all Americans to exercise free speech, it does not advocate the kind of hatred, ridicule, and vulgarity which American Nazis spewed forth on Saturday.

During the Liberty Pole Rally, two very poignant speeches were delivered by men long admired and respected by Rochesterians, Rabbi Judea Miller and Canon St. Julian Simpkins, Jr. Their remarks, which echoed my feelings that we must help unite our country and not tear it apart, follows:

STATEMENT OF THE REV. CANNON ST. JULIAN A. SIMPKINS, JR.

The demonstrations of the American Nazi Party are not only a flaunting of our basic principles of liberty, justice and freedom, but they repudiate all that we, a free people, lived and died for.

The Bill of Rights, of free speech and assembly, were designed by our founding fathers to protect the rights and liberties of every freedom loving citizen, not to give license to hate groups, to spread their venomous bigotry and their cancerous intolerance and hatred.

The American Nazi Party is as repugnant to our system of values as it is destructive. It is as dehumanizing and as destructive of human life and liberty as colonial slavery was dehumanizing on those slaves in the 18th and 19th centuries. The Judeo-Christian ethic which undergirds the tradition of our democracy, the deep moral and spiritual traditions which fashioned us into one great people, are too great to be destroyed by the self seeking of a demented hate group. The American system of democracy abhors the very existence of this group among us.

Any system which would attempt to wantonly destroy 6 million of God's created—is not only repugnant to our creed, but must be tenaciously fought by us and destroyed, for the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to be free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, desiring their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

Only our vigilance will rid us of this debauchery.

STATEMENT OF RABBI JUDEA B. MILLER

In a bizarre, absurd way, the Nazis in Chicage have done us a service. Because they reminded us. A generation has grown up since the days of the Holocaust and the Second World War. A generation has arisen that remembers not Hitler and his mad hordes of killers, who murdered one out of every three Jews in the world—six million! Even the numbers are numbing. For how can one mourn six million? Each was a universe of love and joy: children for the sake of whose smiles it seemed as though the sun itself would shine; gray-headed elders who deserved to complete their days more gently.

Who knows how many potential Mendelsohns, or Gershwins or Copelands or Ernest Bloch were snuffed out before the world could hear their song? How many Marc Chagalls or Sigmund Freuds or Albert Einsteins had their lives brutally ended before giving the world the blessing of their talents? Who knows whether the Jewish child who could have grown up to rid the world of the scourge of cancer, had his life snuffed out prematurely in the Nazi camps of anni-

hilation? The loss to the human spirit is incalculable.

The loss of each was a personal tragedy, unfathomable. Their blood cries out too silently from the earth. So we have not heard. From the ghettoes and camps of slaughter arose the cries of victims. The world did not want to hear then, it tries not to remember now.

All who are born must die, but how shall we compare the slow passage of our time with the callous slaughter of the innocent, cut off before their time? They lived with faith. Not all, but many. And surely many died with faith; faith in God, in life, in the goodness that even flames cannot destroy. They have left their lives to us.

But we tried to forget. Memory is painful. So these Nazi hoodlums in Chicago have done us a service. For they have provoked us to remember. No doubt many of the young, born after the Holocaust have not known; or being told, they did not believe. They thought we exaggerated those grim days. It could not have happened, so they thought. Now they know. These sadistic hoodlums in storm trooper uniforms with swastika armbands and their spiritual bloodbrothers bedecked in white sheets of the KKK and with crosses afire—whether in Skokie or Marquette Park or in Tupelo, Mississippi—they have risen like a shadow from a bygone day, an ugly echo from the past, a nightmare from a dream half-forgotten—to remind us. Yes, it did happen and it can happen again. The victim may again be the Jew or he may be the Black or Chicano, or the Biafran or Cambodian. But it can happen again. And it may happen if we do not remember. The dreadful, hate-filled Amaleks are still with us and we must be alert.

For where ever and when ever a fellow human being is disesteemed because of the color of his skin, or the faith in which he worships, or for the birthplace of his forefathers, there Nazism still stalks the earth. We dare not forget the pain of yesterday, nor ignore the pain of today. For if there is goodness at the heart of life, then its power, like the power of evil, is real.

Which will prevail? Moment by moment we choose between them. If we choose rightly, and often enough, the broken fragments of our world will be restored to wholeness. That is why we are here today at this hour, the hour originally selected by the Nazis to march in Skokie. That they have decided the last moment not to march this day in Skokie is irrelevant. Because they will march another day in another Skokie or in Marquette Park or someplace else to broadcast their hate, to spread their venom and to terrorize the survivors of the last Holocaust, or the potential victims of some possible future Holocaust.

Our response is to reaffirm now our dedication to the humane ideals of our nation, the ideals of equality and respect for people of all races and all religions. This is our way of indicating our support to the people of Skokie and to Holocaust survivors everywhere and to state once and for all that we will never again permit the degradation and massacre of people because of their race or religion.

Even the profoundest truths become dead dogmas if they are not fearlessly and frequently exclaimed. The American goal is to achieve equality and universal human rights for all. In defense of these values, half a million American lives were sacrificed fighting against Nazism in the Second World War. We come together to affirm that those sacrifices were not in vain and to rededicate ourselves to the truths of America.

Recently we observed the Bicentennial of America, the two hundred years of our founding as an independent nation. This gathering here today is in large measure the real Bicentennial observance, the sort of observance that is worthy of an America that is great. For we are reaffirming our dedication to the humane values of a democratic, free society where all may live out their lives with dignity and freedom from fear. We dare not forget.●

CONCERNS ABOUT THE MAGNETIC FUSION PROGRAM

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the administration's policy on the magnetic fusion program in the Department of Energy. Magnetic containment is the most promising avenue to harnessing the tremendous power locked in the nucleus of the hydrogen atom. The program is entering a critical phase wherein large facilities now being built may demonstrate "burn" which is the first big proof-of-concept step for magnetic fusion. The major facility aimed at demonstrating scientific feasibility is the Tokamak fusion test reactor (TFTR) now under construction by the Department of Energy at the Princeton Plasma Physics Lab. The TFTR authorization was completed in our energy research and development administration bill for fiscal year 1978.

Recently the Department of Energy has considered everything from "no-growth" to massive cuts in the magnetic fusion program. As a member of the Science and Technology Committee and ranking minority member on the Science Research and Technology Subcommittee I am deeply concerned about the direction in which the administration is headed. In the light of the President's attempt to kill the Clinch River breeder project it is particularly puzzling that they would pull back on our most viable long-term alternative for energy supply.

The distinguished ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee, Mr. JOHN WYDLER of New York, stated his apprehension about DOE's policy on fusion in a recent letter to Mr. Dale Myers, the Undersecretary. I recommend this letter to my colleagues since it articulates several of my own concerns about this technology development program and puts the administration on continuing notice that the Congress is serious about energy supply:

COMMITTEE ON
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1978.

Hon. DALE MYERS,
Undersecretary, Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DALE: Several matters have come to my attention on the Magnetic Fusion program which I believe are cause for concern.

First of all, I have heard rumblings that the program may receive large cuts via FY 79 reprogramming and reductions in the FY 80 budget request which will set it back at least five years in technology development. This seems to me ill-advised and coupled with the Administration's continued reluctance to press breeder development it raises questions about our long-term energy options.

I have kept a close eye on the Magnetic Confinement program in the Tokamak area partly because of the vital involvement of Grumman Aerospace in the TFTR Project. I had been heartened by the move toward increasing industry involvement which is the only way to ensure that the technology becomes commercial. Grumman's key involvement in TFTR is already facing major cutbacks because of the recent decision to opt for a level-of-effort approach to program funding. These major cutbacks being contemplated now will destroy industry involvement in the program and delay commercialization by at least a decade.

Secondly, there has been some discussion of the possibility that the Magnetic Fusion program would be transferred into the Office of Energy Research under Dr. Deutch. I cannot imagine a clearer signal to the industrial participants that DOE is no longer serious about moving magnetic fusion through technology development into engineering systems activity. I'm certain that this transfer would also impact the level of interest by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). The MFE program has been blessed by early utility interest but this would certainly receive a setback if DOE tells the entire fusion community that they should merely "mark time."

Even if large cuts are not made in Magnetic Fusion, I have concern with the use of resources at the current pace of the MFE program. The TFTR activity must now phase down and Grumman forces the serious problem of retaining 150 or so key people in whom the nation has made considerable investment. These engineers and scientists developed great expertise in advanced technology via aerospace R&D and have gotten their "feet wet" in fusion for over two years with TFTR. I think this sad circumstance raises a question about planning of the technology development program so that principal contractors' resources are used in a more optimum fashion and "valleys" in manpower are avoided. There is a national investment in these groups and, just as for the skilled plasma physicists at the universities, the program planning should consider retaining at least valuable core groups. In this manner, bits of the "corporate memory" so vital to the progress of technology development can be retained.

Dale, I appreciate the range of institutional and programmatic problems you are confronted with now. However, I trust you will retain the MFE program under Bob Thorne and protect it from "near-sighted" massive cuts which will most certainly cripple the program and discourage industry participation. I would be happy to discuss all aspects of this problam at your earliest convenience.

With all best wishes,
Sincerely,

JOHN W. WYDLER,
Ranking Minority Member.●

PERSONAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is my 1977 consolidated financial statement which describes my assets, liabilities, net worth, income, and taxes paid in 1977. Again this year, I am pleased to insert this personal financial

statement in the RECORD for review by my constituents:

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB KASTEN, JANUARY 15, 1978

ASSETS

Savings account	$988.34
Checking account	1,354.07
Automobile (1975 Ford Granada)	3,675.00
Real estate-Residential (Washington, D.C.)	75,000.00
Common Stock:	
Genesco, Inc.—1,000 shares	4,250.00
Household goods and other personal property	15,000.00
U.S. Civil Service Retirement Fund	11,293.77
Town and Country Shop	20,000.00
Life Insurance (Cash Value)	4,274.13
Total assets	135,835.31

LIABILITIES

Mortgage on real property (Washington, D.C.)	53,901.30
Unsecured loan	6,800.00
Automobile loan	952.80
Total liabilities	61,654.10
Net worth	74,107.08

INCOME

Salary	54,275.00
Honoraria	500.00
Interest (Savings Account)	48.18
Dividend Income	83.97

TAXES PAID

Federal	7,218.00
State of Wisconsin	2,976.64
Other	805.00

●

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice has been working for some time now on the recodification of the Federal criminal laws. We have devoted considerable effort to this project, holding extensive hearings at which we received testimony from over 100 witnesses. Markup of legislation is well underway.

The subject of sentencing has emerged as a focal point of much of our work, and a great deal of testimony and commentary was received about it. A major sentencing issue, of course, concerns capital punishment. Although several current provisions of Federal criminal law permit imposition of capital punishment, only one of these provisions appears to meet the constitutional standards described by the U.S. Supreme Court in its decisions in Furman against Georgia and subsequent cases.

Capital punishment legislation, as we are all aware, raises sensitive issues and generally proves to be quite controversial. Previous experience with recodification legislation indicates that the inclusion of capital punishment provisions constitutes a serious impediment to its enactment. On the other hand, a thorough consideration of a modernized criminal code requires confronting the issue of capital punishment.

The Senate's approach, and one which strikes the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice as being sound, has been to deal separately with the issue of capital punishment. This permits the recodification legislation to be considered on its own merits, without attention being deflected to the more controversial issue of capital punishment. At the same time, it allows for expedited consideration of capital punishment legislation. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee has reported a capital punishment bill, S. 1382, which the Senate Judiciary Committee is expected to take up shortly.

The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, therefore, will deal separately with capital punishment. I am introducing today a bill to provide procedures for the imposition of the death penalty. The bill has been drafted in order to meet constitutional standards described by the U.S. Supreme Court in such decisions as *Furman* v. *Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), *Gregg* v. *Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976), *Proffitt* v. *Florida*, 428 U.S. 242 (1976), *Jurek* v. *Texas*, 428 U.S. 262 (1976), and more recently in *Coker* v. *Georgia*, 433 U.S. 584 (1977).

This bill will be the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice on Wednesday, July 19. Markup of it will begin the following week.●

JOURNEY TO CHINA, PART 4

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

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

THE SCHOOL: VINCE LOMBARDI HAS BEEN HERE?

More than anything else in China—the Great Wall was tame by comparison—the thing that knocked us visitors absolutely flat was "the school."

The series of schools made a deep impression but the special school at Taiyuan knocked us right out of our bus seats as we arrived, stunned us again as we went through the program, and finished us completely when we left. Some Americans were crying in their tea when we started out and a good many had tears in their eyes when we left.

Partly it was the staging.

But mostly it was the kids.

The school, like most areas in China, is a large compound behind a 10-foot brick wall, with a great gate. When we swung through the gate, what hit us was a large band playing, dancing little girls waving fans, groups in bright costumes all over the place, hundreds of kids, and all of it a giant "Welcome to our American friends."

In short, instead of treating us like an ordinary bunch of American tourists, they treated us like a delegation of visiting dignitaries.

"I felt like I was the President of the United States!" said Bob Smith of St. Louis.

Most of the group were, naturally, veterans of tour groups in many countries all over the world. They never had been received like this . . . and taken as a showing of friendship for ordinary Americans, it brought tears to the eyes.

It was only the beginning.

We went into the classrooms of this special after-school school for talented youngsters brought there from all the regular schools of Taiyuan for special instruction in their talent—athletic, artistic, or whatever.

A group played unusual Chinese instruments as we entered. A group of kids were painting watercolors in another class, and proudly performing for us. In another room, the violinists were practicing.

"We had very short notice of your coming," said the Wise Director of the school, "but two days ago we started learning an American song."

The violins poured out with "My Darling Clementine." Somebody started singing. There we were, the Chinese kids playing the music and the American oldsters singing:

"You are lost and gone forever,
Oh, my darling, Clementine."

And the Wise Director laughed out loud and clapped his hands.

We saw kids making models of ships and helicopters (almost all military models)—fashioning the parts, first, from blueprints, then fitting them together. And we saw some striking drawings on the drawing boards of a group of youngsters, sitting around sculpture busts of various people and drawing them.

This was the one demonstration that could have been "set up"—if good partial drawings were on hand to be set on the boards—and some suspected as much. They were that good.

There was no way to fake the dance class, spectacular in its style and youth, and all girls.

Nor was the table tennis faked, although there was a sense of staging. When we entered the kids were not really playing but were executing a drill—hitting the ball back and forth, hard, with rhythmic speed but always to the same spot.

I took a paddle and played a little pigtailed girl.

She was murder.

She was also all business, a fierce competitor. She butchered me from the start, as I was getting "warmed up." The Wise Director intervened to give me a chance to tune up.

Then, she butchered me again as I experimented to see if she could do anything besides slam the ball back and forth to a predetermined spot as in the drill.

She could. She could kill with lightning speed, forehand or backhand, anything that was two inches too high. And she knew "strategy."

In the third phase of the game, when I started playing for my life, I managed to fool her a couple of times—but not twice with the same surprise.

And she really sizzled with obvious anger once, when I got a sharp cut on a hard hit to her backhand. She took a killing swing at where she thought the ball would be and missed it a mile.

Not once did she crack a smile—but when the game was over, it was like throwing a switch. She was all glowing with warmth, as if we shared something. She was beaming with eyes alight as we shook hands.

The kids finally put on a big show on stage, a kind of variety show, and it was most impressive. (It also clearly had a policy message.)

But perhaps the most unbelievable thing about the performance were the "bunnies" seated just across the aisle from me. These were tiny, nursery-age kids. Through the whole show, not one of them got off his chair, squirmed, or poked his neighbor.

But don't get a picture of them sitting like automatons. They watched the show, looked around between acts, grinned at me watching them, and applauded with animation when acts ended.

The teachers among us were impressed, but with the obvious mixed reactions.

"The discipline is incredible," said one in a general comment on the performance of the youngsters.

"But kind of frightening," said another.

We saw other ordinary schools and a number of nurseries. We saw teachers shouting out questions, and the class shouting out the answers in unison—loudly.

Tiny tots chanted welcome to the "American friends" and sang songs to us—always loudly with full participation.

It seems obvious that much of Chinese education is what we might regard as the old rote system, a great deal of repetition and chorus answers, a great deal of step-by-step repetitive drill.

The results, it would seem, are total participation, high levels of skill at early ages in many things, tremendous discipline and—part and parcel of that—the habit of responding to instruction.

You can certainly find fault with that level of "non-think" training, but you cannot be there and find fault with the results in terms of the very young getting a real "head start" in a positive attitude toward school and future learning, in acquiring solid knowledge and skills early in the game—also as tools to future learning.

And when the discipline is turned off the kids won our hearts, again and again. They were wonderfully spontaneous, alive with excitement, warm and friendly. Totally charming.

The payoff came when we left. In addition to the colorful panorama of class activities in the schoolyard, behind their own big brick wall, kids poured out of the classrooms along with staff.

Tiny tots on each side grabbed the hands of many tourists and escorted them with big smiles and obvious excitement to our bus while the crowds of kids everywhere set up a smiling chorus of handclapping.

Maybe you had to be there, but if you were, there was no way you could go through it without some emotion—and for some of our group, it was almost more than they could stand. They were overcome, between elation and tears.

For myself, I think Vince Lombardi, late of the Green Bay Packers, has been reincarnated as Chinese and is in charge of education.

The discipline is there—and the same passion for perfection.

"I DON'T KNOW WHAT I ATE, BUT IT WAS GOOD"

(By Nina Dancey)

What about the food in China?

"Could you eat the food?" . . . "Got plenty sick of that food, I'll bet." Such questions have been high on the list.

The food? Marvelous! In abundance. We really like it, and we're not Chinese-food buffs.

A few in our tour group ate "Chinese" three meals a day, but most of us had "Western" breakfasts which meant eggs, meat, wonderful homemade bread toast with real butter and jam, coffee or hot tea. Often yogurt.

In some hotels they would bring fried eggs (sometimes three on a plate), scrambled eggs or boiled eggs in a bowl, but if you wished them prepared in a different way, they would. If you wanted oatmeal ("porridge") instead of eggs, they would substitute without charge.

But . . . those Chinese meals! What a pleasant memory. Every meal they brought a big bowl of rice (the sticky kind) which was passed around and we each put some in a small bowl. Then they usually brought a plate of almost appetizers—dried fish, raw vegetables, pickled some-thing-or-other. (There were a lot of those something-or-others, believe me!)

The markets provided us with a better idea of what we were really eating than the dining table!

Then began the arrival of the hot dishes—five or six steaming bowls of vegetables—cabbage, celery, peppers, beans, onions, and a lot of vegetables we never ate before—all crisp cooked, many with meat or fish or chicken or eggs or a combination of such. They were delicious.

My favorite was a cabbage dish—simply marvelous. We were many times served plates of meat without vegetables . . . pork prepared in countless ways . . . chicken and fish.

They all came piping hot, and you dished them up with serving spoons and ate them with your chopsticks from your small plate as they arrived in turn.

When the huge soup tureen was placed in the middle of the table with a large china serving spoon, you knew no more dishes would arrive.

The Chinese conclude each meal with soup. The soup (with one exception that I recall) was always a very clear, thin (almost tasteless, really) soup with a very few vegetable leaves or a mushroom slice or two floating in it. It was usually taken in the rice bowl and eaten with a smaller, decorated china spoon.

No desserts at lunch or dinner. Strangely enough, desserts were served at breakfast. In the Pingyao Hotel at Taiyuan, there was a marvelous pastry chef. We were served tiny pastries shaped in the form of little birds which were filled with too-sweet brown sugar and nut filling.

Another intricate one was like a many-petaled blossom with pink and yellow sugar in the center. I saved mine, dried them on the window ledge together with some steamed bread rolls.

I dried them so they wouldn't mold, sprayed them with hairspray, wrapped them in toilet paper and packed them carefully in whatever kind of box I could find and brought them all the way home in (almost) perfect condition.

Most people didn't like the steamed rolls which are made from yeast dough, but aren't baked. They steam them, somehow, so they are kind of doughy. I liked them very much.

Water was never served with our meals. Warm beer and soda pop (a lemony and orangey kind—not very good) were plentiful, and that is what most of us drank. If you insisted, they would bring you water—bottled.

I should mention that bottled water was always in our rooms to drink and use for teeth brushing. Also in our rooms in every hotel, every day was an extra-large super Thermos-like bottle filled with scalding hot water for the tea they expected us to brew in the lovely, covered teacups which were in every room we had. Also, every room had a plate of fruit with knives and plates. A thoughful thing to do.

We ate, I figure, at least 125 different dishes in the Chinese meals we had—maybe more! Really. Such variety! In Peking, we went to the Nationality restaurant for a Peking duck dinner. Sixteen courses!

When we arrived in the upstairs, private dining room, two small wine glasses were waiting at each place. Into one was poured a very good "Chinese red" wine—not sweet, but not dry, either—a light red. Into the other glass was poured a thimble of colorless Chinese fire! Not many could drink that white liquor—it would blister your tongue!

What a happy memory! Everyone was in an especially festive mood. The chef proudly entered the room and with a great flourish—displayed the beautiful ducks while we applauded. He exited to carve . . . and we looked at one another.

Three ducks for 50 people! That's right. Three ducks. Many marvelous, mysterious dishes were passed and puzzled over—and then came the duck platters. They had carved those three ducks into many tiny, tiny slices—not shredded—just small slices about the size of a nickle or no larger than a quarter.

You placed a crepe-like pancake on your small plate, picked up a tiny piece of duck with your chopsticks, dipped the slice of duck into a marvelous sweetish sauce and put it onto the crepe—repeating it as many times as you wished. Then, deftly (ha!) you rolled the crepe and tucked in the ends, picked the package up with your chopsticks and ate it! Excellent!

Those three ducks served 50 people beautifully.

There was one comic aside. A fellow in the party told us later: "My New York friends sitting at my table were saying, 'This isn't really Peking Duck!'

"How about that? Here we are in Peking, China, eating duck and they say it isn't Peking Duck! What those New Yorkers are used to is Manhattan Duck!"

I can't finish talking about food without mentioning once more the tea which is served many, many times a day. Every factory, commune, household, farm, hospital—every place we went—we were served wonderful, hot, jasmine tea.

They brew it with loose tea in each cup, and it's a little tricky to drink when you don't have a strainer or time to let it sink to the bottom of the cup, but it is a friendly drink.

Even at a basketball game—they brought tea to the team—in cups—during time outs, and the officials drank tea at their own table.

Incidentally, I had always been told—always brew tea in an earthen or china pot—never metal. I dunno . . . on the Chinese airplanes and in the rail stations they poured it into our beautiful cups from large, old (sometimes dented) aluminum tea kettles! (The one on the airplane had the knob broken off the lid.)

Remember the old expression: "I wouldn't do that for all the tea in China!"?

Believe me, that's a bunch!●

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. AGRICULTURAL LANDS

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Family Farms, Rural Development, and Special Studies held hearings on Tuesday, June 20, to determine the impact of foreign investment in U.S. farmland on our agricultural economy.

Witnesses from the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury, and Agriculture told the subcommittee members that they did not see foreign investment as a problem or something we should be concerned about. When asked about the scope of investment by foreign nationals, none of the agencies had any meaningful information. They acknowledged that the responsibility for collecting such information was theirs, but made little if any attempt to do so.

Yet, a syndicated columnist, Jack Anderson, and one investigative reporter were able to uncover far more significant and important information on the scope of foreign investment than all the Federal agencies, with all their bureaucracies, and all their staff. Anderson gave the subcommittee example after example of thousands of acres of foreign purchases, and called the potential far more staggering given world political instability and devaluation of the American dollar.

I wish to share Mr. Anderson's informative testimony with my colleagues. The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF JACK ANDERSON ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN U.S. AGRICULTURAL LANDS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am appearing before you today, not as a muckraking reporter but as a concerned American—concerned about an influx of foreign dollars that is subtly but surely changing our national farm scene.

International investment capital is presently being funneled into the purchase of U.S. farm lands at a flow unequalled since the turn of the century. Farm leaders charge that this injection of foreign dollars is driving up some land prices beyond the reach of American farmers. In President Carter's state of Georgia, for instance, foreign investment companies are openly advertising for land at above market prices.

In a number of areas, small farmers are finding it nearly impossible to get banks to lend them money to buy this high priced land. The returns they could expect from future harvests wouldn't be enough to pay off their bank loans.

In response to concerns expressed to us by farmers from California, Utah and Georgia, my staff and I have conducted an investigation of the situation since last March. We found a sharp increase in foreign purchase of American farms.

Here are some examples:

In my home state of Utah, Dutch investors purchased 6,000 acres of prime farmland. The land was sold to them by Mountain Valley Realty of Logan. A spokesman told my office that the Dutchmen are actively shopping for another 4,000 acres in the state. He said that the Utah farmers were forced to sell because they were unable to keep up their loan payments and have no operating capital.

In Hillsdale, Michigan, 650 acres of small family farms were purchased by a Netherlands Antilles agent representing other unknown foreign investors. The agent then set to work lobbying the local county council to rezone the land for residential development so that 350 high-priced suburban housing units could be built.

In Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Albuquerque Journal reported a Panamanian corporation bought 3,000 acres of farmland, then handed over the deed of sale to Geneva bankers who, in turn, leased the farm to a Swiss firm.

The Agriculture Department estimates that up to 21 percent of farm sales in 1977 were made to foreigners. Gerald Jackson, president of the American Real Estate Exchange Association, told my office that in some areas of California and the South, at least 40 percent of all sales were to foreign purchasers.

It is impossible to get accurate figures on the overall amount of foreign investment in U.S. farms. The General Accounting Office, after three months of intensive investigation, found that information on the subject is still "fragmentary and limited."

Two major forces appear to be behind the recent surge in foreign investment. First is the rising political instability in Europe and South America. Italian aristocrats, whose wealth has been traditionally linked to the land, are casting nervous eyes at the powerful Italian Communist Party and surreptitiously transferring some of their cash assets out of the country. Much of this money is being used to buy U.S. farm land. For example, the Stockton Record reports that 5,500 acres of California row crop land were sold to Italian investors who used a Lichtenstein corporation as a front. The Italian government is now investigating this purchase for possible violations of its tax laws.

Argentine industrialists, upset by the violence and kidnappings in their country, have also shelled out dollars for U.S. farms. They are aware that the U.S. would not expropriate their land.

The decline of the U.S. dollar is the second driving force behind the foreign investment boom. The Arabs have flooded the European money markets with devalued oil dollars and European investors are finding in turn that one of the best places to plant this money is in our farm land.

European and U.S. banks now compete for foreign capital to invest in American farm land. The U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland actually arranged a special meeting to introduce American real estate dealers to international banks and buyers. Some of the biggest banks in New York and Chicago have established special farm investment subsidiaries with branch offices in Switzerland to lure foreign capital into their accounts.

Gerald Jackson's American Real Estate Exchange has pioneered some innovative new techniques to get American farm land on the international auction block. Not long ago, his exchange sponsored a conference in Zurich, Switzerland, to promote foreign interest in American real estate. Billed as a conference for "confidential discussions," it attracted hundreds of buyers and sellers. On the buyers' side were Arabs and Europeans; on the sellers' side were real estate dealers, property owners, private lending institutions and banks.

One American developer, for example, went in search of foreign capital to develop former Texas ranch lands. He found plenty of development money through a Swiss bank representing Kuwaiti clients.

But there are other routes through which foreign capital can quietly find its way into U.S. agriculture. The Hillsdale, Michigan, farms mentioned earlier were bought by investors based in the Caribbean Islands of the Netherland Antilles. The Dutch Government has created a booming tax haven by refusing to tax the earnings of corporations who set up shop on the islands. Italian, German, French, Swiss, and U.S. investors, some with unreported income, have formed straw corporations in the islands to shelter their earnings.

The United States government has actually tried to attract this capital by signing a tax treaty with the Netherlands Antilles, granting its investors special tax treatment when they invest money in this country. A Department of Agriculture official, who closely studied the treaty, says it gives a foreign investor "an advantage over the situation he would face if he were taxed as an ordinary citizen." On the other end of the stick, a farmer who scrupulously reports all his income could end up paying higher taxes than the Netherland Antilles investors.

A tax treaty with England is being considered by the U.S. Senate which could further attract foreign investment in farm land. The treaty would throw major legal road blocks into state government efforts to tax foreign investors.

What kind of changes is this foreign money invasion causing in the structure of American agriculture? In some areas, such as California's San Joquin Valley, foreign investors are finding it convenient to simply lease back the land to its original owners.

But the losers in the California foreign investment boom appear to be the small farmers who want to expand their operations and young people who want to begin a farming career.

Those working for land reform in California are dismayed by these events and are fighting to curb the foreign investment. George Ballis of the Fresno-based National Land for People organization discovered that 1,380 acres of land in the Westland Water District, which is supposed to be reserved for small family farmers ended up in the hands of a Netherlands Antilles company. This acreage was secretly sold to the foreigners for speculative purposes.

In Georgia, foreign investment is having a different impact. The purchase of at least 17,000 acres of land in south Georgia by an international investment corporation called Transatlantic, has aroused considerable hostility. The average size of a Georgia farm is 350 acres. Georgia farmers charge that Transatlantic's front man, Phillip Beegle, is using foreign capital to underwrite his own corporate takeover of Georgia family farms.

Transatlantic's tactics provide disturbing examples of the way international real estate investors can operate behind a screen. "Front" corporations are set up to hide the identities of the European investors. Beegle and his partners install themselves as officials of the corporations. Sometimes a European investor might be named an official of the corporation, but Beegle manages the farms for the absentee landlords.

We were able to document, through the Georgia Secretary of State's office, the existence of at least seven different Transatlantic front corporations. One front, for example, called Southeastern Cotton Industries, Inc., bought 1,291 acres in Johnson County and then placed a European as president. Another front corporation, called Soybean Hill, bought a 100 acre tract in Jefferson County and named Transatlantic official Ferdinand Seefried as president.

Increased foreign investment flow is entering Georgia at a time when its small farm fortunes are at a low ebb. They were hard hit last year by low grain prices, high petrochemical fertilizer costs and a mid-summer drought.

Even Leonard Wright, President Carter's former tenant farmer in Plains, was unable to make ends meet. Earlier in the season, with corn selling at $2.75 a bushel, he decided to plant much of his land in this old standby and purchased high priced liquid nitrogen fertilizer to insure a good yield. But by harvest time, what was left of his drought-stricken corn was selling for a ruinous $1.45 a bushel.

Wright went into debt at the bank last year and it will take a couple of good harvest years in a row to bail him out. To pay off the bank loans, Leonard Wright and many other Georgia farmers applied for farm disaster assistance loans from the federal government.

But some farmers, when confronted with farm debts like Leonard Wright's, have chosen to sell to Transatlantic. Others, like Tommy Kersey, have spurned the company's advances, and joined the Farm Strike Movement.

Attempts to introduce legislation to monitor foreign investment didn't even come to a vote in the last session of Georgia's general assembly. Governor George Busbee refused to endorse the bills. He worried that they might scare off all types of foreign investment in the state.

Legislative efforts in other states have met with more success. In Missouri, a bill was passed which will prohibit almost any foreign investment in farmland. Twenty-five states have some restrictions on foreign ownership of farmland. Only nine states have effective legislation on the books and even this is proving hard to enforce.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN PARAGUAY—PART II

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Thursday I reported that a number of prisoners at

Emboscada jail in Paraguay began a hunger strike on June 11 protesting their imprisonment and demanding knowledge of the fate of other prisoners. Many in Emboscada have not been arraigned for trial. Also, at least five prisoners disappeared from police custody in September 1976 when a large number of political prisoners were transferred to Emboscada jail. The whereabouts of the five are still uncertain.

I have received news that the hunger strike continues. There have been some encouraging developments. Archbishop Ismael Rolon of Ascuncion has intervened, and talks between him and government officials concerning the strike have taken place. The Minister of Interior visited the jail. However, with obvious implications, he ordered released another prisoner who was not participating in the strike.

Today I am continuing a review of the human rights situation in Paraguay. Below is an analysis of the judicial system and the impact of human rights activities on the Stroessner government.

THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

HOW MANY PRISONERS?

Amnesty International reported in 1976 that over the preceding ten years, the number of political prisoners in Paraguay had remained fairly constant, between 100 and 300. Waves of arrests, however, "periodically enlarge the prison population for short periods." For example, Amnesty International reported that in April 1976 about 350 persons were detained including peasants and active members of the Roman Catholic Church.[1] In an August 1977 update, Amnesty estimated that the 1976 wave had totaled about 1,000 arrests. Chartrain and Corneveaux, representing the International Movement of Catholic Lawyers, had calculated 1,900—nearly double the Amnesty figure.[2] The impossibility of confirming the number of arrests makes assessments and comparisons difficult; in a January 1978 wave which was clearly calculated and publicized by the police for maximum intimidating effect, press estimates are as low as 20–30, and only about a dozen names are known.

These waves are more useful for intimidation purposes than are long detentions; a few hours of interrogation and threats is more than enough to discourage popular participation in independent organizations. There is also less need for justification before international public opinion, which is primarily concerned with the "running balance" of political prisoners.

The Stroessner government has quietly acceded to international concern by releasing prisoners, singly and in groups, throughout 1977 and so far in 1978. From 1–2 thousand prisoners in mid-1976, and over 600 in September 1976, the Emboscada population has declined slowly to between 50 and 60 in June 1978. The decline has not affected the intimidating power of police repression, but it stands as silent tribute to the effectiveness of quiet human rights efforts by Paraguayan institutions, the diplomatic community, and international organizations.

LAW 209: SOME CASE EXAMPLES OF ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Thirteen prisoners associated with the opposition Febrerista Party (though not all were members) were the first defendants under Law 209. Judge Carlos Baez Rehnfeldt, who was new to the bench and to the case, set an ominous precedent when he declared all 13 guilty in April 1977. The verdict was based entirely on the police report, which Baez called a "sufficient basis for conviction",[3] only passing mention was made of the defendants' declarations and their lawyers' arguments before the court.

Charges were brought against 46 of the 1976 detainees in the October, 1976 case of "Carlos Brañas and others"; 3 more defendants were added in 1977 and another 4 after the January, 1978 wave of arrests. By April 30, 1978, only 35 of the 53 defendants had been called for the *declaraciones indagatorias* or hearings, which represent the defendant's only chance to answer the charges in person outside the police station: an average of about 2 per month. However, 37 defendants had also been released, some by executive order and some by the courts after their hearings.

The 19 labor leaders charged in the wake of a meeting at the Catholic retreat center in Ypacarai, in December 1977, were all brought to court and released in February 1978. Their case had brought pressures from the international labor movement which led the Minister of Justice and Labor to say publicly that there seemed to be no evidence against them, so their acquittal came as no surprise; but it too was clearly based on factors having nothing to do with the courts.

The government's mixed motives and the judges' uncertainty in political trials, carried out in response to international pressure and under the gentle scrutiny of the Paraguayan press, are clearly reflected in the somewhat spastic progress of these cases. The Paraguayan system of *justica ordinaria* was simply not prepared to deal with political cases.

JUSTICE BY TELEFONAZO

In August 1977, the approximately 180 Emboscada prisoners who had not yet been charged let it be known that they too wanted to go to trial. This was a major change of attitude; for years it had been assumed that a prisoner's best hope was to be released as he was arrested, by executive order.

However, none of the prisoners who made the request have yet been arraigned, although many were subsequently released. No action has been taken on others still in jail.

A common description of Paraguayan justice is "justice by telefonazo": decisions ordered in telephone calls from top government officials. The problem is rooted in the 1967 Constitution: judges are named by the President for a five year term that coincides with his. "Reappointment depends on how their judicial performance is evaluated by executive authority";[4] if the telefonazo does not come, decisions are long delayed and it is finally up to the judge—often in consultation with other magistrates—to divine the executive will, knowing that an error of judgment at this point may cost him his job.

Last year a group of Paraguayan lawyers protested this state of affairs in a note addressed to their bar association:

"Out of respect for [judicial] independence there should be an end to the practice by some magistrates of 'consulting' the opinion of their superiors, in order to assure the 'confirmation' of their verdicts. We should assume that the judges are sufficiently competent to decide in accordance with the law and their own loyal knowledge and understanding."[5]

"There are also magistrates," the Paraguayan lawers said, "who do not respect the turn system and intervene in cases which are notoriously outside their own competence." They were referring to the system by which the six criminal judges in Asuncion are assigned new cases on a rotating basis. In 1977, all cases which carried significant political connotations were assigned to Dr. Bernabe Valdez Martinez; some of these were later transferred.

The Stephansky and Helfield report cited the regular harassment of lawyers during prison visits, and the withholding of the all-important police report, but concluded that Paraguayan lawyers "have been faithful to the highest ideals of their profession and in so doing have made possible a spirited defense of human rights."

One discouraging precedent was set in the case of Dr. Carlos A. Vasconcellos, a lawyer who challenged the impartiality of the judge hearing his case. The judge accused Dr. Vasconcellos under Law 323, which protects judges from "molestation" as a result of judicial actions. Judge Bernabe Valdez Martinez presided over the suit and ordered Dr. Vasconcellos imprisoned; the appeal was heard by Dr. Carlos Baez Rehnfeldt, who declared the penalty fulfilled and released him. The lawyers' note to the bar association commented on the case:

". . . this experience leads our association to the conviction that a sort of judicial terror is being imposed."[6]

The Stephansky-Helfeld visit and other pressures have resulted in some improvement with respect to attorneys' visits in Emboscada; however, the harassment of lawyers is largely a matter of the guards' own attitudes, especially class resentment. Even a serious effort to limit the harassment would be hampered by factors not altogether under the control of either the government or the courts.

IV. HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES: A NEW DYNAMIC

There are signs that human rights attention has had more permanent, significant effects in Paraguay. It will be many months before those indications can be evaluated.

Paraguayan institutions

In the universities and professions there are parallel membership organizations, one affiliated with the Colorado Party (government party) and the other(s) highly vulnerable to infiltration and persecution. The previously suppressed Independent University Movement was a principal target of the July 1977 arrests; the Colorado Student Association provided a public sounding board for Chief of Investigations Pastor Coronel during the January 1978 repression, when he urged them to "collaborate in the care of order and peace."[7] One particularly independent professional association is the Colegio de Abogados, or bar association, which lodged a public protest when some of its members encountered unusual delays in the renewal of their registration early in 1977.

The Paraguayan Workers' Confederation (CPT) began as a branch of the Colorado Party, but enjoyed a brief period of autonomy in the 1950's. For the past two decades the CPT has avoided competing with President Stroessner's image as single-handed protector of the working class; it was finally expelled from the ILO and from ORIT, the Latin American labor federation. Meanwhile, two independent groups developed links with the Catholic-sponsored Latin American Workers' Union (CLAT), which is not officially recognized in Paraguay.

The two CLAT organizations sponsored the December 1977 meeting at Ypacarai which was raided by police, with 19 members imprisoned on subversion charges. The CPT sent a protest note to Minister of Justice and Labor Saul Gonzalea;[8] all 19 were released after two months' imprisonment. It is early yet to predict whether the CPT will become a regular participant in the defense of labor and political rights.

The Paraguayan Commission for the Defense of Human Rights was founded in Asuncion, Paraguay on June 17, 1967, for the purpose of serving the needs of victims of human rights abuses and building awareness of their condition among indifferent or fearful fellow Paraguayans. The first meeting was held in the home of Mrs. Carmen de Lara Castro and her husband, Dr. Mariano

Footnotes at end of article.

Luis Lara Castro; the latter enjoyed parliamentary immunity at the time as a member of the National Constituent Assembly (representing the opposition Radical Liberal Party). From 1968 to 1978 Mrs. Lara Castro was a member of the Paraguayan Chamber of Deputies and therefore also enjoyed parliamentary immunity.

Other members of the Commission, lacking such protection from persecution, have been victimized for their activities. They include: Dr. Geronimo Irala Burgos (president of the Christian Democratic Party); Dr. Jose Maria Bonin (Commission legal counsel and former judge); Prof. Alcides Molinas; Dr. Miguel Angel Martinez Yaryes (professor of medicine); Prof. Luis Alfonso Resk (ex-president of the Christian Democratic Party who has been arrested over 50 times and tortured); Dr. Jorge R. Lara Castro (also tortured, now in exile); Dr. Juan Felix Bogado Gondra (now serving a prison term for alleged subversive activities) and his brother Basilio Bogado Gondra (now in exile); Ing. Gustavo Vargas, Dr. Francisco de Vargas.

Over the years, the Paraguayan people's most supportive institution has always been the Roman Catholic Church. The Church is by far the largest single, politically independent institution in Paraguay.

The repeated repression of Catholic programs in the early 1970's stimulated unprecedented social action and ecumenical concern in some Protestant groups. A human promotion program sponsored by the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) was one of the principal targets of the 1976 repression. That wave also led to the formation of the Interchurch Committee for Emergency Aid, in June 1976 sponsored by Catholic, Disciples and German Evangelical churches. The Committee began by providing material aid to prisoners and their families; when arraignments began it moved toward an advocacy role and assembled a team of highly qualified defense lawyers.

The executive director of the Interchurch Committee is a Spanish Jesuit priest, Father Jose M. Blanch. Its programs are as follows: Program I provides supplementary food and medicines to political prisoners; Program II assists the families of prisoners, many of whom lost not only their breadwinners but property, equipment and crops in the police raids; and Program III provides legal assistance to those who have been brought to trial. In recent months the Interchurch Committee has extended its concern to include not only political prisoners but those accused of "common crimes," who in many cases are even more harshly abused than the political detainees.

One international delegation after another was allowed to visit Paraguay. Two U.S. executives from the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) went in May 1976; Chartrain and Corneveaux went in June, Stephansky and Alexander in July; a four-man team from U.S. and European ecumenical councils in October; Paulo Evaristo Cardinal Arns from Brazil in February 1977; Stephansky and Helfeld in June. Their reception at high government levels varied, but none of the visitors were personally harassed. Each team returned with reliable information, and some succeeded in getting a message across to the Paraguayan government.

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has not succeeded in establishing an on-site investigation. The government extended a formal invitation in November 1977, which was still being reported as news the following January,[9] but the Commission's efforts to negotiate terms and conditions for the visit have been met with silence

OAS Secretary General Alejandro Orfila and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Terence Todman both visited Paraguay in 1977. In both cases there were public hints that human rights had been discussed.

President Stroessner visited Washington in September 1977, to witness the signing of the Panama Canal treaties; there too human rights is said to have been on the agenda.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Amnesty International Briefing: Paraguay. July, 1976, p. 3; update, August 1977.
[2] Francois Chartrain and Alain Corneveaux, in Convergence (International Movement of Catholic Students), Nos. 3–4, 1976, p. 9.
[3] ABC Color, April 6, 1977. (Paraguay newspaper)
[4] Stephansky and Helfeld, p. 30.
[5] El Radical, opposition weekly, third week in September, 1977.
[6] Hoy, March 9, 1978.
[7] ABC Color, January 25, 1978.
[8] ABC Color, January 25, 1978.
[9] The Washington Post, January 10, 1978, and Paraguayan newspapers.●

CARTER'S AFRICAN POLICY: BASICALLY IMMORAL

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of journalisms most respected foreign correspondents is Georgie Anne Geyer. Her dispatches from all over the globe have established her reputation as a fair and exceptionally well informed writer on the often confusing and complex issues of foreign policy.

Where she criticizes this Democratic administration, her views are especially credible, since she admits supporting it from the beginning.

Last Monday's Chicago Sun-Times carried a most important article of hers on President Carter's African policy. For those who sincerely believe in intellectual honesty in foreign affairs, it is indispensable reading:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 26, 1978]

CARTER'S AFRICAN POLICY: BASICALLY IMMORAL

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

WASHINGTON.—President Carter said in his recent speech before the Southern Baptists that he had never "detected" or "experienced any conflict between God's will and my political duty." People who found moral choices in the real world rather more complicated said, "Yes, indeed. At least he's a moral man."

Yet the last, sad week in Washington showed in the starkest relief the basic immorality of the Carter administration. It is, incredibly, an immorality which is quite willing to sell out millions of black people in the name of expediency, which claims self-righteously to talk about majority rule when it really means black power, and which particularly fools itself about its grand moral postures.

I am referring to the "forward-looking and positive" policy toward Africa which Sec. of State Cyrus Vance outlined last week. In one more "restatement of American policy," Vance now says we want to work with the Marxist Angolan MPLA government "in more normal ways."

This elevates to policy United Nations Ambassador Andrew Young's arguments that we should trade a promise by Angola to stay away from Zaire's Shaba Province for our probable diplomatic recognition of the minority MPLA government. This government is kept in power by some 20,000 Cuban troops, and if their are modern-day black echoes of a Munich-like sell-out of Czechoslovakia, this is it.

What is so astonishing about all this is its immorality. Forget for a moment the Cubans' role or nonrole in Shaba. Intelligence sources tell me that now approximately 2,000 black Rhodesians have just crossed from Angola, where they were trained by Cubans, to join Joshua Nkomo's army in Zambia which is trying to impose—not win through the vote—Nkomo as leader of Rhodesia.

Then, forget that for a moment and consider the revolutionary situation in Angola. I know of no analyst of Angola who does not conclude that 90 per cent of the black people of Angola are with the anti-MPLA, pro-Western movements, in particular Jonas Savimbi's UNITA in the south.

With almost no money or weapons, these courageous people are still waging a brutal war against the highly equipped Cubans. Only two weeks ago, Zbigniew Brzezinski, the other side of Carter's conscience, was trying to find ways to aid UNITA. But that was two weeks ago.

If it were only Angola, however, I suppose one could argue for Vance's and Young's propositions.

In March, Young was quoted in the Zambian press as saying he would look favorably upon military aid to the front-line states: Zambia, Mozambique, Angola and Tanzania. Indeed, at the core of the problem is that he has placed our policy under their whims, all in the name of "majority rule for Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa." Yet, two of these are Marxist and total failures economically; one is a totally subsidized "socialist" failure; the other is simply a sloppy economic failure. Not one has elections or will have.

All actively and militarily oppose the internal settlement in Rhodesia, which is going ahead with elections to turn the country over to black majority rule.

Yet, in both places, we are supporting these revolutionary movements and not those who would bring real majority rule. In both places we come out (1) in opposition to free elections, (2) in opposition to free enterprise and our own economic interests, (3) in support of further, all-out civil war in which countless blacks will be killed and (4) in favor of the final despotism and economic failure of the one-party states that surround them.

I have tried to be fair about this administration, which I supported from the beginning, but I am finally disgusted.●

CARTER'S TOUGH TALK ON SPENDING NOT MATCHED BY HIS ACTIONS

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the recent addition of a $50,000 a year public relations man to the White House staff at least means more publicity for President Carter. Most every newspaper and news broadcast in the country has reported how Mr. Carter wants to hold down Federal spending. Well, all this tough talk just does not mesh with the President's actions. He may say that he wants to cut back on spending, but that is just another empty promise when compared with what he has been doing.

Typical of this "watch what I say not what I do" public relations ploy is the President's trip to Texas over the weekend. After telling the hard working and

conservative voters of Texas that "somebody has to hold the line on spending," he then had the U.S. Army stage a $1 million war games spectacle in the afternoon. He tells us that his budget for next year—that is 1980—will be "lean and tight" and that he plans to veto excessive spending bills. But remember he said exactly—I repeat, exactly—the same thing this time last year and look what he gave us: a half-trillion dollar budget with the second highest deficit ever and an 11-percent increase in spending. He called that budget "lean and tight" too. And President Carter did not see fit to veto a single major spending bill. So much for all that budget cutting rhetoric. To the American people, action speaks louder than words, and when it comes to spending, Mr. Carter is the biggest spender of them all. Look at the record:

ITEMS

Immediately after his inauguration he added $6.2 billion to the fiscal year 1977 budget even though the year was almost half over. He then increased President Ford's budget for 1978 an additional $19.4 billion, a boost of 12 percent over the previous year in total spending.

His "lean and tight" budget for 1979 actually camouflaged major social welfare spending increases—15 to 20 percent in most areas—by deliberately cutting such programs as agriculture, veterans, and disaster assistance when he knew full well Congress would have to restore these unrealistic cuts.

By the time fiscal year 1979 is over, here is what Mr. Carter has accomplished since he was elected:

First. Federal spending will have grown by $132 billion since President Ford left office. That amounts to 36 percent and is the biggest 3-year increase in peacetime history.

Second. The national debt will have grown by $213 billion, or 34 percent, to $849.1 billion. For each man, woman, and child in this country that amounts to $2,860, or an increase of $968 per person just since Mr. Carter became President.

Third. Next year, Federal taxes alone will consume nearly $1 out of every $5 this Nation produces. This, too, is an all-time high rate of taxation in peacetime. And even with this record, back-breaking tax burden Mr. Carter cannot balance the budget because he is increasing spending even faster.

ITEMS

What happened this year when the voters made it clear they wanted a lower deficit? Did the President cut spending? Absolutely not. He first reduced the size of next year's promised tax cut from $25 billion to $20 billion, and now I read he has shaved it another $5 billion.

Our tight-fisted President wants to eliminate nine water projects approved by the House on the grounds that is excessive spending, but turns around and demands funding for five water projects of his own choosing not in the original House bill.

On Monday the President announces national health insurance will have to be delayed because it is too costly, but an hour later is telling supporters of socialized medicine that he will probably send up a bill after all.

The President tells us we have to fight inflation which has risen from less than 5 percent before he took office to over 10-percent today. But look at some of things he has been doing:

Demands the biggest boosts ever in the minimum wage—an increase of 32 percent overall—but rejects efforts to set a youth differential in order to reduce teenage unemployment;

Supports common situs picketing and cargo preference legislation;

Settles coal strike with an inflationary 39-percent wage package;

Gives in to OSHA's inflationary cotton dust standards against advice of his economic advisers;

Presides over the collapse of the U.S. dollar abroad; and

Allows taxes to rise to all time highs, then wants to force them up another $15 billion or more a year with big new taxes on gasoline and heating oil.

The big spenders in the House have not stood idly by while Mr. Carter was saying one thing while doing another. They too have been talking tough about cutting spending while doing exactly the opposite.

When the first budget resolution was in committee, I proposed a 5-percent reduction in spending which was rejected by every committee Democrat but one.

Many amendments to cut spending have pased on the House floor recently only to be undone by the strong-arm tactics of the majority leadership in getting Members to change their votes after all voting time had expired. For example:

May 3: The Holt amendment to reduce total spending in the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1979 was actually approved within the specified voting period, but subsequently defeated when the leadership made seven Democrats change their votes from "aye" to "nay."

May 9: An amendment to cut spending by 2 percent only after 16 Democrats had their arms twisted and ended up reversing their votes, again well after the 15-minute recorded voting period was over.

May 17: The conference report on the first budget resolution with its $50 billion deficit managed to pass only after the voting time had ended and two Democrats were "coaxed" into changing their minds.

The same pattern has been continued on votes to reduce appropriations bills. Recall that on:

June 14 an amendment to the State-Justice_Commerce appropriations which would have cut only $30 million from the Legal Services Corp. budget failed when six Democrats switched their votes in the well.

On June 22 the leadership managed to change the outcome of two votes on amendments to the Agriculture appropriations bill by arm twisting at the conclusion of the voting period. In one case five Democrats changed their votes and killed an amendment to reduce food stamp spending by 2 percent; then an attempt to reduce all controllable expenditures by 2 percent was beaten when 10 Democrats reversed themselves.

For every example I could give 10 more. The point is this: For all his tough talk about cutting spending and balancing the budget, President Carter is actually doing the exact opposite. Talk is cheap, but the programs and proposals at the heart of President Carter's legislative agenda are the most expensive ever encountered by the taxpayers of this country.

Yes, there is a taxpayers' revolt going on. They want immediate and substantial tax relief and they want spending at all levels of Government cut back. If the millions and millions of taxpayers who are a part of this revolt really want a Government responsive to their needs, then starting right now I urge them to watch what their elected officials do, not what they say. A good place to start is in the White House.●

PROF. ROBERT BORK OF YALE LAW SCHOOL QUESTIONS FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE BILL

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposed Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (H.R. 7308), the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and Administration of Justice received important testimony today from Prof. Robert H. Bork of the Yale Law School and former Solicitor General. He outlined, quite vividly and objectively, the extremely serious problems which this piece of legislation entails.

Professor Bork observed first that existing executive branch guidelines adequately protect the constitutional rights of the American people. Therefore, while being both historically unprecented and constitutionally questionable, the requirement in H.R. 7308 that the judicial branch be responsible for the authorization of foreign intelligence electronic surveillance is unnecessary to correct any existing problems.

Inasmuch as judicial warrant requirement would add no substantive fourth amendment protections, and because of the great potential for irreversible harm to our national security posed by the involvement of a third branch of government, this bill is unwise and should certainly not be passed in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues in the House who in the near future may be addressing on the floor the issues presented by this bill, I would like at this time to have Mr. Bork's prepared statement entered in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. BORK

JUNE 29, 1978.

I am pleased to be here at the invitation of the Subcommittee to discuss certain constitutional and policy questions in connection with H.R. 7308, the proposed Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

The impulse behind H.R. 7308 is an understandable one. Given past intelligence abuses, it is natural to consider legislation.

But I believe that the plan of bringing the judiciary, a warrant requirement, and a criminal violation standard into the field of foreign intelligence is, when analyzed, a thoroughly bad idea, and almost certainly unconstitutional as well.

I will urge upon you, briefly, five propositions:

(1) The bill meets no need since existing protections of constitutional freedoms are as good as this law would be;

(2) The proposed law would damage, perhaps severely, our foreign intelligence capacity at a time when it needs to be strengthened;

(3) The proposed law would damage the federal judiciary;

(4) The law would weaken Congress' oversight function and make the intelligence community less accountable; and

(5) The law is very probably a violation of both Articles II and III of the Constitution.

EXISTING PROTECTIONS OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE AS STRONG AS THIS LAW WOULD BE

What is forgotten in discussions of measures like H.R. 7308 is that past abuses were uncovered and rectified, without a law like this, by processes of investigation and law already in existence. The possibility of future abuses has been greatly lessened because of that exposure. We have established a new set of expectations, a new tradition, about how we want our intelligence agencies to behave. It ought to be remembered that we now call abuses actions which a few years ago we wanted our agencies to take. Moral standards have changed, and, as a result, the conduct of the agencies has been greatly altered. This suggests that our intelligence agencies, by and large, behave as the American people expect and want them to.

But there is much more protection for constitutional freedoms than that. In response to this problem, Attorney General Edward Levi promulgated detailed regulations governing foreign intelligence electronic surveillance. I chaired the committee that prepared drafts for his consideration. These regulations state the cause necessary to initiate or continue a surveillance, locate responsibility in named officers, require reconsideration at periodic intervals, minimize surveillance to what is actually required by the cause stated, require that less intrusive means be used if possible, and closely limit the persons who may have access to the information developed and the use they may make of that information.

As I understand it, those regulations, or ones very like them, remain in force, and it is impossible to imagine a President and an Attorney General who would be so foolhardy as to materially weaken their provisions.

These executive branch regulations are so sensitive to Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches and seizures, and to First Amendment protections against inhibitions of free speech, as the bill before you is. The regulations are also likely to be as effective. The intelligence officer or Attorney General reckless enough to ignore those regulations and thus subject himself to criminal liability would be reckless enough to bypass the warrant requirements of the proposed statute.

THE PROPOSED LAW WOULD DAMAGE OUR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITY

This law would almost certainly increase unauthorized and damaging disclosures of sensitive information and secret technologies because it would greatly widen the circle of people with access to it. In some cases, as many as thirteen judges, their clerks, and secretaries would share the knowledge. If judicial opinions—required only when warrants are denied—are circulated, or if the judges consult one another in an effort to produce a more or less uniform body of rulings, a minimum of 26 judges and support personnel will have top-secret information. Leaks are inevitable. Security problems have in the past arisen with federal courts, and now this bill would for the first time give foreign intelligence agencies reason to concentrate on our judicial system.

Disclosures of secret information are not merely intelligence calamities; they may create foreign relations debacles as well. Electronic surveillance is known to exist by everyone in the diplomatic community, but public disclosure of it or of particular pieces of information may be hard to ignore, just as Khrushchev could ignore the U–2, until it was shot down.

Problems such as these may lead the intelligence agencies not to seek electronic surveillance in cases where our national security indicates they should.

Most troublesome in this respect is the role to be created for the judiciary. There are and there can be no judicial criteria for making decisions about the needs of foreign intelligence. Judges would be asked to play a role that is essentially managerial. We might as well put a sitting judge in charge of all intelligence activities to make sure that no constitutional right is abridged.

Under this proposed law the judges could behave in one of two ways, neither of them satisfactory. The judge, who has no expertise in the complex field of foreign intelligence, might defer to the expertise of the intelligence community, in which case he would provide no constitutional protection but would be merely a symbol, a false reassurance to the public. To provide real protection, and also to take account of the circumstances upon which the application of constitutional guarantees depend, the judge would have to be drawn deep into the foreign intelligence operation. He would have to know about available technologies, alternative means of gathering the information sought, the relevance and importance of the information in the total intelligence picture, and what the client agencies intend to do with the intelligence.

Doubtless, different judges would behave differently. Some would defer to the intelligence community and the Attorney General, thus providing little more than new opportunities for the compromise of the information. Others would plunge eagerly into intelligence work and begin to run the operation.

No one should underestimate the strength of the tendency displayed by the judiciary in recent years to take over both legislative and executive functions. Judge Wright's plurality opinion in the Zweibon case, though it did not command a majority of the en banc Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, explicitly argued for a foreign intelligence warrant requirement on the ground that judges possess the analytical ability and sensitivity of foreign affairs necessary to evaluate recommendations for electronic surveillance. He said a federal judge with lifetime tenure could presumably develop an expertise in the field of foreign affairs.

We should not ask or allow judges to decide foreign affairs and foreign intelligence questions for us in the guise of passing on warrant applications. There could be no clearer case of what is coming to be known as "judicial imperialism," and this bill invites just that. It will be bad for foreign intelligence, for national security, for the judiciary, and for the preservation of our constitutional arrangements.

This law is also seriously defective in that it requires for the surveillance of a United States person a determination that his intelligence activities on behalf of a foreign power "involve or may involve a violation of the criminal statutes of the United States." If a United States person is knowingly engaging in clandestine intelligence activities on behalf of a foreign power that person ought to be under surveillance whether or not there is reason to think a crime may be committed. It is important to know who is working undercover for foreign governments and to know what networks exist.

The criminal violation requirement either hampers essential intelligence work or else is another example of symbolism without substance because it will be interpreted to mean that if the work is clandestine there is always a chance that a crime will be committed. One of these alternatives is true, and both are bad.

THE PROPOSED LAW WOULD DAMAGE THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

I have already mentioned an important injury to the federal judiciary that would flow from this law: thrusting them into the management of intelligence matters, which is a statement by Congress to the judiciary, and one that some judges are eager to hear, that the federal courts are competent to run more and more of this country's business under the guise of interpreting the Constitution.

Related to that concern is the very troubling element of judicial secrecy. Because it reverses our entire tradition, it is difficult to think of secret decisions as "law." The assertion that this bill would ensure that foreign intelligence electronic surveillance is conducted according to "the rule of law" is, therefore, seriously misleading. The bill pretends to create a real set of courts that will bring "law" to an area of discretion. In reality, it would set apart a group of judges who must operate largely in the dark and create rules known only to themselves. Whatever that may be, it debases an important idea to call it the rule of law. It is more like the uninformed, unknown, and uncontrolled exercise of discretion. The insertion of a judge into foreign intelligence does not solve all problems, and only those who confuse the "cult of the robe" with the rule of law could imagine that it does.

Finally, this law would present judges with an impossible legal and moral dilemma. Suppose that the Supreme Court splits, say, five to four, in granting a warrant. If the dissenting Justices are convinced that the decision and others it presages deny the basic constitutional rights of Americans, what are those Justices to do? Should they confine themselves to writing a dissent that will be classified top secret and stored in a locked vault? Must they remain stoically silent about what they believe to be the secret destruction of rights they are sworn to uphold? Should they publish a full opinion and damage national security? Or should they perhaps state publicly from the bench that constitutional freedoms are being destroyed but they are not at the moment at liberty to explain what they are talking about?

This bill would give the dissenting judge or Justice anywhere in the special court system a choice between behavior that is dishonorable or fatuous. That is an intolerable moral and constitutional position in which to place judges. It cannot but damage the morale and the virtue of the Federal judiciary.

THE LAW WOULD SERIOUSLY WEAKEN CONGRESS' OVERSIGHT FUNCTION AND MAKE THE INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES LESS ACCOUNTABLE

The law seems certain to diminish the responsibility and accountability of the Executive Branch. To take a not improbable case, if even one judge proves excessively tolerant, the government can go to him in all doubtful, or even improper cases. Since there is no adverse party to appeal the grant of a warrant, the "rule of law" will turn out to be the temper of one district judge, unknown to the other judges and the Supreme Court.

But suppose it is merely true that some of the judges do not want to become full-time experts on foreign intelligence and foreign relations and, for that reason, defer to the

superior knowledge and expertise of the intelligence community. What can Congress do if it comes to think the surveillance power it granted is being abused? Can the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts and Civil Liberties summon before it for explanation the judges, perhaps including some members of the Supreme Court, who approved the warrants? I should think certainly not. Can we expect successful criminal or civil actions against the Executive Branch personnel who, following statutory procedures, obtained warrants from the judges? That, too, seems impossible.

This statute has the effect of immunizing everyone, and sooner or later that fact will be taken advantage of. It would not be the first time a regulatory scheme turned out to benefit the regulated rather than the public.

THE STATUTE WOULD PROBABLY VIOLATE ARTICLES II AND III OF THE CONSTITUTION

Presidential power to conduct foreign intelligence arises under the President's Article II powers as commander in chief and as the officer of government primarily responsible for foreign affairs. The power to conduct warrantless electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence purposes has been asserted by every President at least since Franklin Roosevelt. The only two courts of appeals to pass upon that claim have upheld it.

This is not to say that Congress has no role to play with respect to the war power or the power over foreign affairs, including foreign intelligence. It is to say that, as in the exercise of the war power, Congress' constitutional role is largely confined to the major issues, issues such as whether or not to declare war and how large the armed forces shall be. Congress makes the large decisions; it may not dictate the President's tactics in an area where he legitimately leads.

This bill does just that, prescribing numerous details of the conduct of foreign intelligence surveillance, imposing the warrant requirement and intruding the judiciary into the process of foreign affairs and national security, and forcing upon the President the wholly inopposite requirement that a federal criminal law be about to be violated before he may defend the nation's interests. This President may be willing to accept such an invasion of the office's power, but future presidents should not. Nevertheless, this law, unconstitutional and unwise as it is, will prove a serious embarrassment to them, and they may find it politically unwise to challenge it. If so, a grave disservice will have been done the nation.

Article III, the judiciary article of the Constitution, is violated because in the application for a foreign intelligence warrant there is no "case" of controversy" to give the federal court jurisdiction. The government attorney appears in a secret session before a special judge. There is nobody present to oppose the issuance of the warrant. Warrants obtained for purposes of criminal prosecution do not have this defect because they are expected to become known and the subject of litigation. The criminal law standard inserted in this bill does not meet the "case" or "controversy" requirement—not if we really intend to conduct foreign intelligence—because it is a subterfuge. Foreign intelligence must often be done in cases where, whether or not there is a violation of the federal criminal code, no prosecution is intended and there will never be litigation over the warrant's validity.

The problem cannot be solved by making these special courts into Article I courts. Not only are these Article III judges, but a writ of certiorari lies to the Supreme Court of the United States, and I do not suppose anyone proposes to have the Supreme Court sit as an Article I court.

Nor is there a solution in providing a government attorney to oppose the warrant, some sort of devil's advocate. Such a lawyer is not a representative of a party who is not even informed that he is in court, is not informed he has a lawyer, and will never find those things out. That is a toy "case" or "controversy", not a real one.

For all of these reasons, I believe H.R. 7308 to be a thoroughly misguided venture, adding no protections but doing substantial damage to vital interests. I would prefer no legislation, but if there must be legislation, Congressman McClory's substitute is infinitely preferable to this. ●

TRIBUTE TO FRED T. ALLEN

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 5, 1978, Fred T. Allen, one of Fairfield County's most distinguished industrialists and citizens, will observe his 40th anniversary with Pitney Bowes of Stamford, Conn. As chairman of the board and president, Fred Allen is a distinguished leader in American business and a good neighbor.

Like Pitney Bowes, Fred Allen has come to full fruition in Stamford, earning recognition not only for skillful guidance of the business and retail systems company to national and international prominence, but also for his compassionate awareness of human causes and of the issues which shape the quality of human lives.

This past May 17, Fred was honored by the Stamford Area Commerce and Industry Association (SACIA) with its highest honor, the Walter H. Wheeler, Jr. Leadership Award, for outstanding community service. As 1975 chairman of SACIA, Fred Allen launched "Critical Choices," a 5-year goals program for our region and implemented the Stamford economic base study. He has for many years played an active role in key community projects, setting an example for the people of Pitney Bowes which has strengthened and sustained their sense of responsibility for their community.

Addressing the American Chamber of Commerce in Zurich, Switzerland in 1975, Fred Allen was among the very first to issue a call for a renewed commitment in ethics in American business. As chief executive of a prominent American multinational industry, he spoke out against kickbacks and questionable payments abroad which were then marring the reputations of leading American industries and, by inference, American business as a whole. In dozens of speeches over the next few years, Fred Allen called for adherence to the highest level of ethics in industry and for a high standard of behavior to restore public confidence in business and its leadership.

Fred Allen's commitment to Stamford and Fairfield County is second only to his commitment to Pitney Bowes. He has worked to attract the many companies now making their new corporate headquarters in Stamford and has sought tirelessly to upgrade housing and other social welfare and equal-opportunity programs in the area.

In his 40th year with Pitney Bowes, Fred Allen can look back to his company's early struggle to establish the revolutionary new concept of metered postage for business mail. Pitney Bowes is one of the Nation's leading business equipment industries, with products and technology branching well beyond the postage meter and the metered mail system which have long set the standard for U.S. business mailing. In the meantime, the Fairfield County company has not lost the sense of public responsibility born with its fundamental charge: the collection and securing of postal revenue by means of the postage meter. Fred Allen, schooled for 40 years in honorable traditions, has left his imprint on Pitney Bowes.●

LIBERATED LADIES WHO POUT IN PRINT

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of heightened public consciousness concerning the feminist movement, hardly a day goes by that does not see our news media carrying columns of opinion on the disadvantages of being a woman. Of course invidious discrimination exists against women, minorities, the elderly, the handicapped and others. Of course our efforts should be directed toward eliminating such wrongful discrimination—but sometimes people of good will can disagree on the nature and extent of the problem, and how best to resolve it.

Unfortunately, only one side of the controversy gets much coverage. Once in a while, however, a column is written which finds its way into print that speaks of the other side of this argument. Such a column appeared in the June 26, 1978 Chicago Tribune, written by Pat Somers Cronin, a former reporter and mother of 10 children. She is lighthearted, articulate, and not at all unhappy being a housewife and mother.

Her column is well worth reading:

LIBERATED LADIES WHO POUT IN PRINT

(By Pat Somers Cronin)

By George, I think I've got it, I really think I've got it!

Here I am at the point in life when a woman can reasonably expect to pour a second cup of coffee and settle down with the morning Tribune, assured that her family is off to a secure and well-fed start and that she has earned a few minutes' repose.

Then on they come, nagging and nipping, those hoards of younger women, publishing prolifically, talking interminably, all urging me out of the house and back into the market place to find fulfillment. Stridently aggressive, and with intense fervor, they insist that I be free and liberated on *their* terms, not mine.

But now, finally, I'm on to it, and it's so simple I should have guessed it long ago. They have, you see, and almost to a woman—The Tribune's own Sunday columnist, Jane O'Reilly, included—been attending their 20th college class reunions. And that has given them pause, and a chance to recollect . . . publicly, of course.

What they are recollecting is that they were unfairly programmed from the start to be good little wives and mothers, to keep the old IQ hidden away, to abstain from anything remotely scholarly, and to realize the great American dream *ad nauseam:* the good suburban life.

Achieve it they did, these golden gals, and then too late found out the dream was dust; they who were given so much woke up to wonder where life went.

That might be the end of the story except that it happened to so many of them at precisely the same time, and in so many of our Eastern schools; so now they do indeed represent a valid and obviously vocal segment of society. The world, you see, owes them not only a living but a brand new shiny dream as well.

By the merest coincidence, as their hymns of regret for the past appeared in print on their 20th anniversaries, my alma mater sent out notices for our 30th class reunion, and that's when it hit me.

I've got to be at least 10 years older than Jane O'Reilly and her chums and not once, not ever, did anyone say to me cool it kid, settle down, don't let the old brains show—you'll only get married some day so who needs an education anyway?

What someone, namely my father, said to me was, "I'll put you through college, which won't mean a thing to an employer. After that, go into nursing, teaching, or business, so that you, kid, can support yourself."

That seemed reasonable and I elected business, which led to writing, and eventually to reporting, with no regrets and no sour grapes. That I later met someone who made me think marriage, home, and family could also be fun, maybe even challenging, maybe even more worthwhile than a fascinating career, was a happy and very fortunate circumstance.

What is the difference between the classes of '48 and '58? For us, life and the marketplace were real; we knew we had to get out there and struggle for our share of the pie. Nor did we worry about who got to the top, male or female; from what we observed, those who worked harder, studied more, gave more to the job, ended up with the promotion . . . or got out and went somewhere else.

Ten years later, women college graduates, instead of being grateful for the privilege of education and the years in academia, have turned into professional crybabies, and when things don't go their way they pout in print and call it consciousness-raising. They seem to have arrived in the real world with ego-padded expectations and built-in chips on the shoulders.

At our 30th, by the way, I sat next to a friend who is divorced and the mother of three, all of whom she is putting through college.

"Well," she said matter-of-factly, "I soon realized I couldn't do it on a secretary's salary . . . so I went to law school and just passed the bar."

Take that, Jane O'Reilly! No sad songs, just a creative, successful solution.

So now, you see, when I pour that second cup of coffee and dip into the paper only to find the touchy tantrums of the class of '58, I am neither impressed nor convinced. Why, with all their advantages, are they so dumb? ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILSON H. ELKINS

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the poet Alfred Lord Tennyson once said, "Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers." In just a few days, many colleagues, associates, admirers, and friends will be honoring a man whose wisdom, dedication, and vision will remain with us as a treasured legacy for years to come. That man is Dr. Wilson H. Elkins.

Dr. Elkins will be retiring Friday, June 30, after more than two decades as president of the University of Maryland. And in that span of time, he has guided the university to an unprecented level of academic excellence while nurturing an expansion of curricula and enrollment. Most of the credit for the university's success through this period of progress goes to Dr. Elkins, and his achievement is even more significant when one realizes that the University of Maryland is a State institution.

We wish we could claim Dr. Elkins as "Maryland's own," but as some of my colleagues would tell you, the next best thing is to be born in Texas, which he was some 70 years ago. Even during his formative years, his activities and achievements were harbingers of future successes, for he excelled in virtually every category in his own career at the University of Texas. A Phi Beta Kappa in the classroom, "Bull" Elkins, as he was known in those days, earned eight varsity athletic letters, as well, combining brains with brawn. And in his final year, he captained the school basketball team while also serving as president of the student government, thus combining clout with politics. Indeed, his training ground for the future was well founded and complete. Dr. Elkins graduated in 1932 with both a B.A. and an M.A. degree, and after graduation he was recognized for his academic excellence by being selected a Rhodes Scholar in Oxford. He earned a Ph. D. in 1936 and returned to his alma mater, the University of Texas, to teach history for 2 years before being named president of San Antonio Junior College. He has then appointed president of Texas Western College, a post he held until becoming the 21st president of my own State's university in 1954.

Upon arriving at College Park, Dr. Elkins found a school with a good reputation in athletics, but one in danger of losing its accreditation. He moved immediately to strengthen the school's academic standing. Under his leadership, Maryland's enrollment grew from 15,000 to 78,000. The first budget he administered was $23 million, the last $316.8 million. Academically, Maryland today is recognized by both the Association of Maryland Universities and Phi Beta Kappa. In research, it is among the 30 top institutions in the Nation. There are those who would tell us that big is not necessarily better, but the growth of the University of Maryland has in no way diminished its effectiveness in serving so well each individual student.

During the turbulence of the Vietnam war era, and the unrest on the campuses across the Nation during the 1960's when so many of our educational institutions were wracked with dissent and violence, Maryland University emerged unscathed. Dr. Elkins' understanding, patience, and guidance provided the even hand which kept our school intact. To be sure, there were times of stress, times when demonstrations led to the takeover of the administration building, but unlike other schools, there were no students injured and destruction was minimal. That tells us a lot about the respected administration of Wilson Elkins.

New challenges face Maryland University today. The current era is one of growing demands and even more scarce educational dollars—all coupled with an impatient taxpaying public. But I know that if Maryland can count, in the years ahead, on the kind of leadership it has had under Dr. Wilson Elkins, we need not worry about its future. It will not only survive, but will continue to thrive and provide the kind of progressive and practical learning which has been its hallmark for so long.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather in honor of Dr. Elkins on Friday evening, I know the Members of this House join me in extending a deep and heartfelt expression of appreciation to him for his efforts on behalf of Maryland residents for the past 24 years. Wilson and his gracious wife, Vivian, have told me that they plan to remain in their College Park home, but I venture to say, it will not be in retirement. The enthusiasm and energy which they both possess will lead them to new and challenging pursuits, and I wish them every success in whatever endeavor they undertake. ●

INSURANCE BROKERS SUPPORT SELF-INSURANCE OPTION FOR PRODUCT LIABILITY

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, last year I joined with CHUCK WHALEN and several of our colleagues to introduce the Product Liability Insurance Tax Equity Act, H.R. 7711. That legislation pioneered the concept that companies or individuals with product or professional liability risk should be allowed to self-insure for all or part of that risk.

This is not a terribly novel idea. But it is necessary to change the Internal Revenue Code to facilitate self-insurance, and our bill was the first proposal offered in the House to that effect. In the year since we introduced H.R. 7711, several other Members have introduced variations of our original proposal, over 100 Members have become sponsors of one or more of the bills, dozens of trade and professional associations have endorsed the legislation, and the Commerce Department has recommended that the President support the concept of facilitating self-insurance for product liability.

Thus far, the only organized resistance to the self-insurance option has come from the insurance companies that offer product liability policies. In the June 15 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, CHUCK WHALEN presented a detailed rebuttal of the arguments being expounded by the American Insurance Association, which represents most of the companies that write product liability policies.

Mr. WHALEN accurately summed up his statement when he said:

The case against the self-insurance option is weak. The arguments of self-insurance opponents are easily refuted.

One argument in particular is especially easy to refute. The material put out by the AIA would have us believe that there is no way that a self-insured could possibly cope with all the details of running an insurance program. This is nonsense.

Many of the really big manufacturing firms in the United States have had self-insurance programs for years. Some call it retained risk and others simply take very large deductibles. Increasingly, big businesses are creating their own captive insurance companies. Often, these large companies have their own in-house personnel to handle their insurance needs. The Risk and Insurance Management Society is currently composed of several thousand individuals who earn their livings as in-house experts on insurance.

The object of H.R. 7711 is to make the benefits of self-insurance available to the smaller companies, those that cannot afford to set up a captive insurance firm. And for these smaller companies it may not be feasible to contemplate having a full-time risk management or insurance expert on the payroll. But this is not a serious problem.

There are thousands of insurance brokers and consultants in this country who are not only ready but eager to help firms that want to self-insure. Last fall it was my privilege to address a meeting of the National Association of Insurance Brokers. They told me then that they thought our proposal to facilitate self-insurance was long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, the NAIB publishes a weekly news bulletin and commentary, entitled the "Friday Flash." While it is not on the required reading list for Members of Congress, as a former State insurance commissioner I do read it from time to time.

In the June 2, 1978, issue of the Friday Flash, the NAIB takes issue with recent reports that the "insurance industry" opposes our tax equity proposals. They say that while the AIA and its member insurance companies may oppose the legislation, the insurance brokers—the portion of the industry that is closest to the consumers with insurance problems—support our effort to revise the tax code to facilitate self-insurance

In the June 2 *Friday Flash*, in a section labeled "Commentary," the editor says:

In the debate about pending "tax equity" legislation—bills to permit businesses a tax deduction for contributions to a self-insurance trust—we read with considerable annoyance that "the insurance industry" opposes it; that "the insurance industry" doesn't want the competition; that "the industry" is concerned about losing business to self-insurance. For the record, the nation's commercial insurance brokers are part of that all-encompassing and usually misleading phrase, "the insurance industry." Contrary to that sold-front imagery, NAIB endorses "tax equity. . . We don't buy assertions by insurance company spokesmen that there's no problem and no need. Tax equity legislation is no panacea but we think it will help. Our part of "the insurance industry" will continue to support it, and let nobody be misled about that.

There are other signs, too, that the insurance industry is not 100 percent united in its opposition to self-insurance proposals. For the time being, though, I merely wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the foregoing quote from the National Association of Insurance Brokers' publication. The members of the NAIB labor long and hard to help their clients obtain needed insurance protection and I think we should recognize their support for legislation that will further help these companies and individuals that are experiencing liability insurance problems.●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS XI

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, as the vote on the repeal of the Turkish arms embargo approaches, Katherine Zenz and JoAnn McDaniel continue to languish in a Turkish prison. The two girls, from Oregon and Wisconsin, have served 5 years of a 24-year nonparolable sentence for the alleged possession of hashish.

As I have repeatedly reported to you over the past weeks, it is my desire to see a prisoner exchange treaty established with the government of Turkey. Such a treaty, like the ones already established with Canada and Mexico, would be in the best interest of both nations. As we have deemed human rights to be a major concern of not only our own Nation but also in our dealings with all nations we, especially, cannot neglect our own citizens who are being held, under deplorable conditions, in foreign prisons.

In an effort to achieve this much needed treaty, I have written a letter to President Carter, urging his prompt attention to this matter and asking him to take whatever measures he deems necessary to hasten the completion of such a treaty. I have asked my colleagues to join me in this letter and I have been very pleased with the response I have received. Inserted, herewith, in the RECORD is the letter to President Carter. This letter, supported by so many individuals, should be a sign to both the U.S. Government and the Turkish Government of the deep concern over this fundamental human rights issue.

The letter and cosigners follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have learned of the plight of two young American women, JoAnn McDaniel of Oregon, and Katherine Zenz of Wisconsin. These girls are presently serving a 24-year nonparolable sentence in Turkey for the alleged possession of hashish. Having already been in prison for five years, it would seem to us that consideration should be given by the Turkish government to the establishment of a prisoner exchange treaty with the United States so that these two women can be promptly returned home. The provision that both nations agree to such an exchange is basic, and, of course, necessary.

The girls' parents are elderly and without the means to travel to Turkey to visit their daughters, and may never have the opportunity to see JoAnn and Kathy again unless a treaty is negotiated.

As you know, the United States has a prisoner exchange treaty with both Canada and Mexico. The implementing legislation in the form of Public Law 95–144 is already in effect, and many prisoners have already been exchanged.

We are advised that the government of Turkey has a similar prisoner exchange treaty with the European Council, and that they have expressed an interest in entering into such a treaty with the United States because their treaty is already in force, and is broad enough to accommodate subsequent treaties with other countries. We are also advised that the State Department is studying this proposal, and we think that negotiations could be completed promptly so JoAnn and Kathy could serve the remainder of their sentences in the United States.

We are exceedingly sympathetic with the situation of these women, and we urge you to do all that you can to encourage prompt action on this matter of great concern.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. SAWYER.

COSIGNERS

Les AuCoin, Anthony Beilenson, Mario Biaggi, Michael Blouin, William Broomfield, Phil Burton, John Conyers, Laurence Coughlin, Joseph McDade and Edward Derwinski.

Robert Edgar, Don Edwards, Joshua Eilberg, John Erlenborn, Millicent Fenwick, Hamilton Fish, Bill Frenzel, Willis Gradison, William Green, and Tennyson Guyer.

George Hansen, Marjorie Holt, Elizabeth Holtzman, Henry Hyde, Barbara Jordan, Robert Kastenmeier, Martha Keys, Robert Krueger, Robert Lagomarsino, and Norman Lent.

Ron Marlenee, Norman Mineta, Ron Mottl, Richard Nolan, Richardson Preyer, Joel Pritchard, Carl Pursell, James Quillen, Frederick Richmond, and Robert Roe.

Richard Ottinger, Keith Sebelius, Ted Weiss, Doug Walgren, Paul Trible, Gene Taxler, Dave Stockman, Newton Steers, Charles Thone, and Louis Stokes.●

TIME FOR A CYPRUS SETTLEMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, two British editorial comments on the present impasse over Cyprus were recently called to my attention. I would like to share them with my colleagues.

One, "Time for a Cyprus Settlement," was published in the Guardian, June 5, 1978. The second headed, "Carter, NATO, and Cyprus," from the May 26, 1978, New Statesman notes that—

The triangle which is formed by Ankara, Athens and Nicosia will not cease to be a source of instability until there is a just political settlement in Cyprus.

This is quite true. This is why many of us are reluctant to modify the restrictions on sales of arms to Turkey at this

time, because there is no just political settlement on the horizon.

The editorials follow:

[From the London, England, New Statesman, May 26, 1978]

CARTER, NATO, AND CYPRUS

The latest NATO declarations on the Cyprus question provide almost a *locus classicus* of how not to conduct a foreign policy. They display just that combination of strategic special pleading and political naivete which led to the Cyprus catastrophe in the first place. What the NATO ministers are saying in effect is that Turkey should not be inconvenienced at all for her unauthorized use of American weapons in the 1974 invasion, and should be allowed to annex as much of the island as she wishes without any apparent demurral from the West. This, of course, because she is an ally, and because of the stratgic importance of the Bosphorus. Exactly this kind of approach was demonstrated by NATO leaders when they excused seven years of repulsive military dictatorship in Athens—a dictatorship culminating in the very aggression against Cyprus which made the Turkish invasion inevitable. Only then, of course, the strategic importance of Piraeus harbour to the Sixth Fleet was being invoked. (One wonders why it is not being invoked now.)

Because Dr. Kissinger had deceived Congress so thoroughly over the 1974 events, and because his policy in the area achieved the remarkable triple feat of alienating Greeks, Turks and Cypriots all at the same time, the Cyprus issue became something of a test case in the fight for open government in foreign policy. That, and not the activism of the 'Greek lobby', is the reason for the tenacity of certain Senators in upholding the embargo on arms to Turkey which NATO has said should be removed. One of the advantages of the Carter policy to date has been its reluctance to excuse piratical behaviour on the grounds that it is conducted by 'allies'. The condemnation of Israel's use of cluster bombs has been a case in point. Now Carter is contradicting this policy as it applies to Cyprus, in order to appease its powerful foes in the military and defence establishments. It has been found a mistake in the past to treat Cyprus as if it was uninhabited; it will be found so again.

NATO has called for a relaxation of pressure on Turkey just at a time when her pretexts for occupying the island are dissolving. There are increasing signs of Turkish-Cypriot discontent with the forces of the 'peace-keeping' contingent, illustrated forcibly by large demonstrations in Turkish Nicosia on May Day, when slogans against partition and colonisation were raised. Turkey still stands condemned at the United Nations for its policy towards Cyprus, and, although the report has not been published, at the European Commission on Human Rights as well. Negotiations between Turkey and the EEC are also impeded by the issue. But the hope of a settlement is being frustrated by the very group of intransigent military men whose bluff NATO is so eager not to call.

The triangle which is formed by Ankara, Athens and Nicosia will not cease to be a source of instability until there is a just political settlement in Cyprus. It is therefore absurdly short-sighted of the West to use one aspect of that instability—the unrest among Turkish generals—as an excuse to postpone a policy which could bring a settlement closer. The scare-mongering about Russian influence in Turkey just will not wash. Not only is the Turkish high command the most resolutely anti-Communist in NATO, but opportunities for Russian meddling in the area multiply precisely because Cyprus is such a source of division.

It might have been hoped that NATO, two of whose armies participated in the dismemberment of Cyprus, would accept some responsibility. But apparently its sole concern is to inter the issue as swiftly as possible, to get Turkey off the hook and to act as if strategy and politics existed on different planes. This stance, which involves conceding the right of one country to acquire the territory of another by force, is wrong in principle and foolhardy in practice. A Labour government should have no part in it.

[From the London, England, Guardian, June 5, 1978]

TIME FOR A CYPRUS SETTLEMENT

There is something about the long-running Cyprus tragi-comedy which encourages experienced players to mistime their entrances, muff their lines, and exit on banana skins. Already this year President Carter, Mr. Ecevit of Turkey, President Kyprianou and Dr. Kurt Waldheim have tripped over each other's feet in farcical fashion. As a result the Cyprus problem looks to be more completely deadlocked than it has for some time. Yet this week in New York Dr. Waldheim launches a new round of informal contacts designed to see if a settlement is possible. If his ability to chew Turkish delight and walk at the same time has improved there is a possibility that he will succeed in picking up the pieces he and the other participants so recently spilled on the ground. President Carter appealed to Congress to lift the Turkish arms embargo shortly before the Turks completed their peace proposals. Emboldened, the Turks toughened up those proposals quite unreasonably at the last moment. Distressed by the loss of American support and genuinely horrified by the ruthless nature of the modified Turkish plan, President Kyprianou labelled it unacceptable "in substance and philosophy" and indicated that it would be impossible to amend the plan in any way acceptable to (Greek) Cyprus. Whereupon Dr. Waldheim, who had just welcomed the Turkish plan without studying it or the likely Cypriot reaction to it, backtracked rapidly. His enthusiasm for the plan apparently did not mean he thought it an appropriate basis for negotiation. Which did nothing for his reputation either in Ankara or Nicosia. Final Catch-22: President Carter has discovered (mainly as a result of the hard line taken by Turkey since he proposed the end of the arms embargo) that Congress will almost certainly reject his proposal.

Even so there are signs for hope. At the NATO summit Mr. Ecevit made it clear that there would be no friction with Greece engineered in the Aegean this summer. And, though Turkey will continue to rock the NATO boat, he does not intend to leap overboard. More than that—all Turkish sources now insist that there is massive give in the Turkish position if only the Greeks would agree to negotiate. (Six weeks back there were merely vague nods and winks about possible, marginal, shifts.) The industrial and political unrest in the Turkish sector of Cyprus and the bitter confirmation by Dr. Kutchuk in the opposition press, that the mainland Turkish army has secretly shipped in more than 40,000 illegal and highly unpopular immigrants from the mainland all suggest that Turkish Cypriots would welcome a reasonable settlement and an end to meddling by the 25,000-strong Turkish "peacekeeping force."

Dr. Waldheim's task, with a little help from the Americans, is to get substantial improvments on the public record in advance of talks. Specifically the Turks should offer —as an opening bid—to return at least a quarter of the occupied North to the Greek Cypriots. That would enable perhaps two-thirds of the 180,000 refugees to return to their own homes and fields and still leave the Turks with far more than their fair share of land. Next the Turks' mis-named "federal" proposals (two defense forces with no joint command, two assemblies which do not normally meet jointly, two currencies and two central banks—two mini-states free to negotiate separate international treaties) should be re-jigged to look a lot more like what the rest of the world knows as federalism. It is inevitably going to be a weak federation at first. But there is no reason to build deadlock and dissolution into it from the start. Finally the Turks must make some concession towards (phased?) freedom of movement and compensation or resettlement for the remaining refugees, Turkish as well as Greek. If Dr. Waldheim can get that far the Greek Cypriots would be well advised to swallow their pride and get back to the conference table. Four years is a long time in politics and the Greek Cypriot tragedy is no longer at the top of international compassion tables. Tough as the present mainland Turkish regime is, the next (possibly military) could well be tougher. And, with the cold war getting colder, the strategic significance of Turkey looks significantly more strategic than that of Cyprus and Greece combined. One way and another a speedy—but not inherently unworkable—solution to the Cyprus problem is in the interest of all Cypriots, Greek and Turkish alike.●

AMERICA'S FIRST FOREIGN WAR DEAD TO RETURN

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, on the night of September 4, 1804, the U.S.S. *Intrepid* crept slowly into the harbor at Tripoli, in what is now Libya. The fledgling United States was engaged in its first foreign war, fighting to maintain freedom of the seas for American ships against the Barbary Pirates. The mission of the 13 officers and men, commanded by Captain Richard Somers, of Atlantic County, N.J., was to turn their small ship into a floating torch, destroying as much enemy shipping as possible in the crowded harbor. No sooner had the *Intrepid* entered the harbor than it was fired on by Tripolitan gunboats. At 9:47 p.m. the *Intrepid* blew up. Many historians believe that Captain Somers and his men deliberately destroyed the ship and its load of gunpowder to keep it from falling into the hands of the pirates. Two days later, the bodies of Captain Somers and his men were recovered, mangled beyond recognition. The remains were buried in five graves in a small cemetery in Tripoli. They were the first casualties in America's first foreign war.

Now, it is time to bring them home. A bill just introduced by me directs the Navy to bring the bodies home for burial in Arlington National Cemetery. The problem was brought to my attention by members of the Sergeant Clendenon Newell Post No. 1 of the American Legion, Leonia, N.J. That post, incidentally, was the first in New Jersey.

First of all, these men were the first men to die for the United States in a foreign war. Second, they died while per-

forming their duties above and beyond the call of duty, and in the highest traditions of American servicemen. Third, the war with the Barbary Pirates is one of the only wars from which have not honored an unknown soldier. I think we owe it to these men, to American men and women in uniform everywhere, and to ourselves as a nation, to pay tribute to the heroism and patriotism these men displayed.

The men are buried in a foreign cemetery rather than in an American military cemetery overseas, and the graves receive little of the attention accorded to those buried in the military cemeteries. The *Intrepid* sailors are a special case which calls for returning the men to American soil.

I hope the bill can be enacted in time for the men to be laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery on Veterans' Day and I ask the Carter administration to support the bill. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ST. ANN'S PARISH, CINCINNATI, OHIO, ON THEIR 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 2, members of St. Ann's Parish in my congressional district will celebrate the 25th anniversary of their founding with a Mass of Thanksgiving, followed by a reception and dinner.

As part of this national tribute to St. Ann's, I urge my colleagues to join with me in offering our heartiest congratulations to this pround parish.

St. Ann's was founded on July 2, 1953. The founding pastor was Father James Lunn. The first masses were held in the Groesbeck Community Hall on Colerain Avenue. When St. Ann's started in 1953, half of the building was a hall and the other half housed the Groesbeck Fire Department. Sunday masses were held in the hall at that time, and weekday masses and confessions in the chapel in the farmhouse located on St. Ann's property. Of course, it involved parishioners setting up for mass on Saturday nights after dances were held in the hall, and cleaning up after the masses on Sunday, but it was all done with a spirit of joy and thanksgiving.

When the school building was finished in September of 1954, mass then took place in the north side of the building, which would later be converted into four schoolrooms. The front area where the altar was situated could be closed off with a folding door. The rest of the area served as seating for mass, meeting room, and hall for dances, card parties, and so forth.

Finally, the present church facility was completed and a special mass of dedication was held on June 28, 1959. Since that time there have been very few physical changes. Following Vatican II, the altar was turned to face the people. Baptisms now take place in the sanctuary as those being baptized are welcomed into the church. The former baptism room has been converted into a room for reconciliation.

Many special masses have taken place in this church: First masses for Father Wayne King, Father Ed Williams, Father John Kummer, and Father Harry Kist; farewell mass for Father Lunn when he retired; installation mass for Father Bill Dorrmann and Father Dave Brinkmoeller, our copastors; and for many of the parishioners, weddings and funerals of loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to seek this recognition for St. Ann's parish. I am proud to represent this parish as they have and continue to be a vital part of this community. I also hope that their concern for others is rewarded by continued success in all their endeavors. May we wish them a happy 25th anniversary.●

PIPELINE SHIPMENTS TO CHILE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution of inquiry regarding U.S. arms shipments to Chile, with my colleagues JOHN BURTON, PHILLIP BURTON, TOM HARKIN, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, GEORGE MILLER, and TOBY MOFFETT. Last week the matter of "pipeline" shipments to Chile became a matter of national concern when members of local No. 10 of the ILWU courageously refused to load shipments of bomb parts destined for Chile.

In 1976 Congress passed important legislation terminating U.S. arms sales and military assistance to Chile. Those of us who voted for this legislation expected that, in fact, the United States would cease to supply arms to the Pinochet regime—a government which is notorious for its consistent repression and denial of the most basic human and legal rights of the people of Chile. Two years later, the Chilean armed forces and police continue to receive U.S. arms, ammunition, and military equipment—an estimated $57 million worth in 1977 alone. The military hardware shipped to Chile since the arms cutoff includes aircraft engines, transport planes, naval search radars, and high explosive artillery shells.

The spirit, if not the letter, of the arms embargo is repeatedly violated because the United States has been willing to fill those orders for military equipment made by Chile prior to June 30, 1976, the effective date of the arms cutoff.

The resolution we are introducing today requests information regarding all agreements to sell arms to Chile which were not fully executed as of that effective date. I include a copy of this resolution for the RECORD, as it will enumerate our questions on this matter. Congress must know what items have been delivered since the ban took effect, and what items are yet to be delivered under this arrangement. It is well within the President's power to discontinue the delivery of these pipeline sales. Failure to do so makes a mockery of the congressional ban and totally undermines the administration's stated human rights policy.

Despite the announced "reforms" and the "program of liberalization," the Pinochet government persists in a policy of aggressive disregard for the internationally recognized rights of its citizens. Union elections, strikes, and collective bargaining are outlawed—as are political parties. 1,500 persons have disappeared after being seized by the police, and the government has failed—despite repeated promises to families and loved ones—to account for these persons. The most significant impact of the government's recently announced "amnesty" is that it has closed the court cases of those police officers who were under investigation for involvement in the disappearances. There have been no substantive improvements in the human rights situation in Chile.

Last Friday, June 23, the Department of State recalled Ambassador Landau from Santiago and announced that all pipeline shipments to Chile would discontinue, pending review of the human rights situation in that country. On that day I joined with many of my colleagues in applauding the administration's actions in this regard. Again, today, as I introduce this resolution of inquiry, I commend President Carter for this decision and urge him not to resume these shipments. I believe, however, that the information requested in this resolution regarding pipeline shipments is vital if we are to carry out the will of Congress as articulated in the legislation prohibiting U.S. arms shipments to Chile.

The resolution follows:

H. Res. —

Resolved, That not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, the Secretary of State shall furnish to the House of Representatives the following information, if such information is known by the Secretary or is within the possession of the Secretary:

(1) A list of all agreements to sell defense articles or defense services to Chile which were entered into under the Foreign Military Sales Act before June 30, 1976, and which were not fully executed as of that date, such list to include with respect to each such agreement—

(A) the date on which the agreement was entered into;

(B) a listing of any defense articles or defense services delivered under the agreement between June 30, 1976, and the date of adoption of this resolution;

(C) a listing of any defense articles or defense services scheduled for delivery under the agreement after the date of adoption of this resolution; and

(D) a listing of any defense articles or defense services which have been ordered under the agreement as of the date of adoption of this resolution but which have not yet been scheduled for delivery.

Each such listing shall identify the defense articles or defense services and shall specify the quantity of defense articles or defense services delivered or to be delivered, their agreement price, the date on which they were ordered, and the date of delivery where known.

(2) A list of all licenses for the export to Chile of commercially sold arms, ammuni-

tion, or implements of war, including technical data relating thereto, which were issued under section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 before June 30, 1976, and which were still in effect on that date, such list to include with respect to each such license—

(A) the date on which the license was issued;

(B) a listing of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war, including technical data relating thereto, delivered under the license between June 30, 1976, and the date of adoption of this resolution;

(C) a listing of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war, including technical data relating thereto, scheduled for delivery under the license after the date of adoption of this resolution; and

(D) a listing of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war, including technical data relating thereto, which have been ordered for delivery under the license as of the date of adoption of this resolution but which have not yet been scheduled for delivery.

Each such listing shall identify the arms, ammunition, or implements of war, including technical data relating thereto, and shall specify the quantity thereof delivered or to be delivered, their contract price, the date on which they were ordered, and the date of delivery where known.●

TURKEY'S INSENSITIVITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS—X

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a chilling column by Jack Anderson which confirms the absolutely abhorent conditions which Americans are experiencing while incarcerated in Turkish prisons. This article, entitled "Turkey's Prisons: Heartbreak Houses," demonstrates the urgent need for the United States to rapidly conclude negotiations with the Government of Turkey on a prisoner exchange treaty which would allow American citizens to serve their sentences in the United States.

The idea of a prisoner exchange is not new to the Turks as they are participants in a similar agreement among Council of Europe nations. Therefore, I strongly urge our own State Department and the Government of Turkey to begin deliberate and serious negotiations to promptly reach mutual agreement on a much needed prisoners exchange treaty.

The article, taken from the Washington Post of June 27, 1978, follows:

TURKEY'S PRISONS: HEARTBREAK HOUSES

(By Jack Anderson)

President Carter's move to lift the U.S. arms embargo against Turkey has a special urgency for five Americans now interned in Turkish prisons. If Congress can be persuaded to end the embargo, the five might be sent home to finish their sentences in the United States.

For several months, American and Turkish diplomats have been discussing a prisoner exchange treaty, similar to the pacts recently negotiated with Mexico and Canada. The Turks have been acutely sensitive about the idea, because it implies that their treatment of prisoners is less than humane. Given the strain in Turkish-American relations over the arms embargo, there is little chance the Turks would give up the five Americans.

Over four months ago, U.S. officials gave the Turks a draft of the proposed prisoner exchange treaty with Bolivia and suggested it be studied as a model for an American-Turkish pact. But a confidential source said: "There has been little feedback. They are really dragging their feet." Added another insider: "If the embargo is lifted, things could get better."

At the urging of the Turkish government, I sent my associate Joe Spear to Turkey. The Turks promised that Spear would be permitted to visit a Turkish prison.

The penal institutions in Turkey, Spear determined, fully deserve their notorious reputations. The food is barely edible; sanitation conditions would fail flophouse standards in the United States; brutality by prison guards is an accepted, if unofficial, way of life. A favored form of punishment, said confidential sources, is flailing recalcitrant prisoners mercilessly on the soles of their bare feet with long sticks.

Even worse than the guards are the surly, ruthless Turkish hoods who belong to the "Turkish mafia." Armed with guns and knives smuggled in, and aided by informers, they control the prison population and run the rackets behind prison walls.

The mafia also trafficks in hashish and heroin. "The stuff comes over the walls at night," said one former prisoner. "The authorities try to control it, but they just can't do it."

In fairness to the Turkish authorities, they give preferential treatment to foreign prisoners, especially Americans. In each institution, the foreigners are assigned to a special area called the "tourist section." The Turks also take pains to locate American prisoners in prisons where U.S. consular officers can visit them conveniently.

In Ankara, Spear interviewed the director of Turkish prisons, Dr. Mustafa Yucel, who earned his Ph.D. in law at New York University. The gruff but likable Yucel apparently had done his homework before the meeting. He began by pointing a finger at Spear and declaring: "I know all about you!"

He then launched into a tirade about the negative stories that have been published about the Turkish prisons. He pulled a book from a shelf and slammed it down on his desk, "Lies! All lies!" he shouted.

The book was "Midnight Express," written by Billy Hayes, a young American who spent five years in Turkish prisons and finally made a daring dash for freedom. Snorted Yucel: "They say the prisons are schools for criminals. But this book," he said, stabbing it with his finger, "is proof that Turkish prisons are schools for writers."

With Yucel's permission, Spear flew to Istanbul and drove out to Sagmalcilar prison, whose grey stone eminence looms over a grimy industrial suburb known as Bayrampasa. The institution holds about 3,000 inmates, some 150 of whom are "political prisoners" detained for shooting or bombing people who don't share their ideologies.

His institution, said the director, was built in 1968 and was "the most modern prison in the Middle East." Prisoners are served two meals a day, he said, but can purchase extra food in a canteen if they have the money. There are also "common rooms," he said, containing TV sets, refrigerators, foreign newspapers and books.

Spear then visited with Michael Ray, a native of Little Rock, Ark., who has spent five years in Turkish prisons. A wiry, dark-complexioned man in his mid-30s, Ray looked Turkish and, indeed, spoke the language fluently.

He had been arrested near the Syrian border in 1973, he said, with a half-ton of hashish in his possession. "I am a capitalist," he shugged. "I was trying to make some money." He took the rap for his girlfriend, who accompanied him. His sentence: 101 years.

This has now been reduced to 24 years—leaving him, he said, with a wry smile, "only 18 years to go." He served time in several Turkish prisons, "from the worst to the best. The worst are awful. This is the best."●

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSMAN TOBY MOFFETT

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, as has been my practice in the past, I am again submitting for the public record a listing of my assets and liabilities, as well as my 1977 income taxes.

I firmly believe that this kind of voluntary disclosure, although not required by law, helps counter the shockingly low degree of public confidence in Government which we have seen reflected in recent opinion polls.

It also gives the public a better basis upon which to determine whether their Representatives in fact view their position as a "public trust," rather than a service to some special interest.

I also wish to note that, as a matter of principle, I rejected the most recent congressional pay raise, amounting to $12,900 a year. I do not feel that a sitting Congress should have anything to do with giving itself a raise—if it is going to vote a raise, it should at least make that raise effective for the next Congress, thus giving an opportunity to the public to judge its actions before the raise takes effect. Additionally, the Government ought to reflect some sensitivity to the burdens imposed on the public during difficult economic times.

Consequently, although my salary is listed at $54,275, I did not accept the raise, using it instead to aid my area's emergency fuel banks and to expand and improve Sixth District services.

1977 ASSETS

Savings account	$53
Checking account	852
(Escrow account, from salary—rejected pay raise)	(1,510)
1965 Dodge Dart	75
1975 Ford Mustang	3,000
Stocks	none
Bonds	none
House in Washington, D.C.	43,000
House in Washington, D.C.	53,500
House in Unionville, Conn.	34,000

1977 LIABILITIES

Mortgage on house in Washington, D.C. (as of December, to be paid)	47,842
Mortgage on house in Washington, D.C. (as of December, to be paid)	54,559
Mortgage on house in Unionville, Conn. (as of December, to be paid)	31,924
Personal loan	13,200
Personal loan	3,131
Auto (Ford) loan	3,217
Home improvement loan	2,630

1977 FEDERAL TAXES

Federal	$13,383

1977 INCOME (LOSS)

Salary	54,275
Interest (incl. escrow account)	86
Dividends	none
Business income	none
Honoraria	1,950
Medical reimbursements	none
Rental income (loss)	(−3,179)

RACIAL QUOTAS

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of June 18, 1978 excerpted Mr. Thomas Sowell's contribution to the June issue of Commentary in an article entitled, "Racial Quotas Achieve Nothing—At Great Cost." Mr. Sowell is a professor of economics at UCLA and the author of several books including, "Black Education: Myths and Tragedies."

In this article Mr. Sowell examines the assumption that the statistical "representation" of a group—in jobs, schools, and so forth, shows and measures discrimination, which is at the center of the controversy surrounding preferential admissions and hiring policies.

His examination of this assumption provides strong evidence that discrimination and injustice, brought about by the use of quotas, can never be used to eliminate discrimination or do away with past injustices because the only thing produced is more discrimination and injustice. In light of the Supreme Court's decision in the Bakke case, I commend Mr. Sowell's article to my colleagues' attention:

RACIAL QUOTAS ACHIEVE NOTHING—AT GREAT COST

(By Thomas Sowell)

Race has never been an area noted for rationality of thought or action. Almost every conceivable form of nonsense has been believed about racial or ethnic groups at one time or another.

Theologians used to debate whether black people had souls (today's terminology might suggest that *only* black people have souls). As late as the 1920s, a leading authority on mental tests claimed that test results disproved the popular belief that Jews are intelligent. Since then, Jewish IQs have risen above the national average and more than one-fourth of all American Nobel Prize winners have been Jewish.

Today's grand fallacy about race and ethnicity is that the statistical "representation" of a group—in jobs, schools, etc.—shows and measures discrimination. This notion is at the center of such controversial policies as affirmative-action hiring, preferential admissions to college and public-school busing.

But despite the fact that far-reaching judicial rulings, political crusades and bureaucratic empires owe their existence to that belief, it remains an unexamined assumption. Tons of statistics have been collected, but only to be interpreted in the light of that assumption, never to test the assumption itself. Glaring facts to the contrary are routinely ignored. Questioning the "representation" theory is stigmatized as not only inexpedient but immoral. It is the noble lie of our time.

THE AGE AND EDUCATION FACTORS

"Representation" or "underrepresentation" is based on comparisons of a given group's percentage in the population with its percentage in some occupation, institution, or activity. This might make sense if the various ethnic groups were even approximately similar in age distribution, education and other crucial variables. But they are not.

Some ethnic groups are a whole decade younger than others. Some are two decades youngers. The average age of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans is under 20, while the average of Irish Americans or Italian Americans is over 30—and the average age of Jewish Americans is over 40. This is because of large differences in the number of children per family from one group to another. Some ethnic groups have more than twice as many children per family as others. Over half of the Mexican American and Puerto Rican population consists of teenagers, children and infants. These two groups are likely to be underrepresented in any adult activity, whether work, or recretion, whether controlled by others or entirely by themselves, and whether there is discrimination or not.

Educational contrasts are also great. More than half of all Americans over 35 of German, Irish, Jewish or Oriental ancestry have completed at least four years of high school. Less than 20 percent of all Mexican Americans in the same age bracket have done so. The disparities become even greater when you consider quality of school, field of specialization, postgraduate study and other factors that are important in the kind of high-level jobs on which special attention is focused by those emphasizing representation.

Those groups with the most education—Jews and Orientals—also have the highest quality education, as measured by the rankings of the institutions from which they receive their college degrees, and specialize in the more difficult and remunerative fields, such as science and medicine. Orientals in the United States are so heavily concentrated in the scientific area that there are more Oriental scientists than there are black scientists in absolute numbers, even though the black population of the United States is more than 20 times the size of the Oriental population.

Attention has been focused most on high-level positions—the kind of jobs people reach after years of experience or education, or both. There is no way to get the experience or education without also growing older in the process, so when we are talking about top-level jobs, we are talking about the kind of positions people reach in their 40s and 50s rather than in their teens and 20s. Representation in such jobs cannot be compared to representation in a population that includes many 5-year-olds—yet it is.

The general ethnic differences in age become extreme in some of the older age brackets. Half of the Jewish population of the United States is 45 years old or older, but only 12 per cent of the Puerto Rican population is that old. Even if Jews and Puerto Ricans were identical in every other respect, and even if no employer ever had a speck of prejudice, there would still be huge disparities between the two groups in top-level positions, just from age differences alone.

Virtually every underrepresented racial or ethnic group in the United States has a lower than average age and consists disproportionately of children and inexperienced young adults. Almost invariably these groups also have less education, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The point here is not that we should "blame the victim" or "blame society." The point is that we should, first of all, talk sense. "Representation" talk is cheap, easy and misleading; discrimination and opportunity are too serious to be discussed in gobbledygook.

DO PREFERENCES HELP?

The idea that preferential treatment is going to "compensate" people for past wrongs flies in the face of two hard facts:

1. Public opinion polls have repeatedly shown most blacks opposed to preferential treatment either in jobs or college admissions. A Gallup Poll in March 1977, for example, found only 27 percent of nonwhites favoring "preferential treatment" over "ability as determined by test scores," while 64 percent preferred the latter and 9 percent were undecided. (The Gallup breakdown of the U.S. population by race, sex, income, education, etc. found that "not a single population group supports affirmative action.")

How can you compensate people by giving them something they have explicitly rejected?

2. The income of blacks relative to whites reached its peak before affirmative-action hiring and has declined since. The median income of blacks reached a peak of 60.9 percent of the median income of whites in 1970—the year before "goals" and "timetables" became part of the affirmative-action concept. "In only one year of the last six years," writes Andrew Brimmer, "has the proportion been as high as 60 percent."

Before something can be a "compensation," it must first be a benefit.

The repudiation of the numerical or preferential approach by the very people it is supposed to benefit points out the large gap between illusion and reality that is characteristic of affirmative action. So does the cold fact that there are few, if any, benefits to offset all the bitterness generated by this heavy-handed program The bitterness is largely a result of a deeply resented principle, galling bureaucratic processes and individual horror stories. Overall, the program has changed little for minorities or women. Supporters of the program try to cover up its ineffectiveness by comparing the position of minorities today with their position many years ago. This ignores all the progress that took place under straight equal-treatment laws in the 1960s—progress that has not continued at anywhere near the same pace under affirmative action.

WHO PUSHES FOR PREFERENCES?

If blacks are opposed to preferential treatment and whites are opposed to it, who then is in favor of it, and how does it go on? The implications of these questions are even more far reaching and more disturbing than the policy itself. They show how vulnerable our democratic and constitutional safeguards are to a relative handful of determined people.

Some of those people promoting preferential treatment and numerical goals are so convinced of the rightness of what they are doing that they are prepared to sacrifice whatever needs to be sacrificed—whether it be other people, the law or simple honesty in discussing what they are doing (note "goals," "desegregation," and similar euphemisms).

Other supporters of numerical policies have the powerful drive of self-interest as well as self-righteousness. Bureaucratic empires have grown up to administer these programs, reaching into virtually every business, school, hospital or other organization. The rulers and agents of this empire can order employers around, make college presidents bow and scrape, assign schoolteachers by race, or otherwise gain power, publicity and career advancement—regardless of whether minorities are benefited or not.

While self-righteousness and self-interest are powerful drives for those who have them, they can succeed only insofar as other people can be persuaded, swept along by feelings, or neutralized. Rhetoric has accomplished this with images of historic wrongs, visions of social atonement and a horror of being classed with bigots. These tactics have

worked best with those most affected by words and least required to pay a price personally: nonelected judges, the media and the intellectual establishment.

The "colorblind" words of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or even the protections of the Constitution, mean little when judges can creatively reinterpret them out of existence. It is hard to achieve the goal of an informed public when the mass media show only selective indignation about power grabs and a sense of pious virtue in covering up the failures of school integration.

Even civil libertarians—who insist that the Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination is a sacred right that cannot be denied Nazis, Communists or criminals—show no concern when the government routinely forces employers to confess "deficiencies" in their hiring processes, without a speck of evidence other than a numerical pattern different from the government's preconception.

Preferential admissions to colleges and universities are "justified" by similar rhetoric and the similar assumption that statistical underrepresentation means institutional exclusion. Sometimes this assumption is buttressed by notions of "compensation" and a theory that (1) black communities need more black practitioners in various fields; and that (2) black students will ultimately supply that need.

The idea that the black community's doctors, lawyers, etc. should be black is an idea held by white liberals, but no such demand has come from the black community, which has rejected preferential admissions in poll after poll. Moreover, the idea that an admissions committee can predict what a youth is going to do with his life years later is even more incredible—even if the youth is one's own son or daughter, much less someone from a wholly different background.

These moral or ideological reasons for special minority programs are by no means the whole story. The public image of a college or university is often its chief financial asset. Bending a few rules here and there to get the right body count of minority students seems a small price to pay for maintaining an image that will keep money coming in from the government and the foundations. When a few thousand dollars in financial aid to students can keep millions of tax dollars rolling in, it is clearly a profitable investment for the institution. For the young people brought in under false pretense, it can turn out to be a disastrous and permanently scarring experience.

The most urgent concern over image and over government subsidies, foundation grants and other donations is at those institutions which have the most of all these things to maintain—that is, at prestigious colleges and universities at the top of the academic pecking order. The Ivy League schools and the leading state and private institutions have the scholarship money and the brand-name visibility to draw in enough minority youngsters to look good statistically. The extremely high admissions standards of these institutions usually cannot be met by the minority students—just as most students in general cannot meet them. But in order to have a certain minority body count, the schools bend (or disregard) their usual standards. The net result is that thousands of minority students who would normally qualify for good, non-prestigious colleges where they could succeed, are instead enrolled in famous institutions where they fail.

For example, at Cornell during the guns-on-campus crisis, fully half of the black students were on academic probation, despite easier grading standards for them in many courses. Yet these students were by no means unqualified. Their average test scores put them in the top quarter of all American college students—but the other Cornell students ranked in the top 1 percent. In other words, minority students with every prospect of success in a normal college environment were artificially turned into failures by being mismatched with an institution with standards too severe for them.

When the top institutions reach further down to get minority students, then academic institutions at the next level are forced to reach still further down, so that they too will end up with a minority body count high enough to escape criticism and avoid trouble with the government and other donors. Each academic level, therefore, ends up with minority students underqualified for that level, though usually perfectly qualified for some other level. The end result is a systematic mismatching of minority students and the institutions they attend, even though the wide range of American colleges and universities is easily capable of accommodating those same students under their normal standards.

Proponents of "special" (lower) admissions standards argue that without such standards no increase in minority enrollment would have been possible. But this blithely disregards the fact that when more money is available to finance college, more low-income people go to college.

The GI Bill after World War II caused an even more dramatic increase in the number of people going to college who could never have gone otherwise—and without lowering admissions standards. The growth of special minority programs in recent times has meant both a greater availability of money and lower admissions standards for black and other designated students. It is as ridiculous to ignore the effect of double standards on their maldistribution among institutions. It is the double standards that are the problems, and they can be ended without driving minority students out of the system. Of course, many academic hustlers who administer special programs might lose their jobs, but that would hardly be a loss to anyone else.

As long as admission to colleges and universities is not unlimited, someone's opportunity to attend has to be sacrificed as the price of preferential admission for others. No amount of verbal sleight-of-hand can get around this fact. None of those sacrificed is old enough to have had anything to do with historic injustices that are supposedly being compensated. Moreover, it is not the offspring of the privileged who are likely to pay the price. It is not a Rockefeller or a Kennedy who will be dropped to make room for quotas; it is a De Funis or a Bakke. Even aside from personal influence on admissions decisions, the rich can give their children the kind of private schooling that will virtually assure them test scores far above the cut-off level at which sacrifices are made.

Just as the students who are sacrificed are likely to come from the bottom of the white distribution, so the minority students chosen are likely to be from the top of the minority distribution. In short, it is a forced transfer of benefits from those least able to afford it to those least in need of it.

In some cases, the loose term "minority" is used to include individuals who are personally from more fortunate backgrounds than the average American. Sometimes it includes whole groups, such as Chinese or Japanese Americans, who have higher incomes than whites. One-fourth of all employed Chinese in this country are in professional occupations—nearly double the national average. No amount of favoritism to the son or daughter of a Chinese doctor or mathematician today is going to compensate some Chinese of the past who was excluded from virtually every kind of work except washing clothes or washing dishes.

The past is a great unchangeable fact. Nothing is going to undo its sufferings and injustices, whatever their magnitude. Statistical categories and historic labels may seem real to those inspired by words, but only living flesh-and-blood people can feel joy or pain. Neither the sins nor the sufferings of those now dead are within our power to change. Being honest and honorable with the people living in our own time is more than enough moral challenge, without indulging in illusions about rewriting moral history with numbers and categories.

THE LEGACY OF BUSING

It is chilling to hear parents say that the worst racists they know are their own children. Yet such statements have been made by black and white parents, liberals and conservatives, and without regard to geographical location. It is commonplace to hear of integrated schools where no child of either race would dare enter a toilet alone. The fears and hatreds of these schoolchildren are going to be part of the American psyche long after the passing of an older generation of crusading social experimenters. It is quite a legacy to leave.

The ringing principles of equal rights announced in the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* have been transformed by 20 years of political and judicial jockeying into a nightmare pursuit of elusive statistical "balance." The original idea that the government should not classify children by race was turned around completely to mean that the government must classify children by race. The fact that the racial integration of youngsters from similar backgrounds has worked under voluntary conditions was seized upon as a reason for forcing statistical integration of schoolchildren, without regard to vast contrasts of income, way of life, or cultural values. Considerations of cost, time, feelings or education all give way before the almighty numbers.

The civil rights establishment has a similar investment of ego and self-interest to protect. The NAACP Legal Defense Fund now insists that the issue is not "educational" but "constitutional." This might be an understandable position for an academic association of legal theorists, but not for an organization claiming to speak in the name of flesh and blood black people—people who reject busing in nationwide polls and who reject it by large majorities in cities where it has been tried. The head of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund brushes this aside by saying that they cannot ask "each and every black person" his opinion before proceeding, but the real question is whether they can consistently go counter to the majority opinions of the very people in whose name they presume to speak.

However futile the various numerical approaches have been in their avowed goal of advancing minorities, their impact has been strongly felt in other ways. The message that comes through loud and clear is that minorities are losers who will never have anything unless someone gives it to them.

The destructiveness of this message—on society in general and minority youth in particular—outweighs any trivial gains that may occur here and there. The falseness of the message is shown by the great economic achievements of minorities during the period of equal-rights legislation before numerical goals and timetables muddied the waters. By and large, the numerical approach has achieved nothing and has achieved it at great cost.●

"INDOCHINESE REFUGEES"

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for 1

additional year of full Federal support of the Indochina Refugee Assistance Program.

The Indochina Refugee Assistance Program, known by its acronym as IRAP, currently provides 100 percent Federal reimbursement to State and local governments for the cash and medical assistance, as well as the social services made available to the refugees. Under legislation enacted by Congress last year, the extent of Federal support of this program will be limited to not more than 75 percent of the fiscal year 1978 costs in fiscal year 1979, 50 percent in fiscal year 1980, 25 percent in fiscal year 1981, and it will terminate thereafter.

At the time Congress approved this legislation, it was assumed the number of refugees to be served by IRAP would remain around 150,000. However, the Attorney General has recently granted parole authority for an additional 25,000 refugees. They will be in addition to the 22,000 refugees previously paroled and expected to enter the United States during the current year. The enactment of refugee-admission legislation or the approval of additional parole authority could result in the further admission of as many as 12,500 additional Indochinese in the coming year. In total, it is possible that 59,000 more Indochinese refugees may reach our shores by the end of fiscal year 1979, increasing the population to 220,000.

Clearly, the assumption on which we based the phase-down of IRAP, that is that the refugee population would remain around 150,000, has been rendered invalid by virtue of the administration's actions. As a result, the State and local share of IRAP may be more than 50 percent larger than anticipated by Congress last year. I strongly believe that we should not force our State and local governments to bear the brunt of these Federal actions.

IRAP has been highly successful in enabling refugees to obtain self-sufficiency and integrate into the mainstream of American life. An additional year of full Federal funding will insure that assistance is extended to the refugees soon to enter our country without working undue hardship on the localities in which they settle. This extension, adding very little to the overall cost of the program—perhaps $27 million, would constitute an important step in maintaining the resettlement effort.

This proposal, introduced in the Senate by Mr. CRANSTON and Mr. KENNEDY, has strong bipartisan support as well as the backing of the Coalition for the Effective Resettlement of Indochinese Refugees, the National Association of Counties, plus numerous voluntary agencies, State and local officials involved in the resettlement effort. I urge my colleagues in the House to give it their serious consideration.●

AGE DISCRIMINATION MYTH

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced the first bill to end the pernicious practice of mandatory retirement in 1974. I have noticed at times an almost automatic, unthinking opposition on the part of a few. It has seemed to be based on an uncritical acceptance of the assumption that as people get older they lose effectiveness. Nothing could be further from the truth, as the examples of so many successful persons over age 65 illustrate. Fortunately the majority have seen through the myth. The House voted 359 to 4 this year in favor of a bill to raise the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70.

But the recent improvement in the law is just a first step, and I have introduced legislation to outlaw mandatory retirement completely. I hope the 96th Congress will take that final step so it will be effective when those now 65 reach 70.

A recent book published by Doubleday enhances the prospects for success. Entitled "It Takes a Long Time To Become Young," and written by Garson Kanin, it focuses on the concept that judgments about individual job performance should be made on merit, not age. One cannot help but be impressed with the book's inspiration, quality of expression and with the evidence used. Thus I would hope that my colleagues would ponder the ideas in the book, and for their consideration I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of the review of the book printed in the Los Angeles Times of April 9, 1978.

KANIN IN METHUSELAH'S CORNER

(By Ben Irwin)

One thinks of him ordinarily as a writer of witty, graceful, amiable prose, unfailingly entertaining. It is something of a surprise, therefore, to discover that in "It Takes a Long Time to Become Young," his latest book, Garson Kanin is serious, provocative and thoroughly angry. On second thought, make that furious.

Kanin was made so initially by a CBS–TV editorial defending the right of the State of Massachusetts to force mandatory retirement on one Robert Murgia at the age of 50. Murgia, a policeman, promptly filed suit to protest the law. Kanin asked CBS for air time to answer their editorial. He was accorded 80 seconds, not exactly a time framework in which to make telling arguments. Yet he did just that and superbly.

"Of all the 'isms' that have plagued this century," he said, "ageism is the most stupid." He went on to add: "It's time to declare war on the mindless Youth Cult that has our time in its grip, demoralizing our people, weakening our system . . . wasting our experience, betraying our democracy and blowing out our brains."

Strong words.

The response to these words was overwhelming. Among those responding was Doubleday, urging Kanin to expand his views into a book. After some slight hesitation, he agreed. The result is this valuable work, the author's personal and spirited contribution to the battle against compulsory retirement.

The derivation of the light-hearted title is this: some years ago Picasso was having a retrospective exhibit. An admirer approached him, commenting that what astonished her was that Picasso's early efforts were so "solemn" while his later work was so "wild." How did he explain it? "Easily," the genius artist answered. "It takes a long time to become young."

Kanin's book documents the observation, adding his own conclusion that talent or ability does not automatically disappear or even diminish at age 65 but may, in fact, flourish.

We are given an impressive list of people who had or have productive and even brilliant careers long after the age of "retirement." Included are such a varied cross-section as R. Buckminster Fuller, in his 80s and still producing new inventions; Benjamin Spock in his mid-70s; Marshall Tito, 85; Georgia O'Keefe, painting daily at 90; and, of course, the author's own wife of over 35 years, Ruth Gordon.

Kanin goes on to give us a long list of the famous who registered their most notable accomplishments late in life. He makes his point with total effectiveness, although after he has presented the 20th talent on his list we are tempted to cry: "Enough already. We're convinced."

And so we are. Or should be.

This book will find its natural public among older citizens but many not in that group will find pleasure and wisdom in its pages.

Time and again Kanin reminds us that those people who find or continue in useful work in their vintage years have a foothold on longer life. Witness the indestructible George Burns who said recently: "I can't die. How can I? I'm booked.●

SENATE—*Monday, July 10, 1978*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 17, 1978)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of this world and all things in it, Ruler of men and nations, bless this land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. May the United States find its rightful place among the nations and fulfill the purpose Thou hast for it. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom, in Thy name, we entrust the authority of government, that we may be unafraid of any challenge, strong and wise in every response.

As we resume our labor in this place we beseech Thee to keep us under the authority, discipline, and wisdom of Thy higher kingdom.

Through Him who lives and reigns above all men and nations. Amen.