

—In section 3, strike out section 3(a), and redesignate sections 3(b) and 3(c), as sections 3(a) and 3(b), respectively.

H.R. 11986

By Mr. VANIK:

—Page 28, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 28, after line 12, insert the following:  
"Sec. 6455. AUDIT BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

"The General Accounting Office shall audit the credits and refunds, and the recapture of such credits and refunds, under this subchapter in a manner similar to the manner in which the General Accounting Office audits similar Federal expenditures. The

Comptroller General shall report periodically to the Congress the results of such audits."

Page 10, after line 5, insert after the item relating to section 6454 the following:

"Sec. 6455. Audit by the General Accounting Office.

—Page 28, line 12, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 28, after line 12, insert the following:  
"Sec. 6455. AUDIT BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The General Accounting Offices shall audit the credits and refunds, and the recapture of such credits and refunds, under this subchapter in a manner similar to the manner in which the General

Accounting Office audits similar Federal expenditures. The Comptroller General shall report periodically to the Congress the results of such audits.

"(b) Authority to Examine Records and Witnesses.—For purposes of carrying out audits under subsection (a), the Comptroller General, or his delegate, is authorized to examine materials, to summon persons, and to take testimony, in the same manner and to the same extent as the Secretary is authorized to perform such functions under section 7602."

Page 10, after line 5, insert after the item relating to section 6454 the following:

"Sec. 6455. Audit by the General Accounting Office.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE NAVY'S PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

#### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, our Navy has been the subject of an unusual amount of attention over the past few years. Shipbuilding problems, personnel problems, and even some serious questioning of the Navy's roles and missions have led to long and sometimes heated debate within the halls of Congress and in the public.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, former Chief of Naval Operations, and former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has written a short letter in the Wings of Gold magazine which may help to put some of the Navy's problems in perspective.

I ask that the text of Admiral Moorer's letter be printed in today's Extension of Remarks.

The letter follows:

#### THE NAVY HAS A PROBLEM

In recent weeks we have been reading doom and gloom newspaper and periodical Navy. "U.S. Navy Losing Its Greatest Battle" (San Diego Union), "The Navy Has a Problem" (Christian Science Monitor), "Battle Over Consolidation of Pilot Training Begins" (Army Times), "Decision Time for Naval Aviation" (Seapower), "Getting the Debate Over Naval Aviation in Context" (Armed Forces Journal), "Pilot Drain to Airlines Worries Services" (Aviation Week).

There is no doubt that the Navy's problems—and particularly naval air's—are severe. The American people are just beginning to recognize that the Administration's concept of the Navy's mission is only sealane control and convoy protection. Projection of force, presence, mobile based seapower are considered missions which are passe. And so, the Navy's budget is axed in favor of both Army and Air Force.

To the young pilot, NFO and air crewman in naval air, who understandably lacks historical perspective, the position of naval air does seem to be one of deterioration and slow decay. Accordingly, a great many pilots are submitting resignations. But to those of us who have watched the ups and downs of naval air for more than 40 years, the present doldrums are just one more cycle in a recurrent pattern.

To the naval aviators of World War I, the

early 1920s were such a low. The need for carriers, pioneered and used by the British in the first Great War, made it obvious that the U.S. Navy should also develop carriers. The role of the airplane was expanding greatly—but the Navy was slow to perceive both of these trends.

In my early days in naval air, aviation was regarded merely as "eyes of the fleet." The battleship was almighty. I can remember on the cruiser I served on as a pilot of a scout plane, the exec of the ship frowned on engine turn-ups around the stern catapult because the plane's engines leaked oil on the spotless teak decks! Because of this our flying was curtailed.

After World War II, there was another low cycle. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson proposed a plan in the late 1940s to reduce the Navy's carrier force to only seven ships. But in less than one year the Korean War was upon us, and every usable carrier we had was rushed back into service.

There was also a period after WWII when it was seriously doubted that jet aircraft could ever be flown from carriers. And certainly, many said, a carrier plane could never carry a nuclear weapon or be part of a long range strike force!

The next low cycle was in the mid-sixties. The carrier and the mobile air base were again in dispute. Secretary of Defense McNamara opted for conventional power for the JFK, and his young whiz kids (some of who have now become "whiz men" in the present administration) sharpened their pencils to reduce naval air once again. Pilots began to leave the Navy to take airline jobs. In Pensacola the pilot training rate fell to 1000 pilots per year.

And then came the Vietnam War; the pilot training rate doubled. The carriers were pressed into greater-than-ever service, with helicopters taking a greater role in naval air than ever before. Month after month, three, four even five and sometimes six carriers laid off Vietnam in support of a Washington-run war directed by armchair strategists.

Meanwhile, over \$2 billion were spent in Vietnam to build airfields and other facilities. These several fields were stacked with helicopters, aircraft, spare parts and munitions, only to see them seized by our enemies after our withdrawal.

But we did not leave a single aircraft carrier in Vietnam. Today the present administration single-mindedly focuses its attention on Europe and a NATO war, forgetting that a NATO war of necessity must involve Russia as a major Pacific power, with 120 submarines and a large Soviet fleet in that ocean where two of our states are located. Any war in Europe is automatically a Pacific War, and the need for mobile based

air-seapower will, once again, be as crucial as often before.

The world of 1978 to 2000 will be a world increasing in population, in growing, expanding third world nations, in increased nationalism in the Southern Hemisphere, and in greater dependence on trade. In our own case, the United States' need for overseas oil, for raw materials, for strategic and critical ores, will grow—not diminish. And so will our need to trade, to sell the products of our farms and factories overseas, and to maintain unity among our friends and allies.

All this adds up to greater dependence on the world's oceans as sources of power, food, minerals, oil, fish, and of course, as the highways of world trade. This means an increased need for seapower, and that must include a strong naval air organization.

This issue of "Wings of Gold" tries to look into the future of naval air and to set in context in terms of history as well as in future possibilities, the case that naval air, as in many times past, will pass through this current low cycle and prove to be, once again, one of our country's great pluses in terms of national defense.

Adm. THOMAS H. MOORER,  
USN (Ret.) ●

HARRY BROOKS, JR., HONORED BY NAACP

#### HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization whose contributions to the minorities of America are immeasurable, each year honors men and women who have made their own lives shining examples for our Nation's youth.

Among the honors presented by the NAACP at its recent national convention was its annual Armed Service and Veterans' Affairs Meritorious Service Award. Mr. Speaker, I will let you judge the quality of the award by observing the quality of its recipients since 1975, the first year of its presentation. The honorees have included Brig. Gen. Robert Arter, Col. Benjamin Waller, Gen. (ret.) Michael S. Davison, and the late Gen. Daniel "Chappy" James, Jr.

To that illustrious company, the NAACP has now added a man who makes

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

it a habit to set examples, not only for our Nation's youth, but for all who are fortunate to know him—Maj. Gen. (ret.) Harry Brooks, Jr.

As the commanding general of the 25th Infantry Division at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii prior to his retirement 2 years ago, General Brooks made it a point to set examples for his men, and it was unit SOP for him to be out in front for the "Tropic Lightning Mile," a conditioning run like no other. Harry was out in front, too, as a man who understood the modern Army's problems and took decisive action to reconcile those problems and keep his command in fighting shape.

Harry was, and continues to be, an innovator of change and improvement. Prior to his command of the 25th Division, Harry served in Korea, where he became an exponent of Tai Kwon Do, the Korean form of karate. Harry brought the martial art with him to Hawaii, where he introduced it to his men as a part of their conditioning. He also originated a form of organized mayhem known as combat football, a combination of English rugby and American football that separated the men from the boys, but made all its participants better soldiers.

Harry has now channeled that exuberance and professionalism into the world of private business, where he is an executive with a major Hawaii-based corporation. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to know Harry Brooks as a friend, and I wish to commend the NAACP for having the wisdom to recognize him as one of America's outstanding men and an example of the American dream fulfilled.●

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT HONORS HIALEAH INSPECTION TEAM

**HON. PAUL G. ROGERS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, in a ceremony at the Sylvania Theater last month, the Department of Agriculture presented its 32d annual honor awards to employees who made outstanding contributions to the work of the Department during the past year.

I was pleased to note that among those honored was the Hialeah Inspection Team of the Food Safety and Quality Service. The team was honored for their initiative in developing a novel approach for coordinating efforts to detect antibiotic residues in cattle, and prevent the marketing of affected cattle.

I would like to extend my congratulations and commendation to the members of the team, Paul T. White, Marvin Aronofsky, Robert L. Britton, Guillermo Valazquez Ramos, Joseph R. Kaile, Robert Madero, and David Sweig. Mr. Sweig resides in West Palm Beach, in my congressional district.

Their hard work and initiative will, I am sure, make a significant contribution to the health of people of Florida and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would in-

sert in the RECORD the Department's award description.

HIALEAH INSPECTION TEAM HONORED

CITATION

For exceptional contributions in detecting potential antibiotic residue cases and initiating appropriate followup activity.

JUSTIFICATION

The Food Safety and Quality Service (FSQS) is dedicated to insuring that the Nation's supply of meat and poultry is safe, wholesome, and truthfully and informatively labeled. A large share of this responsibility is borne by the 8,400 field inspection personnel who perform the on-line inspection requirements.

Meat and poultry are inspected both before slaughter (ante-mortem) and after slaughter (post-mortem). During the post-mortem examination, inspectors look for any indications of carcass abnormality or product adulteration, such as tissue inflammations, tumors, and injection sites, which would necessitate retaining the carcass for veterinary review and disposition.

Antibiotics or other drugs are frequently administered to dairy cattle in an effort to correct infections of various types. The use of the drugs would not constitute a problem if the animals were withheld from slaughter for the recommended period. However, if these recommended withdrawal periods are not carefully observed, drugs will likely be present in tissues of animals, causing adulteration. Such antibiotic residues in animal tissues can produce allergy-type reactions in people who ingest the adulterated meat and are sensitized to the particular antibiotic.

In order to prevent this type of hazard to the public, MPI has authority to take certain steps. When the slaughter inspector detects an antibiotic lesion, the carcass is identified and set aside for sampling by the veterinarian. Once a sample has been identified as having an antibiotic residue, then certain restrictions are placed on the owner or producer of the animal. When the producer/owner is ready to bring animals to slaughter, five are selected and tested. If the results reveal no antibiotic residue, then the producer/owner can again freely bring animals to slaughter.

One problem with this procedure is that a producer placed in a restricted slaughter category might not return to the same plant. At a different plant, the producer/owner may not reveal that there is an antibiotic problem, and consequently antibiotic-treated animals may be slaughtered without detection.

A group of slaughter inspectors in Hialeah (Miami) saw a special need for detecting antibiotic-injection lesions and also for developing a communication system between the Federal plants in the local areas to facilitate followup activity. Through their concern and dedication, this team was able to detect 186 injection sites in cows and calves during January 1976 through October 1977. This surveillance removed from food channels 186 carcasses that would have passed for food had the lesions not been detected. Instead these carcasses were held until laboratory analyses were completed indicating whether the product should be passed or destroyed.

In response to this need, this group, along with the area supervisor, initiated a plan to have inspectors keep a running case history of each suspect sample. Identical information is posted on the bulletin board in the inspection office at each plant. Each inspector in charge carries pocket-size cards bearing current information on active cases.

The area supervisor has now implemented this program area-wide. Now, information copies of all correspondence are exchanged between meat inspection staffs throughout Florida, so that all can be on the alert for animals which may be diverted from normal

destinations. Tighter control on the movement of suspect animals is expected to result in better compliance and cooperation from herd owners and to encourage the producer to abide by the recommended drug withdrawal times.

In summary, under the residue program in Florida each inspector has knowledge of the entire area program, and consequently he has a much better control over the slaughtering of animals from a source known to have residue violations. The inspectors have become directly involved in a program where their efforts have been acknowledged, and which has resulted in team interest and increased effectiveness.

BASIS FOR AWARD

Extent of Application—Limited

Through the geographical configuration of the State of Florida this procedure is of great practical value because of the limited opportunity to move livestock elsewhere. Application of this same process in other areas would not work as well because they do not share the same circumstances.

Value of Benefit—Exceptional

This area formerly had a high level of antibiotic violations. Through this new procedure such adulterated product is now prevented from entering food channels.●

TIGHTENING UP THE BUY AMERICAN ACT

**HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. For some time now I have been arguing that our country should be creating and protecting jobs here at home instead of exporting them abroad. I would like to share with my colleagues my July 7 Washington news column, which deals with this issue.

The news column follows:

TIGHTENING UP THE BUY AMERICAN ACT  
(By Representative MORGAN F. MURPHY)

The July 3 issue of U.S. News and World Report says that a "Buy American" campaign is rapidly gaining ground among citizens angry that their tax dollars are going to foreign firms while many domestic industries are struggling to stay afloat.

The article noted these signs of the trend:—The Pennsylvania legislature recently passed a bill requiring that all steel used in state-funded construction projects be American-made. The action came after steel industry officials pointed out that imports—which account for one of every five tons of steel used in government buildings, and one of every four tons used in highway construction—have contributed to the laying off of some 32,000 steelworkers in the last year.

—Boston's City Council is debating whether to give U.S. manufacturers a 10 percent preference over imports, following the decision of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority to order 120 subway cars from a Canadian firm for \$86.3 million.

—In Arkansas, a state agency's purchase of 40 East German typewriters set off a controversy in the legislature, where a state senator promptly threatened to introduce a bill prohibiting the buying of foreign made materials for state projects.

Here in Illinois, Gov. James Thompson directed the state Department of Transportation on June 23 to reinstate for a one-year trial period the "Buy American" clause in its structural steel contracts.

Similar actions are being taken in Con-

gress, too. The same day that Gov. Thompson issued his directive to the Illinois DOT, the House showed its support for a provision requiring Amtrak to buy American goods and materials for purchases of more than \$100,000.

An amendment to delete the Buy American clause, offered by Rep. William Steiger (R-Wis.), was soundly defeated by a vote of 207-93. The House also thwarted a move to weaken the provision by giving the Special Trade Representative (Robert Strauss), rather than the Transportation Secretary, the power to waive the Buy American requirement. The House turned back this effort by a vote of 178-121.

The Buy American clause in the Amtrak legislation and pending highway bills reflects an increasing concern among Congressmen that spending tax dollars on foreign products hurts American industries and workers. While there is already a law on the books (the Buy American Act of 1933) to help protect U.S. industries, it is vaguely worded and full of loopholes.

As Congressional Quarterly has noted, the biggest loopholes are provisions exempting funds spent by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Environmental Protection Agency, Amtrak and the Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) are also exempt from the Buy American law.

These loopholes have had an adverse impact on Chicago. Two years ago, Cleveland accepted the bid of an Italian firm, Breda, to build subway cars for the city's mass transit system. The next lowest bid was made by Pullman Standard, based in Chicago. Approval of the grant by UMTA—which picked up 80 per cent of the construction tab—deprived South Chicago of a vital boon to its local economy.

As chairman of the House Steel Caucus' subcommittee on legislation, I am disturbed that the U.S. is spending tax money on foreign-made items while major American industries are struggling to survive. At a time when thousands of U.S. workers are threatened by unfair foreign competition, this country should strengthen, not weaken, its Buy American laws. That's why I am cosponsoring legislation in the House that would extend the Buy American requirement to state and local projects that receive more than half of their funds from the Federal government. The bill would also raise the American price preference to 15 per cent above foreign bids.

The legislation has taken on a new importance now that the Carter Administration has forecast a 1978 economic growth rate barely sufficient to keep unemployment from rising. It is time that the U.S. stopped exporting jobs to other countries when thousands of jobs are badly needed here at home. ●

#### IN SUPPORT OF BROCK ADAMS

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this morning's edition of the New York Times carried an article suggesting that Department of Transportation Secretary Brock Adams was considering resignation from that post.

Not only do I think that not to be the case, but I also think that Mr. Adams is one of the most competent and effective members of the Carter

Cabinet and his departure from the Cabinet would be a serious loss.

I think Brock Adams has been doing an excellent job in handling some of the most complex and thankless tasks in Government.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs his experience and his judgment—and so does the Congress. ●

#### PAM SHRIVER

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to Ms. Pam Shriver, who won two rounds in the oldest and most important of tennis tournaments, Wimbledon.

Pam, a 16-year-old high school student from Lutherville, Md., has set a fine example for all Americans, not only because of her physical talent, but because of her good sportsmanship. She told a Baltimore Sun reporter, "I'm still learning, and I enjoyed playing on the center court for the first time."

A tribute to Pam in a recent Washington Post article describes her play at the tournament:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1978]

#### WIMBLEDON LOOKS REAL TO SHRIVER

(By Barry Lorge)

LONDON.—Like everyone else at Wimbledon yesterday, Pam Shriver, who has stormed into the third round of women's singles, marked time as an all-day rain forced postponement of play in the tennis championships.

Shriver came out to the All England Lawn Tennis and Croquet Club on Monday, the first day of this year's championships, and had a long curious look around the place. She wanted to see if her sport's ultimate shrine matched the vivid impressions she had formed from reading about it and watching it on television.

She roamed around the outside courts, through promenades jammed with more spectators than she had imagined. She investigated the elevated, glassed-in players' tea room, which affords a panoramic view of the premises, and gazed for a long time at the vine-covered walls that enclose Centre Court.

"That was the first thing that caught my eye as I came through the gates," said the soon-to-be-16 from Lutherville, Md. "I love ivy—the way it looks and sounds in the breeze. I'll always remember that first glimpse."

Westminster Abbey, Big Ben and Buckingham Palace would have to wait. Shriver wants to see the sights of London, but not until she is out of the tournament she has dreamed about playing for nearly half her life.

"The first memory I have of Wimbledon was the last year Rod Laver won," she said. That would have been 1969. She celebrated her seventh birthday that week, on July 4.

Now she is a Wimbledon herself, as a competitor, as excited as a young scientist making a first visit to the Royal Academy, or a budding politician checking out the halls of Parliament.

Her leisurely walk around the grounds was part of Shriver's preparation for her first match the following afternoon.

"I don't think anybody can really tell you what it's like until you actually see it and absorb the atmosphere. I thought it would

be wise to come out a day early so that I wouldn't get overwhelmed by it right before my match.

"As we drove in, people crowded around the car to see who was inside. They wanted autographs. I couldn't believe that some of them knew who I was. The place has so much character, it's awesome. It's neat."

Her coach, Australian-born Don Candy, a former international player who now teaches in Baltimore, had advised her to get acclimated.

He told me that it's important to keep your mind clear when you play here. You can get swallowed up pretty easily in the surroundings," she said.

"I wanted to get off to a good start, to make the first step right," added the bright teen-ager, who wants to combine her junior and senior courses at McDonogh School in Baltimore so she can graduate and turn pro in June, a month before her 17th birthday, "because I hope to be here a few more times."

Undoubtedly she will be. Shriver is 6 feet tall, weighs 145 pounds, and is still growing. She has a fine serve and volley and is improving rapidly under Candy's tutelage. In addition to shot-making talent she seems to have a gift for match play, a court sense and an aggressive instinct that have caught the eyes of knowledgeable observers.

Shriver—a distant cousin of 1972 Democratic vice presidential candidate Sargeant Shriver ("I've never met him, but he sent me a letter when I started doing well, saying thanks for admitting you're related to me")—is one of two 15-year-olds in the women's singles draw. The other is California prodigy Tracy Austin, six months her junior.

Last year Austin—5 feet tall and weighing 90 pounds—celebrated Wimbledon's centenary by becoming the youngest player to compete in the oldest and most important of tennis tournaments. She won one round, then lost to Chris Evert, the reigning queen of women's tennis, on the center court.

Austin went on to reach the quarterfinals of the U.S. Open in September and earn No. 4 U.S. women's ranking. Her success gave hope and encouragement to other teens longing to jump from the deepening junior ranks into the women's major tournament circuit and challenge the power elite.

"The only measuring stick I had when I started playing adult tournaments was that I had played Tracy three times in the recent past and had gone three sets with her each time. Then I saw her beating top players and figured that I couldn't be that far behind," said Shriver, who is winless in six matches against Austin, still marginally behind her precocious contemporary.

Shriver doesn't have the giggling, little girl manner that makes Austin seem such an anomaly when she beats up on her tennis elders.

Because she is so tall and so mature in manner, Shriver seems too old to be worrying about Algebra II. But she is appealing, too, in a completely different way from Austin.

Shriver played her first pro tournament, the Virginia Slims of Washington, in January, and won a satellite event—the Avon Futures of Columbus, Ohio—two weeks later, winning 12 matches to go all the way from preliminary qualifying to the championship.

That earned her a berth in the Dallas Slims tournament, where she upset Dianne Fromholtz, Regina Marsikova and Kerry Reid (the No. 8, 15, and 10 seeds at Wimbledon) before losing a tough match to Evonne Goolagong in the semifinals.

Shriver has done all that was expected of her in her Wimbledon debut: won her first two rounds. Anything more will be extra cream on Wimbledon's traditional strawberries.

In her debut Tuesday, she beat Mimi Wikstedt, a chunky 24-year-old Swede, 6-3,

6-3, on court No. 4, in one of the most distracting corners of Wimbledon.

It is a difficult court to play on, separated by only a 10-foot-high green canvas backstop and a bed of shrubs and climbing roses from the bustling concourse between the outside courts and the Elizabethan-style structure that houses the center and No. 1 courts.

This concourse is always full of traffic, pedestrian and vehicular, and a bit noisy. Its sounds are those of shuffling crowds, regularly punctuated by the shrill voices of vendors peddling ice lollies and other goodies and squealing schoolgirls seeking autographs.

But Shriver turned off all intrusions nicely. She was purposeful and efficient.

"I knew from the beginning that I was going to be okay," she said. "I wasn't talking to myself. You can bet that when I'm talking to myself, I'm not concentrating."

On Wednesday Shriver beat Robin Harris, a 22-year-old Californian, 6-0, 6-0. She probably will play 14th seeded Sue Barker of Britain, a semifinalist here last year, tomorrow.

"In the beginning, in January and February, nobody knew who I was and there was no pressure at all," Shriver said. "Now, since Dallas, people have talked about Tracy and me and they expect us to win. There's more pressure.

"But I think I like the pressure." ●

#### THOUGHTS CONCERNING THE CARE OF OLD PEOPLE

**HON. JOHN M. SLACK**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we consider legislation designed to help elderly persons toward solutions of their problems. Too often we have acted with the best of intentions, but would succeed only in placing authority for solutions of the problems in the hands of social welfare bureaucrats who are more interested in technique than people.

Recently I received a memorandum of suggestion about problems of the elderly from an attorney who is past his 80th year, but still maintains a lively interest in public matters, Mr. Emmette L. Moseley of Huntington, W. Va.

I recommend his comments to your attention:

There have been numerous books, pamphlets and articles written about the aging population of this country. All that I have seen were written by young people and none by anyone who has experienced getting old. Generally they seem to give a bleak picture of the aging people. They are shown to be lonely, unhappy with many other adverse qualities of personality.

I am well into my eighth decade of life. Till now I have never been lonely or unhappy myself. Those who are unhappy have no doubt always been unhappy. I find no fault with the way I have been treated by people of any age. I have been given all the courtesies that I have been entitled to. In general, people get back what they send out. I have come thus far without being afraid.

People who have lived to an old age do not die easy. Some of them take months or even a year to take leave of this state of being.

I have no fear of death but I do have a fear of what will happen during those last months or years when I am not able to protect myself and control my own body. When one goes to a hospital or a nursing home,

they lose control over their body and their life. I am sure that I have many disabilities, but none are curable.

It is my desire to discuss this phase of the life of the so-called senior citizens and make some suggestions to those who desire to assist the old people.

I have watched several hundred people pass through that stage of life.

What I have to say refers to the section of the population of which I am acquainted. They consist of persons who have worked a life time, acquired a modest home and modest investment and a fairly good retirement income.

When their facilities begin to fall one of the first troubles that they begin to have is that they are unable to keep their check-book, that for a time they write their checks and forget to fill out their stubs, and finally that they have to have someone to write the checks and have them to sign them to pay their necessary bills.

If there is a need for medical attention or treatment, he must be taken to a doctor's office where he enters a room full of patients. I always wonder then if some of the patients are not suffering from communicable diseases. The waiting patients are from babes in terms to the oldest senior citizens.

Then the time comes when the old person is not able to do the housework and cooking that is necessary to maintain their home.

Then they are taken to the emergency clinic of the hospital, most likely by ambulance. The patient is deposited in a room and told that the doctor will soon be there. Then there is a period of waiting from one-half hour to 2 hours. The doctor finally comes and determines that an X-ray or other laboratory test is necessary. The patient is then taken to the X-ray room or whatever lab test is necessary. Again there is a long waiting. Then finally the X-ray and other laboratory techniques are completed and the patient is returned to the emergency room and told that he must wait for the X-rays to be developed and read by the doctor in the clinic.

There is a great movement of people in waiting rooms. The drone of many voices.

Finally it is decided that the patient will be admitted to the hospital. After the admission, the patient is moved from place to place and given different tests and sometimes elaborate examinations including brain scans. When he is admitted the ambulance leaves.

After a few days it is decided that the patient is suffering from no disease or disability which is treatable. Then, the social workers come into the picture assisted by other medical personnel. The patient's family is then told that the patient is in need of professional nursing care and such care is not possible at home.

While the social workers are on the subject of nursing homes they inquire what health insurance the patient has and what he receives from his retirement benefits and what he receives from investments and what his investments consist of.

The privacy which he has guarded throughout life no longer exists. Although no proof may be available, it is suggested that the nursing homes obtain full knowledge of the income and estate an old man or woman has.

These people in their last years have the same desires and hopes that they have had throughout life. All of them, if they had their wish and that wish could be carried out would be to stay at home and be cared for there. I am sure they would be willing to pay from their own funds if necessary.

After all the turmoil and large amount of money spent, it has been officially decided, what was already known. Generally it is understood that the ill of old people do not respond to treatment. Custodial care is needed. There is no need for fruitless diagnostic studies. These studies are frustrating

to the patient and use many valuable hours of medical and other personnel, without results. This time could be used on the care and treatment of disabilities which respond to treatment.

In addition, these old people have been greatly disturbed and confused. The Merck Manual, 11th edition, Subj: Brain Syndrome, at pg. 1163; under Treatment says:

"\* \* \* The patient should stay in pleasant, friendly, familiar surroundings where variation in routine is minimal. He should be encouraged to continue with tasks that are still within his capacity. This promotes a sense of participation and accomplishment. \* \* \* By working patiently with the family, the physician may be able to save them needless expense in further, fruitless diagnostic studies and also may help them arrange for custodial care. \* \* \*"

I have observed both in hospitals and nursing homes that patients give very little trouble to the personnel. Since the advent of tranquilizers, they are, when I have visited them, been under the influence of drugs and in a semi-stupor. When walking through hallways of hospitals and nursing homes you will see them lying with head back and mouth open, not conscious of what is going on around them. I am sure that the body can fight off disease afflicting it. I am not sure whether the body can fight off disease while under the influence of drugs.

Why should these people be put through this ordeal at the close of life, and burden the wife or husband with the attempt to visit the hospital or nursing home?

I recommend:

1.) That the banks arrange to have a trust-worthy employee visit the home of the senior citizens who are no longer able to keep their bank balance current and write their checks for current expenses to see that they are properly signed and mailed. This would avoid gas and electricity being discontinued and property sold for taxes.

2.) That the medical association and government agencies cooperate and set up a system whereby private doctors will make visits when necessary to these old people at their home.

3.) That they also provide training to responsible people who know and are known to the patient, that would enable them to do such basic things as to insert a catheter and fasten on the rubber bags and other sanitary knowledge for cleanliness for the home and be able to prepare food and other necessities for the old person.

4.) That the regulations and or laws relating to medicare and medicaid be amended so that the doctor who visits the home and those who furnish the care be paid.

5.) That the Blue-Cross and other carriers of health insurance amend their health insurance policies and include the necessary expenses.

6.) That prosthetic appliances such as hospital beds, wheel chairs, walkers, and so forth be made available at home when found necessary by the physician.

How these recommendations could be put into effect would require many pages.

I fear that there are many people who will say, "these old people don't know what is good for them." To them I say, your turn will come sooner than you think. ●

#### MY AMERICA

**HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my constituents, Mr. H. M. Burck, who is a World War I veteran, I

would like to insert a poem entitled "My America." This poem addresses a hope which all Americans, particularly those of this body, should keep in their thoughts and express in their words and deeds. I request the poem be inserted in the RECORD:

MY AMERICA

In thoughts, as wise as is her prairie sea;  
In deeds, as splendid as her mountain piles;  
As noble as her mighty river tides.  
Let her be true, a land where right abides;  
Let her be clean, as sweet as summer isles;  
And let her sound, the note of liberty  
For all the earth, till every man and child  
be free!

[Thomas Curtis Clark.]●

EFT LEGISLATION DESERVES  
SUPPORT

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1978, the House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs unanimously passed H.R. 13007, the Electronic Fund Transfer Act of 1978. At this time I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration and support. The measure will be taken up by the full House in the very near future.

As a member of the Banking Committee, I took part in a number of public hearings which dealt with electronic fund transfer systems (EFT's) and participated in the drafting of the final version of the act. Because EFT's are in the infancy of their development, I believed that the committee had to be very careful in drafting the first piece of legislation to regulate consumer rights and responsibilities in regard to EFT's. A balance had to be struck between essential consumer protection and the creation of an atmosphere conducive to the rapid spread of EFT systems, and with one major exception, the bill successfully incorporates the necessary balance.

The original version of this bill, H.R. 8753, contained six very troublesome components which could have effectively hamstrung the further development of EFT's, but I am pleased that we were able to resolve five of those problems.

First, the final version of the bill does not mandate any prescribed billing procedures. As I said in my April 3 speech before the American Bankers Association in San Francisco, the main debate in committee revolved around "country club" billing (complete itemization of all purchases) versus descriptive billing (a shorthand accounting that considerably reduces credit paperwork) with the latter being preferable to the former. The original version of the bill made provision for country club billing, but that has been totally eliminated because of the unnecessary paperwork burden it would impose.

Second, the final version does not mandate prescribed billing rates, which had been present in the original bill. Although everyone would like an interest-free period every month on their bills, such an arrangement is clearly not a

right of the consumer, but rather a service a financial institution might wish to offer, as many do.

Third, a majority of my Banking Committee colleagues and I were able to delete the reversibility of transactions section of the bill. The reversibility provisions were based on a faulty understanding of the ability to stop payment on checks and could have prevented any further implementation of EFT systems nationwide.

Fourth, H.R. 13007 will facilitate the safe distribution of debit cards for operating an EFT system, while the original language would have severely hampered financial institutions' ability to provide customers with the necessary means of access to an EFT system.

Fifth, after lengthy consultations with all interested parties, the committee was able to carefully delineate the rights and responsibilities of both financial institutions and consumers in terms of liability for unauthorized transfers. The final version, unlike the original, prescribes a negligence standard for both parties, so that the rights of both are fully protected.

The sole drawback which appeared in the original bill and remains in the final version is a provision which forbids sellers to charge more for check transactions than for EFT transactions. An attempt to delete this section, which I supported, was unfortunately defeated in the committee by a 20 to 19 vote. This is clearly an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government into the free enterprise marketplace and is certainly not in the consumers' real interest. I expect that an amendment deleting this provision will be offered on the House floor, and will be successful.

Despite that weakness, I believe that the committee has reported out a very responsible regulatory measure. The ABA and other spokesmen for the banking community have expressed their general satisfaction with H.R. 13007, and their particular support for the five changes which we were able to make in the Electronic Transfer Act.

I intend to fully back those changes when the bill reaches the Whole House; and I will continue to oppose any provision which would prevent financial institutions and merchants from charging the consumer less for EFT transactions than for other means of payment. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.●

THE GOVERNMENT'S RIGHT TO  
RUMMAGE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on May 31 the Supreme Court delivered an opinion which drastically cut away at the constitutional right of every American to be secure against search and seizure activities by the police. In the case of *Zurcher* against the *Stanford Daily* the Court held that the police may use an ex parte

warrant to enter and search the premises of a party not suspected of any crime. The subject of the search in the case before the Court was the *Stanford University* newspaper, but the Court's decision reaches far beyond the press. It essentially renders every home and place of business vulnerable to a surprise search by the police. As Justice Stevens stated in his dissent in the case, "Countless law abiding citizens—doctors, lawyers, merchants, customers, bystanders—may have documents in their possession that relate to an ongoing criminal investigation."

The reaction against this decision has been widespread and vehement. Newsman, publishers, civil libertarians, and individuals across the political spectrum have declared their opposition to the Court's erosion of privacy rights. Several of my colleagues have introduced measures to restore these basic rights. In a well-reasoned editorial, the *Long Beach Independent, Press-Telegram* articulates the nature of the threat which the *Stanford Daily* decision poses to individual rights. The paper stresses the need for a legislative response to this threat such as the bill introduced by my friend and colleague, *Don Edwards*. I encourage my colleagues to read the editorial:

[From the *Independent Press-Telegram*,  
June 25, 1978]

A RIGHT DIMINISHED

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

That is the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, and the Supreme Court has decided that it was not violated when police obtained a search warrant and rummaged through files of the *Stanford University* campus newspaper in a vain search for photographs of an anti-war demonstration.

The threat that decision poses to the press is great, and because the press is self-centered that threat got most of the attention when the decision was first reported.

But the decision poses a threat to all citizens. It says, for the first time, that no citizen has any protection against searches and seizures if a judge somewhere can be persuaded to issue a warrant. Even though the citizen is not suspected of committing any crime. Even though the evidence sought could be obtained by subpoena rather than search.

The Supreme Court followed the letter of the Fourth Amendment. The spirit of the Fourth Amendment escaped it.

That spirit was explained once by Justice Felix Frankfurter. "It makes all the difference in the world," Frankfurter said, "whether one recognizes the central fact about the Fourth Amendment, namely that it was a safeguard against recurrence of abuses so deeply felt by the colonies as to be one of the potent causes of the Revolution, or one thinks of it as merely a requirement for a piece of paper."

Justice Byron R. White, who wrote the majority opinion in the *Stanford* case, concluded it was merely a requirement for a piece of paper.

Pieces of paper are easy to come by. A seven-year check showed that of 5,569 police requests for wiretap warrants, only 15 were denied.

In Justice John Paul Stevens' dissent in the Stanford case, the spirit of the Fourth Amendment breathes again.

Until recent years, Justice Stevens noted, the history of search warrants was that they were used only to seek evidence likely to be held by those suspected of crime. Such persons could be expected to destroy evidence of their criminality. The governing interpretation of the Fourth Amendment held that there was no probable cause to issue a search warrant for lesser evidence held by others. That kind of evidence could be subpoenaed.

"Countless law-abiding citizens—doctors, lawyers, merchants, customers, bystanders—may have documents in their possession that relate to an ongoing criminal investigation," Justice Stevens noted. "The consequences of subjecting this large category of persons to unannounced police searches are extremely serious."

Rep. Don Edwards, a Democrat from San Jose, has introduced legislation to protect not only newspapers but all citizens from the kind of search the Supreme Court has sanctioned. Edwards' bill, which would become part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, would require police agencies to use subpoenas to obtain evidence from persons who are not criminal suspects and who had not threatened to destroy evidence.

Edwards' legislation is important for the press. It is equally important for the public. The need for his bill, or something like it, is urgent. ●

#### THE TAX REVOLT AND FOREIGN AID

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

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

#### THE TAX REVOLT AND FOREIGN AID (By Anthony Harrigan)

Since California's voters gave overwhelming approval to a tax limitation measure—Proposition 13, the spender majority in Congress has been giving lip service to the concept of economical government.

The real test of the majority's intentions will come very soon when the House of Representatives votes on the Foreign Aid Appropriations bill.

If Congress is serious about cutting federal expenditures, it will slash billions of dollars from the foreign aid bill. It can begin by eliminating the \$1.5 billion President Carter is seeking for the International Development Agency.

U.S. Rep. Robin Beard of Tennessee recently pointed out that this \$1.5 billion is "a 93 percent increase over last year's appropriation."

Where do IDA funds go? U.S. Rep. C. W. Bill Young of Florida stated in recent days that "the IDA of the World Bank is considering five loans for Communist Vietnam totaling \$160 million." He added that this money "will be used to develop their coal industry, energy capabilities, water control projects, etc." These loans are scheduled for repayment over a 50 year payment with nothing to be repaid during the first 10 years and during the remaining 40 years only the principal is scheduled to be repaid. No interest is to be charged.

Understand what this means. The Carter administration plans to take money from American taxpayers and send it to Communist Vietnam through the agency of the International Development Association of the World Bank.

Congressman Beard reports that last Sept. 30 in an interview with United Press International, the director of Vietnam's Central Bank, "boasted that the U.S. would pay his country \$4.75 billion in par reparations and that it would be accomplished—not directly, but indirectly through the IDA of the World Bank." Apparently the communist official was right. The indirect funding of Communist Vietnam is in the foreign aid bill now before the Congress. President Carter is responsible for this funding proposal.

One wonders how this reparations plan will sit with those who fought the communists in Vietnam? And what about Americans who are paying 10 percent for a home construction loan? Won't they object to an interest free loan to communist foes of the United States?

This isn't the only devious deal in the foreign aid bill. Congressman Young has revealed that last year the U.S. sent 122,000 tons of wheat to India. The Indians turned around and shipped 100,000 tons of this to Vietnam Rep. Young is of the view that this is "a subterfuge and an attempt to send U.S. foreign aid to Vietnam indirectly through India in order to circumvent the expressed opposition of Congress to sending aid to Vietnam."

The indirect aid to Vietnam is only one reason for slashing the foreign aid bill. This bill is riddled with proposals hurtful to the U.S. interest. For example, Venezuela, which joined other OPEC nations in gouging America on oil prices, will receive \$164 million in foreign aid this year.

If members of Congress don't eliminate the wasteful foreign aid spending, the voters will know who ought to be eliminated at the polls in November. ●

#### CONFLICT OVER FEES KEEPS BARGES WAITING

### HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently carried an article which clearly and meaningfully explains the need to replace locks and dam 26 at Alton, Ill. As the story points out, so long as this project is tied up with the waterway user fee controversy, barges carrying valuable cargo up and down the Mississippi River will continue to face lengthy delays which raise costs and waste energy.

I believe the article will give my colleagues a good appreciation for the need to give prompt approval to H.R. 8309, the Navigation Development Act, authorizing a new and larger locks and dam 26. I encourage my colleagues to read the story and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

#### CONFLICT OVER FEES KEEPS BARGES WAITING (By Iver Peterson)

ABOARD THE BAXTER SOUTHERN ON THE MISSISSIPPI NEAR ST. LOUIS.—Capt. Claude Sexton is used to waiting.

For the skipper of a huge river tug, after all, life on the Mississippi is galloped to the languid pace of the river and the stately progress of the heavy barges that carry grain downriver from the plains and fuel and chemicals north from the refineries and ocean ports of the Gulf of Mexico.

But here, just above St. Louis, Captain Sexton had parked his three northbound ammonia fertilizer barges for more than two days, waiting to go through Lock No. 26.

That, he and other barge operators believe, is too much waiting. But Lock 26, the busiest and most clogged lock on the river, has become a hostage in a battle in Washington, a battle over the barges' right to ply the rivers free of charge.

Between locks, dredging and channel markers, the Federal Government spends about \$400 million a year to maintain 15,000 miles of commercial waterways, and the Carter Administration wants the barge operators to contribute.

Lock 26, just below the confluence of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, enters the conflict because the 15-barge tows, 1,000 feet long, have to be broken into segments to pass through the 300-foot chamber or through the 600-foot one alongside. This leads to long waiting, and the rivermen want a new lock capable of handling all 15 barges at once. The Army Corps of Engineers had planned to spend \$421 million for such a lock, just below the present one at Alton, Ill.

But the country's railroads, contending that the rivermen have an unfair advantage because the Government maintains their watery roadway without charge, joined several environmental groups in a Federal suit to block the new lock and dam.

#### AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED

The Federal district judge hearing the suit, in an interim finding, required the Corps of Engineers to obtain specific authorization from Congress to build the new lock. That legislation became the focus of President Carter's efforts to have the first user fees imposed on the rivermen.

The Administration favored an amendment sponsored by Senator Pete V. Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, a "railroad state," that would impose user fees equal to 100 percent of the river maintenance costs and 10 percent of the cost of new construction.

Last month, however, an amendment by Senator Russell B. Long, Democrat of Louisiana a "riverboat state," was passed instead, providing for a 12-cent-a-gallon tax on the fuel sold to barge operators. Administration critics argue that this would produce only 10 or 15 percent of the maintenance costs.

The House passed a similar fuel tax bill earlier, and the matter is now in conference. Mr. Carter has said he would veto any legislation authorizing the new lock construction that does not include comprehensive user fees, and the lock remains a hostage.

The barge operators' trade associations point out that the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 prescribes that America's inland waterways shall be "forever free without any tax, impost or duty." But they tacitly supported Senator Long's 12-cent tax amendment.

It has been estimated that the \$400 million Washington spends annually amounts to a subsidy of 23 percent of the barges' total operating costs, while the Government's contribution to the operation of railroads amounts to just 6 percent.

"I think they ought to settle it so it's fair for everyone," said Captain Sexton, who has been with the Southern Towing Company for 16 of his 20 years on the river. "The important thing is to get it settled so they can build the new lock and let everybody get to work."

"We don't lose any pay" waiting at Lock 26, said David Osment, a 23-year-old apprentice steersman. "But if the company has to pay me money to wait it could hurt the company and that could hurt us. They gotta make money to pay us money."

#### UNLIKE THOSE ON THE BANK

That kind of concern for the company may not be typical of some workingmen, but then the crew members of the Baxter Southern do not consider themselves to be much like people who live "on the bank."

They work "day for day," staying on the river for a month at a time and earning a day off with pay for every day they work.

Their days are spent in six-hour watches, broken by like periods of easygoing boredom.

Mrs. Barnes, who has been a riverboat cook for six years and likes the job, dishes out huge meals at 5:30 A.M., 11:30 A.M. and 5:30 P.M. A recent meal loaded the mess-room table with steaks, mashed potatoes, lima beans, baked beans, grits, boiled carrots, fresh baked rolls and butter, plus various pickles, relishes and bottled sauces, milk and iced tea. No alcohol is allowed on board.

"Mrs. Barnes don't say much, but she can cook," Dean Hudson, the pilot said.

#### A ROOM FOR WIVES

The Baxter Southern, like most large river tugs, has a guest suite complete with a dressing room and makeup mirror for wives who sometimes accompany their husbands on the boat.

"The company's pretty good about wives," a riverman known as Arkansas drawled in a booming, smoke-cured voice. "They're pretty good if it's legal, but no girlfriends. If they let girlfriends on, shoot, the boat'd go crazy."

The company evidently allows wives on board to combat the long separations that life on the river entails. Now Captain Sexton stands in the wheelhouse—where there is actually no wheel, only hydraulic tiller bars—and watches his 17-year-old son, Claude Byron, learn the difficult task of lashing the barges together.

He is not entirely happy that the boy is on the river. "I don't want him to be," the captain said. "If it wasn't that he'll be away from his family when his kids are growing up, it would be all right. But he'll be gone six months of the year if he stays on the river."●

#### THE FBI INDICTMENTS

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the July 8 edition of the Harrisonburg, Va., Daily News-Record included an excellent editorial concerning the recent indictments of three former officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The thrust of the editorial is that we should not endlessly rake the ashes of the abuses of the past, but rather focus our energies on the prevention of future abuses. I agree.

D. Latham Mims is editor and general manager of the Daily News-Record.

I ask that the text of the editorial, "The FBI Indictments," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The text follows:

[From the Daily News-Record, July 8, 1978]

#### THE FBI INDICTMENTS

Sen. S. I. Hayakawa of California has introduced a "sense of the Congress" resolution urging that Attorney General Bell move to dismiss the indictments of three former FBI officials in New York. The resolution deserves support, and the indictments in our opinion ought to be dismissed.

The three, former acting Director Patrick Gray, former acting Associate Director Mark Felt and former Assistant Director Edward Miller, are charged with illegal acts in the investigation of terrorist organizations during the late phase of the Vietnam War. Members of these terrorist groups openly sought the violent overthrow of the United States government—and they practiced violence in

the form of bombs, some of which killed people. In fact, some of the terrorists were themselves killed when a bomb they were making in the basement of a fashionable New York townhouse exploded.

In view of the temper of those times and of the threat to the public safety, it is hardly surprising that FBI agents surreptitiously entered the homes of relatives of suspected terrorists. That is not to say that their actions were proper or that they should be permitted to recur, but at a date when amnesty has been granted to draft dodgers, is it really important to prosecute FBI officials for passing constitutional limits in their pursuit of persons known both then and now to have posed a clear and present danger to the lives and property of innocent citizens?

Morale in the FBI is said never to have been lower than at present because of the indictments; however distasteful some of its work may be, it is nonetheless necessary, and it should be permitted to go on with it. The FBI remains a bulwark against the sort of terrorism that is all too prevalent in the rest of the world, and we should make sure that we will not be subjected again to such terror as pervaded the Nation a decade ago.

Let us close the books on all the horrors of the Vietnam era, taking care that our intelligence agencies do not again abuse civil liberties.●

#### YOUNG SHOULD GO

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned on previous occasions, the 82 votes that were cast against tabling my motion to impeach Andrew Young are indicative of the sentiments of the American people. As evidence of that fact, I am today placing a fine editorial from the Times-Picayune of July 14, 1978, in the Record. The message is loud and clear—Andrew Young is a misfit and does not represent the United States. He should be removed. The editorial follows:

#### YOUNG SHOULD GO

With much of the rest of the nation we have waited patiently for U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young to develop the maturity and responsibility to serve as an official representative of this country. We hoped he would rise to the task. We were wrong.

We all suffered through his many outrageous and irresponsible statements that have damaged the credibility of the United States, offended its allies and given comfort to its enemies. We were shocked when he called Cuban troops in Africa a "stabilizing" force. We shuddered when he said communism had never been a threat to him. We just gritted our teeth when he insulted our British allies and denied the legitimacy of the South African government, which our government recognizes.

When Mr. Young characterized four former U.S. presidents (Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford) as "racists," we didn't raise protest. We don't even speak out when he injected himself into the New Orleans mayoral contest, suggesting that the city was "on trial" and might be found guilty if it didn't elect a black mayor.

But Mr. Young's latest outrage is the straw that has broken the camel's back. In an interview with a French Socialist newspaper, Mr. Young charged "there are hun-

dreeds, perhaps thousands" of political prisoners in the United States. Mr. Young's asinine remark comes at a pivotal time when our government is officially protesting the Soviet trials of dissidents, men who made the mistake of taking their government's commitment to the Helsinki rights convention seriously.

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's reaction to Mr. Young's latest outburst was reportedly unprintable. Tass, the Soviet government-controlled news agency, predictably seized on the remark as proof of political persecution in this country. The Carter White House, which has become used to defending Mr. Young, weakly responded that his view "does not reflect the policy of this administration." Several members of Congress moved to have Mr. Young impeached.

Mr. Young's irresponsible outbursts can no longer be tolerated. He is not a private citizen expressing personal views. He is an official representative of the U.S. government and his remarks are taken seriously by foreign officials. Mr. Young's childlike innocent view of the world has become more than an embarrassment. It has become dangerous and destructive of U.S. policy interests.

It is time President Carter realized that Mr. Young is not the man for such a sensitive job. As a private citizen, Mr. Young would be free to express his view without damaging this nation's credibility and prestige in the world.●

#### NEH CUTS ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

### HON. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, we find few examples of Federal agencies that are serious about cutting administrative costs these days. I was pleased to learn of recent efforts at the National Endowment for the Humanities to put a lid on the costs of public relations. The following is a news report on the efforts of Chairman Joseph Duffey to find low-cost alternatives to expensive office equipment and furnishings.

The news report follows:

One of the smaller federal agencies has cut its public relations budget from about \$744,000 to less than \$600,000 by buying cheaper desks and typewriters and eliminating walls, its chairman said today.

A saving of \$150,000 a year is not much by federal spending standards, but then the total budget of the National Endowment for the Humanities next year is about \$146,000,000—less than one-sixth what the Pentagon spends on public relations alone.

Chairman Joseph D. Duffey escorted reporters and the head of the General Services Administration, Jay Solomon, on a tour of the new space. Solomon, an advocate of better use of federal buildings, asked permission to bring some of his design staff back to see it when it is occupied.

One example of savings: if the endowment had bought the wooden desks which the GSA prescribes, they would have cost \$349 each, or a total of \$10,470 for the 30 needed. Instead, the agency bought metal desks and had them painted for a total of \$5,265, saving \$5,215.

Many of the employees in the public relations section preferred manual typewriters over the popular electric model, so the endowment bought reconconditioned manuals for \$60 each rather than the electrics at \$740 each. Buying them was a cultural shock to

the suppliers, officials said, since they think the government buys only the latest and most expensive models.

"The employees now think they're in the best space in the building," Duffey said. The endowment is in rented space on five floors of a commercial building, but expects to stay only about two years before moving to the old Washington Post Office Building, a Pennsylvania Avenue landmark which is about to be renovated by the GSA.

Eliminating walls made a significant saving, the agency said: 30 employees will share space normally assigned to half that number. Duffey said the space arrangement is more like that of a newspaper city room or a publishing house than the usual federal agency.

Further savings were realized by avoiding the need for individual air-conditioning ducts, light switches and fixtures, electrical outlets and other standard accoutrements.

When the space is occupied, the walls will be decorated with posters of such endowment projects as the King Tut Show, The Adams Chronicles, paintings from the Soviet Union.

The endowment anticipates additional savings by being able to store research materials needed frequently on shelves, rather than in a basement storage area. The endowment has also cut its mailing list from an average of 7,000 to about 200 by eliminating duplications and by such devices as sending releases about Latin American projects, for example, only to those interested. Formerly, all releases went to everyone on the list, which was handled commercially.●

#### SUPPORT FOR ALASKAN LAND BILL

### HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this time portions of an editorial which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press, discussing the Alaskan National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The Alaskan land bill, H.R. 39, passed by the House May 19, and currently in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, is significant to all as it is one of the greatest conservation measures of our time. I, along with my constituents, support this important issue and am pleased to bring this fine editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Grand Rapids Press, June 30, 1978]  
THE ALASKAN LAND BILL

The U.S. Senate is confronting a very busy calendar. With the labor "reform" bill out of the way for at least the time being, there remain the nation's big four concerns to be faced up to: tax reform, energy, inflation and unemployment. A fifth major consideration—the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act—demands Senate action this year as well.

Under the Alaskan Statehood Act, the 49th state was granted 105 million federal acres, or about 28 percent of the available land and water, when it entered the Union. Selection proceeded slowly and was interrupted by litigation, most notably the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 which gave Eskimos, Aleuts and Indians millions of dollars in grants and mineral rights plus 44 million acres of land.

In consideration for removing legal barriers to the construction of the Alaskan pipeline, conservationists insisted that Congress

set aside "national interest" lands to provide for national parks, wildlife refuges and wilderness areas. Under section d-2 of the Native Claims Act this was to be accomplished no later than Dec. 18, 1978.

No amount of acreage was specified, however, and Congress has been debating that question off and on ever since. Last month, by a margin of 277-31, the House of Representatives set aside 124 million acres—an area roughly equal to the size of California. President Carter has recommended 92 million acres. The state of Alaska thinks that 25 million acres are enough.

It is in the Senate that the future of Alaska will be determined. Unless that body acts by the December deadline the government in Juneau may resume claiming the balance—or 30 million acres—of the 105 million acres to which the state is entitled.

Among the traditions still largely observed in "the highest deliberative body in the world" is senatorial courtesy. The unwritten understanding provides that in matters bearing directly on a senator's home state his colleagues will defer to his wishes. In this case, both Democrat Mike Gravel and Republican Ted Stevens have united to oppose large "withdrawals" of land to protected status. They want much more territory left open for economic development.

But even if a majority of senators choose to ignore senatorial courtesy, there is another danger to the proposals advanced by the administration and the House-passed set-aside. That danger is a filibuster lead by the Alaskans.

By far Alaska is the nation's largest state. Its 365 million acres of land and 10 million acres of inland waterways account for one-fifth the area of the United States. Its wildlands are unmatched anywhere in North America. This gift of nature is a national treasure to be jealously guarded and preserved.

When Alaska became a state, more than 99 percent of its territory belonged to the federal government. In granting statehood, Congress' offering of 105 million acres of land and water to the people of Alaska was most generous. Indeed it was the largest federal land transfer to any state in the Union, greater in fact than all past grants west of the Missouri combined.

Since then the Senate has been very helpful to the development needs of Alaska. It has expedited oil and gas pipelines, granted the most valuable development land (such as Prudhoe Bay) to the state in the 105-million acre Statehood Land Grant, and resolved the "freeze" on lands settling the Native land claims.

Now, however, it is appropriate that the Senate act in the best interest of all Americans—not just Alaskans—for it is they who own the territory in question. A strong Alaskan bill is owed this nation's future generations.●

#### FOUNTAIN ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I sent a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of North Carolina, and asked their opinions on several matters facing the Congress and the Nation in 1978.

The response, in a word, was overwhelming. Approximately 25,000 people

answered the questionnaire—and many included additional, helpful comments about some of the tough issues of the day.

So that my colleagues in the Congress might have the benefit of my constituents' thinking, the results of the questionnaire follow:

1. Do you favor legislation co-sponsored by me which would prevent HEW Secretary Callfano from using the taxpayers' money to finance his massive anti-smoking campaign? 81% yes, 19% no.
2. Do you favor eliminating Saturday mail delivery as a cost-saving measure? 43% yes, 57% no.
3. Do you favor income tax credits for parents who pay for their children's college educations? 74% yes, 26% no.
4. Do you favor legislation to lower unemployment by making the federal government the employer of last resort? 37% yes, 63% no.
5. Do you favor a return to the Selective Service military draft? 59% yes, 41% no.
6. Do you favor paying a portion of the expenses of the Social Security system out of the general treasury? 53% yes, 47% no.
7. Do you favor granting amnesty to illegal aliens now in this country? 15% yes, 85% no.
8. Do you favor public financing of Congressional campaigns? 27% yes, 73% no.
9. Do you favor stricter enforcement of criminal laws? 96% yes, 4% no.
10. Do you favor national health insurance financed by tax dollars? 32% yes, 68% no.
11. Do you favor the proposed Panama Canal treaty? 22% yes, 78% no.
12. Do you favor extending the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment beyond March 1979? 25% yes, 75% no.
13. Do you favor the United States having military strength greater than that of the Soviet Union? 89% yes, 11% no.
14. Do you favor requiring able-bodied welfare recipients to work when jobs are available? 98% yes, 2% no.
15. Do you favor a balanced Federal budget except in time of war or other national emergency? 96% yes, 4% no.●

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ANTI-DISCRIMINATION EFFORT

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times that was printed on May 30, 1978, I expressed my concern about the inadequacy of the Federal Government's existing antidiscrimination effort. As I indicated at the time, a new HUD-financed study of 40 American cities documents the short distance we have traveled since the open housing bill was enacted in 1968—and the enormous distance we have got to travel before we are rid in this country of the blight of housing discrimination.

Of all the comments that my particular letter prompted, the most insightful was provided by Mrs. Olive R. Beasley, director of public service in the State of Michigan's Department of Civil Rights. Because of the critical importance of the subject matter, and because of the thoughtful way that it is addressed in Mrs. Beasley's letter, I would like to share it with my colleagues at this time:



DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS,  
FLINT DISTRICT OFFICE,  
June 7, 1978.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,  
Congressman, 16th District Illinois, 1101  
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I read your very perceptive article in the New York Times May 30 edition captioned—"Housing—Apartheid American Style." I heartily concur in your assessment of the impact to date of 1968 Fair Housing Act in regard to reducing or eliminating housing discrimination. The experience in Michigan supports your conclusions. There are many reasons for the perpetuation of traditional patterns and exclusionary practices including the recalcitrance of the real estate industry, (brokers and developers) through racial steering, block busting and more subtle practices to circumvent both state and federal laws; mortgage and insurance redlining practices; municipal disinvestment in areas of ethnic and racial concentration; overt and covert resistance to non-whites in white residential areas; school desegregation plans resulting in white flight to suburban areas generally tightly restricted against non-whites; deterioration of downtown business areas usually adjacent to non-white population concentrations with a high attrition of business casualties as shopping malls proliferate in peripheral and suburban areas. Also, significant is the fact of cynicism of non-whites in regard to confidence in enforcement of legislation. The general resistance to and delays in providing adequate supply of low and moderate income housing at prices minorities and the poor can afford in most of the major urban areas resulting in long waiting lists building up over the years so that when and if publicly assisted low and moderate income housing becomes available, the waiting lists consist primarily of non-whites particularly for public housing units both family complexes units and scattered site housing. These effects have been further aggravated by poor maintenance, lack of modernization programs which cause them to deteriorate and become neighborhood and area eyesores which in turn reinforce resistance to public housing projects by home owners in these and other areas. Another device which in effect constitutes block busting that realtors frequently resort to is a proliferation of for sale signs in a given neighborhood or geographic area which precipitates panic selling and flight by white homeowners. The list is endless and whether or not any legislation can correct all the root causes is questionable.

I also agree that expedited procedures for investigation and resolution are critical to success and stronger sanctions and enforcement will have a salutary effect. Whatever strengthening of existing laws is being considered will have to take into account the necessity for HUD, EDA, EPA and other federal funding agencies to tighten up enforcement of regulations, eliminate the ambiguities that have prevailed in regard to interpretation. For example, HUD Community Development block grants have been given without adequate monitoring; without prior rather than post evaluations of civil rights compliance, general disregard of A-95 Review comments from either local and state civil rights enforcement agencies or concerned voluntary civil rights organizations. Code enforcement regulations are ineffective against absentee slum landlords and even against local landlords because of cumbersome court procedures and many of them elect to abandon properties on the basis it is not economically feasible to comply with codes when enforcement attempts are made. These structures are left vacant and subject to vandalism, crime, rape or where local authorities are able to condemn properties and compel adequate boarding up they still

stand as offensive eyesores in an area or neighborhood or the local unit of government is forced to demolition at great public expense. Any re-examination of contributing cause and effect require also a hard and critical look at public welfare system which too often becomes a reliable subsidy system for slum landlords.

The whole issue is a very complex one and perhaps it is necessary at this point for the Congress to reconstruct the history and experience with housing laws beginning with 1949 Housing Act designed to guarantee safe, sanitary decent housing to all citizens.

Powerful incentives are imperative today to end housing discrimination and the mistakes that have accrued through well intentioned but misguided stop gap programs since the 1949 Housing Act honored mostly by rhetoric rather than commitment of priorities and resources must be taken into account in developing any effective remedy to the perpetuation of housing discrimination.

I, and many community organizations and agencies I work with, would be extremely interested in legislative developments referred to in your article that can more effectively assure freedom of choice of residency to all citizens and particularly, the protected classes designated in state and federal anti-discrimination laws.

You are to be commended for recognition of the problem and having identified and stated so succinctly and poignantly the status of housing discrimination today in the U.S. Sincerely yours,

MRS. OLIVE R. BEASLEY,  
Director, Public Service. ●

#### IMPORTANT VICTORIES FOR THE INDEPENDENT SERVICE STATION OPERATOR

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. Speaker, during the month of June, all three branches of the Federal Government took critical steps to provide the Nation's independent service station operators with essential protection from the giant oil companies.

On June 14, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a monumental decision, Exxon Corp. against Governor of Maryland, that rebuffed a challenge by the Nation's largest oil company—a challenge that threatened the ultimate extinction of independent operators.

Only 5 days later, the President signed into law H.R. 130, called the dealer's day in court legislation, which provides protection to gas station operators from the arbitrary cancellation of their franchises.

The Supreme Court case involved a Maryland law which prohibited gasoline refiners and suppliers from owning service stations within the State. Exxon Corporation, with its battery of lawyers, filed suit claiming that the law restricted interstate competition. The oil giant said in essence that a State had no right to protect small independent operators from the competition that huge oil companies could bring to bear.

It is a well known fact that within the past decade, oil companies have attempted to carve out the most profitable service stations for their own operation. They have terminated franchise agree-

ments without good cause, and taken over lucrative stations with their own personnel. At the same time, to reduce competition for the stations they do own and operate, they have terminated franchises on less profitable stations, putting rugged independent operators out of business.

The Maryland law represented an attempt to curtail the efforts of the major oil companies to snuff out competition in the retail end of the industry. If other States continue to permit oil companies to dispossess independent operators of their franchises, ultimately, we will end up with a gasoline distribution system in which the oil companies and their own salaried employees control the flow of oil from the spigot to the gasoline pump. Now, at least, we still have a sizable corps of independent operators at the retail end, and they must be protected.

On June 14, 1978, the Supreme Court ruled that the Maryland law is constitutional. In the same opinion, the Court upheld provisions of Maryland law which prevent oil suppliers from playing favorites with retailers—if one operator in a given geographic area is given a price reduction, the same reduction must be given to other operators. This aspect of the Maryland law insures that independent operators will not be driven out of business by unfair competition.

Now that the far-reaching Maryland law has withstood the legal challenge of the largest oil company in America, other State legislatures should look to it as a model for their own States. As a Niagara Gazette editorial recently emphasized:

The main issue is that the power of the giant oil companies to control the retail oil market has been broken by the Supreme Court decision. The main issue is that their power to force out independent competition has been destroyed. The main issue is that small enterprises will again be able to flourish in the retail oil business. Lower prices may result—indeed are almost certain to result—but the main point is that the structure of the retail oil industry will be changed: Standard Oil is out and Charlie's corner gas station is in.

But the independent service station operator has cause to celebrate apart from the Supreme Court decision. On June 19, 1978, President Carter signed into law legislation that will protect gas station franchise holders from arbitrary lease cancellations. The law, now in effect, prohibits a franchisor from arbitrarily canceling or failing to renew a franchise agreement with a gasoline distributor or retailer. The law also requires the Energy Department to conduct a study to determine the extent to which producers and other suppliers of motor fuel subsidize company-owned gasoline stations with funds or services derived from other operations performed by their parent companies. It is clear that such subsidization is predatory, that it is a tool employed by the majors to eliminate competition from nonsubsidized, independently operated stations, and that action should be taken to eliminate this anticompetitive practice once and for all.

I strongly supported H.R. 130, because I believe the protection that it affords the independent operator essential

for the preservation of competition in the marketplace. Consistent with this view, I have cosponsored other legislation such as H.R. 11857, the Fair Franchise Practices and Distribution Practices Reform Act, and H.R. 11749, the Franchising Termination Practices Reform Act. These measures would extend much needed protection to franchise holders in a much broader range of industries.

The recent Supreme Court decision, and the enactment of H.R. 130, are two developments that will help insure the preservation of some of America's most important small businessmen. We all have cause for celebration.●

VFW LEADER CALLS UPON CONGRESS TO FIRE ANDREW YOUNG

**HON. LARRY McDONALD**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, some segments of the press and indeed some of my colleagues have suggested that the vote Thursday on the motion—to table my resolution of impeachment of Andrew Young—House Resolution 1267, indicated or somehow reflected the feelings of Americans on this issue. It did not. As an example of how widespread are my views and those of the 81 other Members who voted to discuss this measure, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this time, the call by the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the Congress to fire Andrew Young as well as the letter from the VFW commander, Mr. John Wasylik, explaining the press release. These two items are for the edification of my colleagues who may now fully comprehend how the people feel about Mr. Young's antics: The items follow:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1978.

VFW LEADER CALLS UPON CONGRESS TO FIRE ANDREW YOUNG

WASHINGTON, D.C.—“This unguided missile, ‘Ambassador’ Andrew Young, in his most recent outburst as reported in the French newspaper, *Le Matin*, has left mere indiscretion and demonstrated ineptness far behind and has leveled charges against our country that he allegedly ‘represents’ which are the peace-time equivalent of war-time treason, i.e., giving aid and comfort to enemies of the United States.

“As has been repeatedly demonstrated in the past, as far as President Carter is concerned, Young is fire-proof and Young seemingly lacks the grace either to shut up or get out.

“For these reasons, I am calling upon the bi-partisan leadership of the 95th Congress to act in concert to secure Young's departure from government. For the name ‘Young,’ substitute the name ‘Singlaub’ and you'll have some idea of the level of hypocrisy to which we have sunk.”

John Wasylik, National Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States today conveyed this “urgent request” to the leadership of the Congress “who, from all reports, share my anger and outrage.”

(Ambassador Young told the French newspaper that “there are hundreds, maybe thousands, of people I would call political prisoners in U.S. jails.”)

(On earlier occasions, Young termed the Cuban forces a “stabilizing influence in Africa,” described former Presidents Nixon and Ford as “racists,” and viewed the Swedes as “terrible racists.”)

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., July 13, 1978.

HON. LARRY McDONALD,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDONALD: The action I propose with respect to Ambassador Andrew Young is contained in the enclosed press release. I urge a concerted, bi-partisan effort on the part of the leadership of the 95th Congress to the end that Andrew Young is immediately separated from his position as United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

In addition to the rationale in the enclosed press release I would add:

(a) Young's manifest inability patiently to pursue any rational, structured, government-wide foreign policy effort;

(b) His flaunting of the sense of the 380-10 vote in the House of Representatives in the matter of the Star Chamber proceedings underway in the Soviet Union affecting Anatoly Shcharansky and Aleksandr Ginzburg; and,

(c) The calculated timing of Young's latest remarks which play directly into the hands of Kremlin propagandists and clearly challenge the veracity and thrust of President Carter's characterization of the Moscow trials.

As I noted in my press release, Young is apparently “fire-proof” and will neither shut up nor get out.

Please advise me as to your reaction to my proposal that the leadership of the Congress act.

Sincerely,

JOHN WASYLIK,  
National Commander-in-Chief.

A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE

**HON. MARTHA KEYS**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Ms. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, today, we have passed important legislation for the handicapped. During the welfare reform hearings, the Public Assistance Subcommittee heard extensive testimony on the many work disincentives for the handicapped. Repeatedly witnesses noted that a major disincentive to work was the fear that if they did not succeed at a job they would be in a worse position than if they had never taken one.

Our improved vocational rehabilitation programs have increased the employment opportunities for many individuals. However, those individuals are reluctant to actually take a job when failure will mean the forfeiture of SSI and medical assistance.

H.R. 10848 is a simple, low-cost way of reducing this disincentive. By providing for presumptive eligibility, it as-

ures that a handicapped individual can regain his benefit without waiting several months during reapplication. Thus, an individual who still meets the medical criteria will continue to receive benefits without a break. He will not be penalized for his efforts in the labor force.

This bill is only commonsense. It simply makes benefits available to those who would be eligible for them in any case. This small adjustment in the administration of the SSI program will make a significant difference for handicapped persons who wish to secure meaningful employment. I commend my colleagues for their support of this measure.●

THE A-7 WINS AGAIN IN SCOTLAND

**HON. DALE MILFORD**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 1977, I was pleased to announce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the USAF 23d Tactical Fighter Wing won the first Royal Air Force tactical bombing competition held in Scotland. I am again pleased to inform my colleagues that the same 23d Tactical Fighter Wing, again flying the A-7D Corsair II aircraft, was declared the overall winning team for the second consecutive year.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will join me in giving the pilots and crew of the 23d Tactical Fighter Wing a hearty “well-done.”

I include a press release of the event at this point:

A-7 WINS IN SCOTLAND

LOSSIEMOUTH, SCOTLAND.—The United States Air Force 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing has flown A-7D Corsair IIs to victory for the second consecutive year in the Royal Air Force Tactical Bombing Competition.

The “Flying Tigers” of the 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing were presented the Sir John Mogg Trophy as overall winners in ceremonies Monday, July 10, at the Royal Air Force Lossiemouth Bombing Range.

The A-7Ds are built in Dallas by Vought Corporation, a subsidiary The LTV Corporation.

The 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing, based at England Air Force Base, Louisiana, was declared the overall winning team on the basis of points achieved in bombing, strafing, leadership in navigation and operational turnaround. The A-7Ds won the 1978 team competition by scoring 1,733 points of a possible total of 1,930.

The winning team represented the Air Force's Tactical Air Command, and competed against four Royal Air Force teams based in Great Britain and West Germany, which flew Anglo-French Jaguars and Hawker-Siddeley Buccaneers. The four-day competition, delayed one day by weather, was held from July 5 through July 8.

Colonel Ted Conrad of the 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing was team leader. Other members included Major Ron Brekke, Captains Dick Burroughs, Bob Gatliff, Mason Whitney, and United States Navy Lieutenant Howard Petrea. Maintenance superintendent was Chief Master Sergeant Thomas W. Neal.●

STATEMENT BY AMERICANS FOR  
ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

## HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Department of Energy regulation to increase the entitlement for importers of foreign refined residual fuel oil on the east coast and Michigan has become the subject of intense controversy. After analysis of the proposed regulation change, I have drafted an amendment to block that portion of the regulation which increases the subsidy for foreign refined residual fuel oil because I am convinced that the regulation is not in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Corroborating my position is a statement submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Regulation by Americans for Energy Independence, a nonprofit coalition composed of members of the business, labor, academic, scientific, industrial, consumer, conservation, ethnic, and religious communities through the Nation in pursuit of effective national energy policies. Its board of directors includes such notables as Dr. Hans A. Bethe, Nobel laureate, Cornell University; Mr. Otes Bennet, president, North American Coal Co.; Mr. Lloyd McBride, president, United Steelworkers of America; Mr. John N. Nassikas, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission; and Endicott Peabody, former Governor of the State of Massachusetts.

The Americans for Energy Independence statement cautions that the proposed change in the east coast entitlements program would detrimentally affect efforts to increase domestic refinery capacity and will serve as a disincentive for U.S. refiners to retrofit their refineries to process more abundant heavy crude. The full text of the statement follows:

We appreciate your invitation to comment on Administration policies affecting to domestic petroleum refinery capacity and the relationship between the crude oil entitlements program and these policies.

The Administration utterly fails to recognize the strategic importance of domestic refineries in the context of the energy crisis. In the absence of any coherent national refinery policy each proposed DOE regulation which would impact on the nation's refinery capacity must be scrutinized carefully by Congress.

On June 15, the DOE announced a proposed expansion of the already terribly complicated entitlements program in order "to equalize subsidies nationwide for residual fuel oil." It is our position that as formulated, this proposed extension of the entitlements program would serve as a disincentive to domestic refiners to undertake the expansion and reconfiguration steps necessary to meet domestic needs.

The United States is the only major industrialized nation which cannot refine its own needs. This country is currently short some 3 million barrels of daily refinery capacity. Under scoring the strategic implications of this shortfall, the U.S. is presently incapable of refining the crude oil which will be stored

in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.<sup>1</sup> (The evasive DOE response to Question 11 posed by this Subcommittee suggests that Americans will have to rely on foreign refineries to process the Reserve oil. The irony of this is clear. Put bluntly, in the event of another oil embargo, New Englanders would be well advised to winter in the Caribbean.)

We are at a critical crossroads. Our domestic refineries are primarily geared to process light, sweet oils which are rapidly diminishing and becoming more valuable. The recently discovered finds here and abroad are predominantly heavy, sour crudes which produce a greater percentage of residual fuels, used for electrical generation and in industrial processing. To gear out refineries to meet what is coming on line and to meet important environmental requirements, present refineries will need retro-fitting, capacity enlargement and upgrading for efficient operation. We will also need more refineries and refineries sited throughout the country with regional needs.

To do these things will be expensive. But the expense should be weighed against jobs lost, a detrimental balance of payments and resulting inflation, and the security risk of a policy which fosters dependence on foreign refineries. We believe that the new DOE proposal as enunciated by the Secretary will preclude a role for the U.S. in processing the now more abundant types of crude.

We are sympathetic to the needs of the East Coast to prevent economic dislocation to its residents and industries, and we have no desire to exclude from the U.S. market refined products from abroad. But we think it dangerous to embark on a new open-ended entitlements program which would hold out the hope of permanent subsidies to the East Coast while providing no incentives to that region and to the refinery industry to correct a growing imbalance.

We could support the DOT's proposal if 1) it were a declining subsidy with a certain cut off date; 2) it could be guaranteed that the cost benefits would be passed through to the East Coast consumers; and 3) the expanded entitlement program were meshed with a national refineries program designed to encourage expansion and diversification of U.S. refinery capacity. We believe a program which contains these features will better serve our national energy goals without aggravating regional rivalries than the baling wire and Band-Aid approach offered by DOE.●

## COAL SLURRY PIPELINES

## HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit an excellent analysis of the proposed coal slurry pipelines as the issue is presented in H.R. 1609.

COAL SLURRY PIPELINES: ISSUES AND IMPACTS  
EMINENT DOMAIN

Eminent domain is a power of condemnation. It is not a popular exercise of government authority. Eminent domain is designed to be used judiciously, within very carefully

<sup>1</sup>At the present time, there is a worldwide excess of refinery capacity. In West Germany, the refinery utilization rate dropped to 65% last year. (An 85-90% rate is considered optimal.) In the Netherlands Antilles, utilization rate of the combined companies dropped from 92% in 1973 to 70% last year. February 13, 1978 *Oil & Gas Journal*.

drawn parameters of what constitutes "the national interest" and "a public purpose". Further, eminent domain "is founded on the law of necessity". It is not a power to be used for "pipeline promotion" or "to facilitate the acquisition of rights-of-way" for essentially private interests across Federal or private lands. Granting federal eminent domain authority to coal slurry interests would weaken and dilute the "public purpose" clause of that authority, and in the process, could set the stage for a whole host of other interests who would want to use federal eminent domain powers for other projects that may be risky, unnecessary, regionally parochial, or otherwise unworthy of "public purpose" sanction. Bechtel, for example, sponsored a study on slurry transport which noted that "the logical next step", after obtaining federal eminent domain power for coal slurry lines, would be to pursue such power for iron slurry pipelines, suggesting a need for such facilities in the Great Lakes Region.

## WATER USE

Fully one-half of the substance moved in coal slurry pipelines is water. It takes about one ton of water, or 250 gallons, to move one ton of coal through a pipeline. One coal slurry pipeline could consume as much as 6 billion gallons of water per year—an amount equivalent to the water needs of a town of about 65,000 people. Three pipelines the size of the ETSI proposal would consume an amount of water equivalent to the needs of half of Wyoming's present population. And the U.S. Bureau of the Census has projected that the population of Western states will increase at double the national average through the year 2000.

## WATER DEPLETION

In the Western and Great Plains states, underground aquifers, which will be increasingly relied upon for agricultural, Indian, municipal and industrial water needs in the years ahead, will not be able to accommodate both slurry needs and expansion of existing uses. For example, present uses alone, combined with the demands of three coal slurry lines, would exceed the estimated 75,000 acre feet "replacement flow" that replenishes the three-state Madison Formation, a process that would gradually lower the water table for that reservoir, possibly falling below the reach of local well fields. Furthermore, there is some indication that destination-state industries and utilities not only want the coal that is carried in slurry pipelines, but also the water.

## AGRICULTURAL IMPACTS

Agricultural interests will be impacted by coal slurry development in several ways. Agricultural land and water will be directly taken for pipeline construction and operation. Shipping rates for agricultural commodities hauled by rail could be driven up in certain areas as coal slurry lines cut into the coal tonnage hauled by rail. Water prices for all water users, and especially agricultural users, will be driven up by competing and speculating coal slurry interests, thus increasing operating expenses for already hard-pressed ranching and irrigated farming operations. For these reasons and others, the National Farmers Union, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Farmers Organization and the American Farm Bureau Federation have all expressed opposition to coal slurry legislation.

## NEW FORMS OF ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION

Federal eminent domain authority for coal slurry pipelines is the crucial link that will enable a small, interconnected web of construction, utility and mining interests to establish coalfield-to-kilowatt control over energy development in certain regions of the country. Large construction and mining interests will team up with natural gas util-

ities to form "coal slurry cartels" around each coalfield/pipeline/powerplant complex. The Department of Justice reported in May that Utah International and Peabody Coal together accounted for 52.9 percent of all coal production in the southwest. Utah International is owned by General Electric and holds the pipeline subsidiary Marcona Construction. Peabody Coal is controlled by Bechtel (15 percent), the Williams Cos. (27.5 percent), Boeing (15 percent) and the Fluor Corp. (10 percent). Each of these firms have interests in either pipeline construction, powerplant construction, or utility/pipeline/powerplant equipment and hardware. ETSI is controlled by Bechtel (30 percent) and Lehman Brothers (30 percent). Further, utilities with coal slurry interests will become involved in joint ventures for mining coal. Panhandle Eastern Pipeline and Middle South Utilities have signed a joint venture agreement with Peabody Coal for 150 to 250 million tons of coal over a 26- to 42-year period. There is nothing to prevent this kind of integration and joint venturing in the current coal slurry pipeline legislation. In fact, there has already been some maneuvering by utilities and other coal slurry interests to avoid certain Securities Act disclosures. While proponents argue that coal slurry pipelines will promote competition in coal transportation, they may in fact be laying the groundwork for yet another form of oligopoly. Such new forms of economic concentration and closed-cycle market control will be officially sanctioned by Congress with a grant of eminent domain for coal slurry lines.

#### PERPETUATING ECONOMIC CONCENTRATION

The pipeline and natural gas industries are clearly planning their growth-projection hopes on coal slurry pipeline development. In 1976, the president of Gulf-Interstate Pipeline Co. optimistically forecast that at least one-half of the dollar value of all pipeline construction in the 1980's could come from coal slurry pipeline development. In one sense, coal slurry pipeline legislation may contribute to the perpetuation of the growth and market power of the natural gas pipeline interests by allowing them to horizontally extend into coal pipeline development.

#### CAPITAL DIVERSION AND CAPITAL COMPETITION

Federal regulatory and siting incentives for coal slurry development will give pipeline interests and advantage over railroads and other industries in the capital market. Throughput contracts will enable slurry interests to obtain favorable financing and lower interest rates. Scarce capital dollars, otherwise available to railroads for rail equipment and roadbed upgrading, might not be as easy to come by once coal slurry interests secure eminent domain and federal sanction. Moreover, scarce capital spent on duplicative and unnecessary energy transportation systems will be capital unavailable to other sectors in the economy, including housing, energy conservation, health care, or solar technologies.

#### WATER RIGHTS

Despite protective legislative provisions to the contrary, state and Indian water rights are likely to be overturned in court due to the "national interest" weight accorded a federal grant of eminent domain. Supreme Court decisions such as *Pike v. Bruce Church* suggest that a ruling invoking the "commerce clause" would favor pipeline interests over a state action denying access to state waters for coal slurry purposes.

#### LAND AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

According to OTA, the proposed Wyoming-to-Texas coal slurry pipeline would traverse 45 counties in 6 states. Assuming a 100-foot right-of-way, this one pipeline alone would require approximately 14,000 acres of land,

much of it used for agriculture. At 15 acres per mile of pipeline, ETSI's 1,400 mile line would require 21,000 acres. Given the propensity of pipeline builders to take "the line of least resistance", productive valley land, diagonal field crossings and a disruption of local land planning will all be in the offing if slurry interests are given federal eminent domain powers.

#### ENERGY USE AND ENERGY WASTE

The Office of Technology Assessment has calculated that coal slurry pipelines would require 610 Btu's of energy per ton-mile of coal moved, while railroads would require 310 Btu's per ton mile. Centrifuge technologies and possible reverse pumping of water to points of origin would require even more energy. One estimate of "energy use" for a 1,000-mile coal slurry pipeline—including coal preparation and de-watering—revealed that the energy equivalent of 1 million tons of coal would be expended in one year moving coal through a pipeline. Also, the Department of Commerce has explained that "there is a significant loss of coal and energy due to drying/separation requirements for coal slurry". Commerce finds that as much as 6 percent of the coal can be lost in these processes.

#### PIPELINE SPILLS AND RUPTURES

Soils and geology will vary considerably along the 1,000-mile routes of proposed coal slurry pipelines. Certain porous soils and geologic formations could serve as dispersing conduits for liquid spills. Underground water supplies and local well fields may be vulnerable to slurry contaminants should pipeline ruptures or leaks occur along these lines.

#### WATER POLLUTION

Coal contains trace elements such as mercury, lead, beryllium, arsenic, cadmium, selenium and others. These elements, plus the addition of corrosive-inhibiting chemicals to protect pipelines, and chemical flocculants used to separate coal from water at the plant site, will, if not treated, end up as toxic substances in local water supplies. The Environmental Protection Agency currently has no standards for coal slurry discharges. In addition, where volume and flow of water resources are affected by coal slurry takings, the ability of such waters to assimilate pollutants or absorb organic wastes will also be reduced.

#### TECHNOLOGY REPLACING LABOR

Coal slurry pipelines will create temporary construction jobs. However, the House Interstate & Foreign Commerce Subcommittee report has noted that "full deployment of coal slurry pipelines could ultimately cost as many as 16,000 railroad jobs." In addition to the Railway Labor Executives Association, the United Mine Workers and the International Assn. of Machinists are also opposing coal slurry pipeline legislation. Technology-intensive methods of transportation, such as coal and iron slurry pipelines, combined with already technology-intensive methods of extraction such as surface and open-pit mining, seem but one more step on the part of industry to move away from labor-demanding processes and organized labor.

#### COAL SLURRY INFLATION

Construction cost estimates for coal slurry pipelines (in 1976 dollars) are running at about \$1 million a mile. Bechtel, a major firm among coal slurry proponents, has participated in the construction of the Alaskan Pipeline, San Francisco's BART, and Washington's METRO, projects which have all experienced substantial cost overruns. Long-term construction and purchase contracts for coal slurry lines will unload financial risk and escalating costs onto the utilities, who, in turn, will pass such costs on to their rate

payers through fuel cost adjustment allowances and other rate-base mechanisms. Secondly, any loss in coal tonnage hauled by rail will impose higher rate burdens on other rail-carried commodities, especially grain and beef moving to Eastern and Midwestern markets. Higher transportation costs for agricultural commodities will mean higher food costs for consumers. Thus, coal slurry construction and operation will contribute to inflation in two basic areas: utility rates and food prices. And inflation rates for food and fuel are already rising faster than the general Consumer Price Index.

#### DOUBLING NATIONAL COAL PRODUCTION

According to the Carter Administration's National Energy Plan, "Coal development and production is most economical when it is near major markets." The NEP notes further that "there should be large production increases in the highly populated Eastern and Mid-West regions, where coal use in industry and utilities could grow considerably in the future." Since the overwhelming share of coal reserves east of the Mississippi River is deep-minable (approximately 90 percent), federal incentives and private investment in deep-mine technology, deep-mine health and safety, and railroad revitalization would appear to be a coal development strategy more in "the national interest" than granting eminent domain for coal slurry pipelines. Eastern deep-mine development would also be more cost-effective and would create more jobs for transportation workers as well as miners.

#### ANTI-TRUST AND COAL INDUSTRY STUDIES

There are a large number of perplexing and complicated questions pertaining to the operation and structure of the coal industry and allied interests in the U.S. Because of the lack of a clear understanding of the coal market and other institutional and financial arrangements relating to coal and coal development, it would be premature for Congress to enact any form of coal pipeline legislation at this time. Enactment of coal slurry pipeline legislation by Congress will necessarily precede several coal industry studies and planned committee investigations. One study of coal industry competition is mandated under section 742 of the coal conversion portion of the pending Energy Bill. Congress should reasonably defer to the results of these studies before proceeding with any further consideration of coal slurry pipeline legislation. ●

#### YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times in the past about the seriousness of the teenage unemployment problem, especially among blacks. The recent news that black teenage unemployment still hovers around 40 percent compounds my concern.

The overall unemployment rate has continued to decline—from 7.5 percent in June of 1977 to 5.7 percent in June of 1978. Total teenage unemployment, although still at an unreasonably high level, has declined from 21.5 percent to 14.2 percent over the past year. But, black teenage unemployment has diminished an insignificant amount—from 40 per-

cent to 37.1 percent. The Labor Department estimates 394,000 black teenagers, ages 16-19, were unemployed in June of 1978. Countless others have undoubtedly stopped looking for work, discouraged by frequent job rejections. Total teenage unemployment is over 1,360,000—a national disgrace.

These figures are alarming and indicate that much more needs to be done to alleviate teenage joblessness. Although Congress created a Young Adult Conservation Corps last year, and although some teenagers find work through CETA, adequate job opportunities for all teenagers still do not exist.

The current situation demands innovative solutions. Our Nation cannot afford to let a generation of youngsters suffer long periods of unemployment with the resulting lack of experience and skill training. The employment deprivation caused by the inaction will haunt us for years to come.

Youngsters need special assistance in entering the job market. Besides Government-provided jobs, which should only play a small role in combating teenage unemployment, teenagers need a less restrictive minimum wage to help their employment prospects. In the past I have suggested either a youth differential to the minimum wage or a minimum wage voucher plan as methods to attack youth unemployment. Given the current unemployment situation, such solutions seem more needed.

G. William Miller, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on June 29, 1978 agreed that the minimum wage is a barrier to youth employment and that a youth differential would be wise public policy. His views, expressed in his official capacity as the individual in charge of the Nation's monetary policy, lend impressive credence to the concept of a minimum wage offset for young people. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues the relevant portion of Mr. Miller's testimony, along with a recent Washington Post article on black teenage unemployment:

Senator ROTH. You think it would be helpful to have some type of partial exemption with respect to the teenage employment, permitting the youth to be employed at something less than the standard minimum wage?

Mr. MILLER. Senator, there is no question; I think that would be a wise move. The young people today have it very difficult, those particularly without higher education, getting the first job. But after they get a job and have had it a few years they progress very well and take up their place in society with well-paying jobs, and it is in their own self-interest to get work experience, even at a differential wage, just to get the experience. Many of them are living at home. They have less personal expenditures.

They are not married and they can afford to go through an apprenticeship, if you will, as many of us did in our years of learning. They learn what work is and what responsibility is. They learn what it means to be a part of the team and produce in one way or the other, so I think it would not be socially regressive, I think it would be progressive to them that opportunity.

[From the Washington Post, July 8, 1978]

#### BLACK TEEN JOBLESS AT 37.1 PERCENT

(By Charles Rowe)

Unemployment among black teenagers remains a serious problem nationwide, with the unemployment rate for black teen-agers at 37.1 percent in June, compared with 14.2 percent for all teen-agers nationally, the government reported yesterday.

According to Labor Department statistics, the unemployment rate for black teen-agers remains the highest of any population group. The June rate was down slightly from the May rate of 38.4 percent, while the rate a year ago was 40 percent.

"The situation is very serious for black teen-agers," Andrew Brimmer, a former governor on the Federal Reserve Board and now a Washington consultant, commented yesterday.

"The situation is improving very, very slowly. Not enough is being done," he said.

Brimmer noted that the slight improvement in unemployment for black teen-agers was less than the improvement for white teen-agers during the recent months. The ratio of the black teen-age unemployment rate to that for whites jumped to 3.2 in June from 2.78 in May, he calculated.

In June, 181,000 more white teenagers and 10,000 more black teenagers found jobs, Brimmer said.

Behind the difference in the employment rates for the two groups, Brimmer said, is the fact that most white teen-agers "live in the suburbs where the jobs are—where the growth is greater."

Brimmer said he would like to see continuation and expansion of government programs designed to find employment for teen-agers with no job skill. Yesterday, one such program run by Youth Pride Inc. certified nearly 400 District youths for work in its summer program.

According to Camilla Brooks, director of in-school programs for Pride, their program finds jobs for economically disadvantaged students—those from families now receiving some sort of government financial assistance. The program receives government funds under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act.

Pride Inc. works with the District's Department of Manpower and area schools to place the students in community service jobs, Brooks said.

Silva King, who accompanied her 16-year-old sister at Pride, said getting jobs for black teen-agers is "easier now than it was." She attributed the improvement to programs such as Pride's. "It's still hard in the winter time," she said, because many employment programs last only for the summer.

Barbara Bergmann, professor of economics at the University of Maryland, said the high unemployment rate for black teen-agers is "due to discrimination in large part." She said she noticed discrimination in some restaurants, which she said had never hired black employees.

"I look at black unemployment as an extremely serious problem that is not being addressed," Bergmann said. What has inhibited solutions to the problem, she said, is a fear of inflation.

"As serious as some people see the problem of inflation, it can not be more serious than getting our black teen-agers prepared for the world of work," she said.

Bergmann said she is coming around to the idea of wage and price controls as a solution to unemployment problems. The controls, she said, "would free our concern from inflation so we can begin attacking the unemployment problem."

If the nation's economy goes into a recession, Brimmer said, he expects "blacks generally and teen-agers in particular to carry a disproportionate share of the slow growth and rising unemployment." ●

#### ANDREW YOUNG'S LATEST COMMENT

#### HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleagues attention to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star, July 14, 1978. The Star comments, as many have, on the foolishness and inappropriateness of Andrew Young's latest comment, which remarkably "falters at the challenge to distinguish rationally between freedom and tyranny." But it is most astonishing when we consider Andrew Young's background as a courageous fighter in the American civil rights movement.

In his work with Martin Luther King, Young exemplified and brought to life the words of W. E. B. DuBois who wrote that "there are today no truer exponents of the pure human spirit of the Declaration of Independence than American Negroes." As true exponents of "the pure human spirit," Mr. Young and those who followed him forced America to hold fast to her guiding principle "that all men are created equal." But in his failure to articulate the not too subtle distinction between the idea which gives America its unique quality and the idea which drives the Soviet tyranny, Young betrays a radical ignorance of his own role and his own achievements as a kindred spirit of Dr. King. Hold the Soviets to their guiding principle and you see the Gulag, hold America to her guiding principle and you see the Civil Rights Act of 1964. What can be said of his disgraceful talk but: "For shame, Mr. Young, for shame."

[From the Washington Star, July 14, 1978]

#### MR. YOUNG'S LATEST

The untimeliness of Ambassador Andrew Young's latest attack of *yakkita inepta* is appalling, of course. Not that there is ever a good time for mentioning U.S. prisoners of any kind in the same breath with maltreated Russian dissidents.

Some good might come of the incident, however, if we ask ourselves what dire confusion might account for Mr. Young's astonishing suggestion that U.S. prisons hold "hundreds, even thousands of people I would call political prisoners," or for his further suggestion that poverty is a common jailing offense. Mr. Young can't repeal the dictionary, or transform a plain prisoner into a political prisoner with an arbitrary label. And "nobody," he conceded later, is "in prison in the U.S. for criticizing the government."

So what prisoners did Mr. Young have in mind? Amnesty International recently listed a small number of American cases in which some political aspect figured—among them the case of the so-called Wilmington Ten in North Carolina. Even that was an adventure in misdefinition, but Amnesty International was infinitely more cautious than Mr. Young.

There does appear to be a school of thought and maybe Mr. Young belongs to it, that breaking laws in the name of some cause transforms plain criminality into political criminality. There are, concededly, times when it may. There is a form of civil disobedience whose condition is the acceptance of punishment. But the very promiscuity of its use has long since blurred crucial distinctions quite hopelessly. The Wilmington

youths convicted of fire-bombing a grocery store attracted vast, uncritical support in the liberal and civil rights communities because their crime was in some sense the offshoot of civil rights conflict. But it was not, of course, civil disobedience by any sane definition.

Mr. Young told the French reporters that he was, himself, "sentenced . . . in Atlanta for organizing a protest movement." Indeed, in the South in the '60s various minor laws against trespass, vagrancy and loitering were sometimes used by local authorities with the aim of stifling "political" purposes. But distinctions may and must be drawn. No one not even Mr. Young, was ever literally "sentenced" for organizing a protest movement. That is not a crime and never was, although it does seem to be a crime in the Soviet Union, Helsinki accords notwithstanding.

The point is that Mr. Young as a former associate of the late Dr. King has more reason than most to recall that the right to organize a protest is constitutionally protected; and that the U.S. government went to extraordinary lengths to see constitutionality vindicated against local repression. Ought he not make it his business, in conversations with the foreign press, to stress crucial distinctions and not casually blur them? Need he equate a legal system with a Bill of Rights and Habeas Corpus with a legal system designed to place individuals at the mercy of an arbitrary state?

The real problem is not Andrew Young or his tendency to sound off inopportunely. It is a frame of mind so unsure of its values as to scant vast differences rationally between freedom and tyranny. We have, as Prof. Walter Berns would have it, "forgotten the answers" to a number of fundamental questions, answers free people forget at their peril.

Mr. Young is not the only offender. He is only the most spectacular. ●

#### VIETNAM TRIBUTE

### HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the House of Representatives has today adopted H.R. 12261, legislation that will finally give us an opportunity to pay tribute to those who gave their lives in Southeast Asia.

I am sure the 107 cosponsors of my original Vietnam tribute legislation contributed greatly to the progress in developing the measure passed today.

A 5-foot marble and bronze plaque is being designed for placement in the Trophy Hall of the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. Plans are tentatively set for dedication of the plaque on Veterans' Day, November 11, 1978.

The plaque will carry the inscription: The people of the United States of America pay tribute to those members of its Armed Forces who served honorably in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict.

The Purple Heart and medals, ribbons, and tributes associated with the Vietnam conflict will be mounted in a manner appropriate for display in the Trophy Hall.

Mr. Ray Constanza, Superintendent of Arlington National Cemetery, and Maj. Don Deline of the Army's Office of Legis-

lative Affairs, took time from their busy schedules recently to personally show me a drawing of the plaque design, and where the plaque will be placed in the Trophy Hall. I was deeply moved by the time and consideration that has gone into developing a suitable tribute.

The courage and conviction, determination and devotion that the members of our Armed Forces displayed in a strange, distant, and unpopular war must place them in the very front ranks of all the heroes in our history to whom the concept of duty was more than a word.

It is uniquely appropriate that Congress put itself on record by recognizing those who, at great sacrifice, served in obedience to the law, above and beyond the call of duty.

I join the families and friends of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in expressing sincerest appreciation to my colleagues who cosponsored the original legislation, and to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Cemeteries, and its chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY), and the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the distinguished gentlemen from Indiana (Mr. HILLIS), Mr. Constanza of Arlington National Cemetery, and Maj. Don Deline of the Department of the Army, for endorsing the concept and helping to develop an outstanding tribute to the memory of those who served in Vietnam.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to list the cosponsors of the original Vietnam tribute legislation:

#### CO-SPONSORS, VIETNAM TRIBUTE

H.R. 6778, H.R. 7512, H.R. 7513, H.R. 7514, H.R. 7625, H.R. 7688, H.R. 8509, H.R. 9766, H.R. 9767, H.R. 9781, H.R. 9867, H.R. 10135.

James Abdnor, Daniel K. Akaka, Clifford Allen, Mark Andrews, Bill Archer, Les AuCoin, Robert E. Badham, Max Baucus, Edward P. Beard, and Adam Benjamin.

James J. Blanchard, Edward P. Boland, Jack Brinkley, Clarence J. Brown, Clair Burgener, James A. Burke, M. Caldwell Butler, James Cleveland, Thomas Coleman, and Silvio O. Conte.

Tom Corcoran, David L. Cornwell, Edward Derwinski, William L. Dickinson, Robert Dornan, Thomas J. Downey, John J. Duncan, Mickey Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, and David Emery.

Aller E. Ertel, Thomas B. Evans, Jr., John Fary, Millicent Fenwick, Floyd Fithian, Walter H. Flowers, L. H. Fountain, Donald Fraser, Bill Frenzel, and Louis Frey, Jr.

Benjamin Gilman, Willis D. Gradison, Jr., Charles Grassley, Tennyson Guyer, Sam B. Hall, Jr., George Hansen, Elwood Hillis, Ken Holland, Marjorie S. Holt, and Frank Horton.

William J. Hughes, Andy Ireland, John Jenrette, Jr., Jack F. Kemp, William Ketchum, Thomas N. Kindness, Robert Lagomarsino, Raymond Lederer, Joseph A. Le Fante, and Norman F. Lent.

Marlyn Lloyd, Clarence Long, Trent Lott, Stanley Lundine, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Larry McDonald, Robert C. McEwen, Matthew McHugh, James R. Mann, and Dan Marriott.

Romano L. Mazzoli, Joe Moakley, Robert H. Michel, Clarence Miller, Donald J. Mitchell, Austin Murphy, Stephen Neal, Bill Nichols, Richard Nolan, and James L. Oberstar.

George O'Brien, Shirley Pettis, Larry Pressler, Carl D. Pursell, Dan Quayle, Albert H. Quie, Frederick Richmond, Marty Russo, Leo J. Ryan, and Richard T. Schulze.

Ike Skelton, Gladys Spellman, Floyd Spence, Arlan Stangeland, Newton I. Steers,

Jr., Bob Stump, David C. Treen, William Welsh, G. William Whitehurst, and Charles Whitley.

Charles Wilson, Larry Winn, Jr., John Wydler, Gus Yatron, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young, and Robert Young. ●

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. ADDABO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of "Captive Nations Week," a time set-aside for us to remember those living under the persecutions of tyranny. The current trials of the Soviet dissident Scharansky and Ginzburg makes especially clear the fact that most people of the world today do not live in freedom, but must endure daily what to us seems like an unbearable oppression.

I think that we Americans are perhaps a bit too complacent with our own hard won liberty. We have just celebrated the 202 anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Our Nation is governed under the oldest written, viable Constitution in the world. Two-hundred and two years seems to be so long a period of time as to make our own freedom invincible in the face of any obstacle from without and from within. Yet, let us remember that tyranny and oppression have been the rule of government throughout history, and not the exception, even today, in a world ruled by the few for the few.

For democracy to thrive it needs an atmosphere of free thought and liberalism not only at home, but abroad as well. For this reason, "Captive Nations Week" is an important tradition, as it forces us to remember those who are not free and encourages us to be vigilant in defense of our own liberties as well as those of others. Vigilance in defense of freedom is an idea which dates back to the glorious revolution of 1688 in Britain and which underlay the thoughts and actions of our Founding Fathers in the 18th century. Unless we remain true to our own best traditions of freedom, the American experiment will be lost.

Soviet actions in Africa have expanded their influence in that part of the world and has, therefore, threatened the cause of freedom everywhere. In Eastern Europe, millions of people still live under Soviet domination and are denied the right of meaningful self-determination. In the Soviet Union, itself, millions of non-Russians, as the current dissident trials remind us, must endure tyranny and persecution as a daily fact of life. In Cambodia and Vietnam, the reports of atrocities document terror on a scope not seen since the days of the Nazis. In fact, when we remember the so-called captive nations, we are thinking of a large proportion of the global population—all except that part which we call the Free World. For so many nations are either captive from without or captive from within. The truth of this fact must not be lost upon us if we are to maintain our own freedom. ●

## CAPTIVE NATIONS

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the week, as part of the Captive Nations Week program, I will be inserting pertinent articles in the Record to dramatize the plight of the peoples held in bondage by the U.S.S.R. One of the most tragic stories of the captive nations is that of Lithuania, one of the small Baltic states which was swallowed up by the Soviets at the close of World War II.

Columnist John Sherwood tells the story of the Lithuanian nation as seen through the current Lithuanian chargé d'affaires in Washington, D.C. In his article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of July 13, Mr. Sherwood comments on the future of the Lithuanian legation in the United States. The article follows:

TEMPO—THE KEEPER OF LITHUANIA'S  
FADING FLAME

(By John Sherwood)

WASHINGTON.—There are no secretaries to answer the phone, no butlers to answer the door, no chefs in the kitchen, maids in the parlors, chauffeurs in the garage. The old mansion is dark and empty; too hot in the summer, too cold in the winter.

On the hot first floor, behind a classic iron-grilled window, works an aging, sady-eyed man without a country. He is a gentleman haunted by what was—still concerned over matters that, realistically speaking, are no longer matters of his concern. There are few telephone calls and even fewer visitors.

He wears black shoes and black, baggy trousers. A conservative striped tie splashes some color on the starched white shirt that is always buttoned at the collar and cuffs. A diplomat without portfolio, he is part of the Old World, and he looks the role as he quietly shuffles papers and sends out literature about a country that no longer exists, except in his heart.

His wife, her hair pulled back severely, is the only other person living and working in the five-story, 24-room house on 16th Street.

Madame Ona Backis is preparing a small lunch in the kitchen that overlooks an overgrown garden, and they will eat quietly together at the kitchen table, not at the large, formal table in the beautiful banquet room upstairs. She is a slight, little woman who walks with her hands clenched together in front of her.

It is all pretty much a matter of time for them now. Their patient, diplomatic waiting game has lasted nearly 40 years and will probably end soon. Their hopes are dwindling fast, along with their funds and their years. Yet, for all the personal tragedies they have suffered, they have grown old wonderfully well together and they accept the fate that they will never see any of their family again.

"It is difficult. It is very difficult," says Dr. Stasys A. Backis, 72, *charge d'affaires* at the former embassy of the former nation of Lithuania here. "I look upon the 17,000 square feet we have here as the last of Lithuania. It is the largest piece of our beloved country that is left in the world (the old Lithuanian diplomatic service maintains an apartment in Rome and a small legation in London). "We live very frugal lives. Funds are getting low, I am growing old, and there is no one to replace me."

Lithuanian funds were frozen by the United States after the Russian takeover and are administered by the Treasury Department, releasing as much from the Federal Reserve in New York as is needed. There is speculation that there are only enough funds to last a couple of more years at the most.

The U.S. government and the West have never formally recognized the 1940 Soviet takeover of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, but they do recognize anyone appointed to the diplomatic service by the legitimate governments before the invasion. Estonia has a diplomatic office in New York. Latvia has a legation in Washington but it is unlike the embassy-type Lithuanian legation that serves as both the home and the office of its charge d'affaires.

"It is a tragic tale," said a State Department official familiar with the Baltic states. "We are looking at the question and the rule that a diplomat must come from the sending state."

And therein lies the problem: Since the Lithuanian delegation does not qualify as a government in exile, how can a country that no longer exists appoint a diplomatic representative? Anyway, most of the last remaining members of the old Lithuanian foreign service are in their 70s and 80s, and when they go, so, in effect, goes Lithuania.

Other small offices are maintained in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Toronto, mainly to serve the more than one million Lithuanian-Americans by providing historical literature about their ancestral country.

Dr. Backis' office is full of books and pictures and mementos that might well have been burned by the Russian rulers in Lithuania. In the dark hallway outside his office hangs a large map of his homeland, and he smiles as he points to the town of his birth, Joniskelis on the River Musa. He has not been there for 40 years and will never be able to return. That saddens him greatly.

"I have a brother back home," he said. "I think he is alive. I hope he is alive. I just don't know. He would be 80 years old, I last heard from him in 1976. My other brother died in Siberia." Madame Backis added: "One of my sisters was sent to Siberia, but I still have a brother and sister living. My home, my birthplace, is now a Soviet cultural center."

Showing a visitor around the darkened building, Dr. Backis pointed out various Lithuanian furnishings and decorations that manage to keep the spirit of the country alive—a rug and tablecloth, a framed Madonna of Lithuania, a rosary, rare Easter eggs, and a knight on a charger (the national emblem) hanging over a carved, wooden mantle near the Lithuanian flag of yellow, green, and red.

Dr. Backis walked up to a carved wooden Christ hanging on a wall in a somber corner. It was barely visible, because curtains were drawn to keep out the summer heat. The legation—built in the 1920s by Washington social figure Mrs. John D. Henderson, who lived in a "castle" just down the street—is not centrally air-conditioned. In the winter they walk around in sweaters to keep heating expenses down.

The envoy flicked on a wall light and, when the visitor had seen enough, flicked it out again. He did this time and time again as the tour proceeded.

Madam Backis is especially proud of a showcase of 20 costumed dolls taking part in a wedding feast. The exhibit was shown in the Lithuanian Pavilion during the New York World's Fair in 1939. It now sits in a back room on the second floor, draped in plastic dust covers.

There are few parties held here, except for the one celebrating the old country's national day, Feb. 16. Several native dishes were served then, but for the most part the buffet was limited (egg rolls and hot dogs in blank-

ets). It was held in the old banquet room, however, but there was no festive gaiety, no dancing, toasting, or celebration.

A poignant sadness is etched in the faces of Dr. and Madame Backis, perhaps because the history of Lithuania is especially sad. Established in 1251, the Lithuanian kingdom bordering the Baltic Sea was under Russian rule from 1795 to 1915, when it fell under German occupation. In 1918 the tormented country finally achieved its restoration of independence that was to last but 20 years.

Lithuania was received into the League of Nations in 1921 and soon after set up its embassy in Washington, buying the Henderson mansion in 1923. In 1926, Lithuania and the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact. In 1939 a "mutual assistance" treaty was agreed upon, and Lithuania was forced to admit Soviet garrisons and to grant air bases.

On June 15, 1940, Russia demanded immediate formation of a "friendly government" and on the same day the Red Army marched in. Within two weeks, 400 members of Lithuania's intelligentsia were deported to Siberia. During this brief occupation the country suffered a loss of 45,000 people and was to suffer even more turmoil at the hands of the Germans, who marched in the following month and proceeded to execute almost all of Lithuania's Jews. The beleaguered country fell under Soviet control again in July, 1944, and villages and cities suffered widespread devastation and massacres.

In Lithuania, during 1945-46, some 145,000 natives were shipped to Siberia and hundreds of thousands of young Lithuanians took refuge in the forests. Thousands of them fled the country and there were many armed clashes between the partisans and the Soviet military and secret police.

Dr. Backis was born in 1906 and entered the foreign ministry in 1930. He lived in Lithuania until 1935 when he went to France. He came to Washington as an embassy official after the last minister died in 1957 and became charge d'affaires after Joseph Kajeckas retired in January, 1977. Now Dr. Backis, too, is hoping for retirement.

"I don't know what will happen," he says, shrugging his shoulders and anxiously rubbing his hands together. "There is no one to take over. It is very difficult. It is a very difficult situation." ●

CHARTING A COURSE OF  
FISCAL SANITY

## HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on July 1, the Washington Post published a letter to the editor from Sid Taylor, research director of the National Taxpayers Union, in which Mr. Taylor pointed out that our Government in Washington has become so huge and complex that no up-to-date organization charts are available.

As Mr. Taylor observes, this fact illustrates the confusion and complexity which now characterize the vast array of programs now operated by the Federal Government in every sphere of national life. He aptly cites proposition 13 in California as a measure of citizen attitude toward big and sprawling govern-

ment—and not just in California, but even more particularly in Washington.

I ask that the text of Mr. Taylor's letter, headlined "Charting a Course of Fiscal Sanity," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The text follows:

[From The Washington Post, Saturday, July 1, 1978]

CHARTING A COURSE OF FISCAL SANITY  
(Sid Taylor, Research Director, National Taxpayers Union)

The other day I tried to obtain a current organization chart of the U.S. government. None exists. The closest available document is a chart (dated Jan. 1, 1978) "Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies" prepared by the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee once a year. Even this chart is woefully out of date with dozens of amendments. On top of this, no similar charts exist to clearly show the current organization and manning of the judicial and legislative branches of government.

If we don't know how our \$500 billion a year federal government is organized and staffed—and where our tax money is going—how can we hope to stop deficit spending, inflation, soaring national debt, waste, mismanagement, white-collar crime, cost overruns, corruption, stealing, incompetence and ripoffs from the federal till. Bureaucracy thrives on confusion, complexity and concealment. Our Fiscal Year '79 federal budget is a mind-boggling document of 506 pages.

Back in the 1960s, we were threatened with the "missile gap." Today it's the "management gap" and inflation is the missile. "Peter principle" incompetence in dozens of federal programs at the billion-dollar level threatens to bury us. In turn, a tax explosion (federal, state, local and Social Security) has triggered a tax revolt. No wonder Proposition 13 is so popular. The American taxpayer is fed up. We now need a Proposition 14—on spending limitations—at federal levels. We also need better management techniques. The \$7 billion lost, strayed or stolen in HEW programs during 1977 is merely one example. Our Social Security System has become a trillion-dollar fiscal Frankenstein. It is even overtaking our income-tax system as a new kind of taxation. However, inflation is overtaking both.

What's the answer? A good place to start would be a current and accurate organization chart of our entire federal government. Armed with this, we might finally get into the war on inflation and even return to fiscal sanity by 1984. ●

#### RADIO-TELEVISION APPEAL AIDS SLAIN TROOPERS' FAMILIES

**HON. JAMES R. JONES**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has sought the attention of the American public oftentimes has reason to believe that the messengers bearing our words are working against us. Many times, our terminology betrays a certain bias. We speak of "the media" as if it were a living, breathing creature with one central nervous system that reacts to any contact. In turn, we are often lumped together as "politicians" by members of the press, who instinctively feel that if it were not for us, they might get a clearer picture of reality.

All of this ignores the fact that there

is no stereotypical "media," nor is there one central mold from which politicians are cast. Rather, we are all individuals, both reflecting and betraying our upbringing, our educations, and our communities. Recently, an event occurred in my State which both saddened me, and yet gave me renewed pride in the people that I represent in this honorable legislative body.

Three members of the Oklahoma Highway Patrol were gunned down in cold blood on an Oklahoma road. Their suffering was mercifully shortlived, but they left wives and children behind who must now attempt to make ends meet while grieving for their loss. This event was widely reported by the news industry in Oklahoma. It was a page one story, and rated such coverage due to the tragedy and senselessness of the killings. A cynic might dismiss the media's interest in this event as mere sensationalism, but not so easily dismissed are the events that followed.

KVOO radio station and KTUL television station in Tulsa did not let this story slip from their news desk into the waste can. Through the efforts of Harold C. Stuart, president of KVOO, and James C. Leake, chairman and owner of KTUL, a memorial fund was set up to allow citizens to express their sorrow in terms of helping the families of the deceased. Five hundred and four Oklahomans contributed over \$14,000 to this fund, which is a tribute to the tireless efforts of Mr. Stuart and Mr. Leake in publicizing the existence of the fund and the needs of the troopers' widows—Mrs. Pat Grimes, Mrs. Houston Summers, and Mrs. Billy Young.

Money will not replace the loss felt by the families of the fallen. Money will not take the place of punishment for those eventually convicted of this crime. This effort will not produce one extra listener or viewer for Mr. Stuart or Mr. Leake. The only thing it will do is to reaffirm the basic goodness of mankind. In reaching out to those touched by this tragedy, it might bring home the gentle message that despite the emptiness and helplessness of the occasion, someone still cares. It should be a lesson to all of us—no matter what side of the camera we are on—that beneath the surface, we are all part of one family. ●

#### WHERE'S SWEDEN HEADED—BANG- LADESH NEXT STOP

**HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing struggle in this country and in this Congress between those who want to cut taxes and Government spending and those who want to increase Government involvement in our lives. There are those of us who have continually spoken up for free enterprise and the individual's right to manage his own income in the way he sees fit. And then there are those who continue to encourage more Government spending and involvement

in our lives. But as the Congress continues this deficit spending, the national pie of productivity keeps shrinking.

In the July issue of the Harry Schultz Letter, a well respected international newsletter published in Lausanne, Switzerland, there is a report from Sweden discussing some of the results of its experimentation with socialism. The cost of living there has risen to an unbelievable level, and the taxes are so high that there is very little incentive to work. Most Swedes have become adept at cheating the Government and stealing from their employers.

Harry Schultz asked one Swede where she thought the country was headed, and the reply was "Bangladesh next stop."

Sweden revisited—or what has socialism wrought? It's been many years since I was last in Sweden, so it gave an excellent opportunity to contrast and compare then with now, especially as this has been, for several decades, the showcase laboratory for free world experimentation with socialism, democratically imposed.

Almost nothing is black or white. Most things are a shade of grey. Thus one can say, for the whiter side, that Sweden socialism does not manifest poverty. But then it inherited a "going concern", a structure of high efficiency and work ethic. Over the years it has dissipated the wealth it inherited and has borrowed, putting the future in hock. It is no show of talent, but merely a trick, to spend money you are given and also to borrow against tomorrow—thus giving the impression to outsiders your high standard of living is due to your own efforts. A masquerade.

That's no different to most of the world today, you may say. True. But as Sweden was the 1st western nation to plant a socialist seed in its garden, it pays rich dividends to study the results, for here we have more case history than elsewhere. . . . I have some good friends there, self-employed. They introduced me to their friends—both workers and employers. Because I was introduced as a friend, they all poured out their conviction and emotions to me, especially so as I was an outsider who simply wanted to know how the country was ticking these days. This enables me to speak with a hundred tongues today. Not as an expert on Sweden, but as one who reflects and synthesizes the sincere views and observations of a pretty good cross section of Swedes.

If Zambia or some similarly stone-age country adopts socialism, it's not sociologically very significant. They don't know what they're doing; they're 99% illiterate and 100% nitwitted. So it's of no great moment. They just stumble from emergency to emergency, taking the course of least resistance. But when a highly developed, highly civilized, educated, ancient culture like Sweden elects to test socialist theories, as it did a generation ago, then its results are worthy of serious appraisal. Especially as every western nation has now embarked on some variation of this abstraction without really knowing where it will lead. Sweden has, I believe, given us the answers. Here they are:

First it's necessary to understand that tax rates here are the largest in the world, on balance. The government has its hand in everyone's pocket all the time. Taxes are both direct and indirect at incredible levels. A bottle of ordinary Scotch whiskey, for example, is \$22, quality whiskey is \$30. And only government stores sell it. The taxes are high because government has undertaken to provide so many "free" services. Obviously they're not really free, and when welfare is distributed by any government their han-



dling merely adds to the cost and lowers the quality.

The effects of these high taxes and wide-span welfarism upon human nature should have been predictable, and were to many of us. These effects include the following:

The prime purpose of most Swedes now is to cheat the government. It was described to me as a "sickness." By doling out freebies to the masses, the common denominator has dropped and this, plus inflation, creates acute frustration. One result: gambling is very big now, obviously an attempt to get even or get ahead, despite hopeless odds, in a hope-free society. Another predictable manifestation is: crime. Stealing is so common now it's not regarded as much of a crime. I don't mean break and entry so much as people stealing from their employers. One large mercantile chain closed down because employee theft sapped their profits entirely. A new law says if you're under 20 and you steal less than \$20 worth of goods, there is no punishment! Guess what that encourages? Theft-protection built into law.

Automatic wage deductions amount to 30% for common laborers, 45% for secretaries, and if you earn over a mere \$20,000 a year, your tax rate is 80% with no nonsense about deductions. Very little is deductible anymore. A famed author was taxed 102% recently, on 100,000 Kroners income. But even these rates mask the high indirect taxes on everything you buy. All this has created black-market labor. People ask to be paid in cash, with nothing reported. It's not even whispered, but blatantly asked for. There is no incentive to work if it is mainly taxed away.

Part of the reason why welfarism went so far here is Sweden's neutrality. Because it was, along with Switzerland, neutral in WWII, there was no war damage. In fact they didn't suffer at all, thus escaping life's realities in another way. The people are, in the words of my friend, "spoiled" by this shielding. Another reason it went so far is that they were first on the scene, which means: when you give people free this and that, it becomes impossible to take it away from them and they indeed want more as they become psychologically attuned to expecting government to be their provider.

Enforcement of tax law is only 3rd rate. That means you can "probably" get away with inaccurate tax returns. But maybe not. So, do you or don't you try? It makes for a schizophrenic society. Most good brains leave, I'm told. Those who stay have every penny they can manage in Switzerland and such. People are increasingly buying rare stamps and coins. "Going somewhere else" is the preoccupation of most successful people.

The schools don't like grading pupils. They want to eliminate giving a, b, c grades, which (they say) make some children feel "inferior". They ignore Mark Twain who I think it was that said: "We're all born equal, but some are more equal than others." I see this dreadful philosophy, which castrates incentive, creeping into GB. Russian isn't so silly; they put brainy children in special schools and encourage the differences. Red China, after 2 decades of trying to make everyone the same, has given that up, now has reverted to fostering brainpower.

Government has made it nearly impossible to fire anyone. (Holland has adopted this idea and suffering badly from it.) It's especially difficult to fire anyone over 40. You may have to pay 1 year's wages if you sack them. Obviously this discourages hiring. Such laws, as with minimum wages laws always hurt the people most they are designed to help. Likewise with sanctions against Rhodesia. So, unemployment is high in Sweden. Especially so for a political concept that thought it had all the answers. Indeed, I'm told the government decides

everything here. This is increasingly true the world over, so as you look at Sweden you see the rest of us in perhaps 10 years.

The banks won't lend money. That sounds incredible, but it's true. They claim not to have enough cash. . . . Gradually the Swedish socialists have used up all the natural resources and or priced themselves out of the market due to excessive labor costs (eg lumber, paper, pulp, steel, iron ore). When you pay people almost as much not to work as to work, wages become noncompetitive and productivity falls. Sweden has a staggering deficit now and the 5 year outlook is grim. The deficit has risen 100% over government estimates of 12 months ago. 1 in 4 of Sweden's biggest companies had a loss last year. The 200 largest firms had a pre-tax profit margin of only 0.1% on total sales. Compares with 6.9% in 1974 and 2.3% in 1976. 1 in 6 had a loss in 1976. Now it's 25% of all the companies. The state owned firms had the biggest losses, naturally. The most profitable firm was a foreign one, Xerox, with 23%. Nobody is investing. Investment fell by 5.1%. . . . Prices, by the way are very high; it's one of the costliest places to live in the world. But the reasons for that are childishly obvious from all we've just discussed. Everything is cause and effect. Yet that principle is seemingly rarely taken into consideration, or always seen through rose (pink) colored glasses—ie, how things "should be", not how human nature works.

So ignorance is still our enemy. Not communism, socialism or fascism as such. In all these it is ignorance that creates the problem. Socialists say: you have certain rights—but no mention of responsibilities. In this manner the Swedes have soiled their pretty nest. . . . The birth rate among Swedes is very low now, due to high costs, frustration and pessimism. Yet the immigrants have a high birth rate and they dependably vote for handouts. . . . There's a new tax on boats. Swedes suspect it's not for income so much as control. "Where did you get the money for the boat?" The option to be anonymous has nearly disappeared. The option to even leave by boat may disappear. . . . True they had a slight swing to the right in their last election. But the chap is no Einstein, I'm told, and in any case he can't turn back the tide.

Said one Swede to me: "The Swedes are boring, complaining and preoccupied." If that were partly true, it would be the result of political conditions. . . . Oh yes, government provides virtually all housing. And naturally there is an acute housing shortage. Who wouldn't be bored, complaining and self-occupied under such pinkoeconomica? . . . Socialism destroys the individual. In a Republic or proper democracy the individual is supposed to be the society. Under socialism he is just a hapless cog. And when I say "socialism", I don't mean a fanatic cultism practiced by some remote "them". Rather, it is the political philosophy, in one shade or another, of the or a major party in every major western nation today. It wasn't 20 years ago. But it is today. So, in Sweden, you probably see you and me in some tomorrow, if we don't stop the trend. Among the silly legislation now in practice in Sweden, as a fitting climax to this report, is a social welfare program wherein fathers are urged to take time off work to stay home with the kids, to see what it's like and to give equal rights to men to stay home. The percent of fathers who are now often absent from their jobs rose from 2 1/2% in 1974 to 5.2% in 1975 to 7 1/2% in '76 and over 10% in '77. They took off from 26 to 42 days a year in '76-'77. They get paid for being away. Absenteeism does nothing for Swedish productivity. "Whom the Gods would destroy, they first make mad" . . . I asked one Swede where she thought Sweden was headed. Her reply: "Bangladesh next stop." ●

## THE SOVIET UNION HAS FORFEITED ITS RIGHT TO HOST THE OLYMPIC GAMES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged at the "kangaroo court" trials and sentencing of Alexandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Scharansky. This Soviet hypocrisy does not surprise me, however, since our correspondents have relayed to us the aura of predetermination which has characterized these so-called trials. The Soviets have lived up to speculation that these men would suffer for having brought to the attention of the world that the Soviets are not complying with the Helsinki accord, and so it is.

The Soviet Government would have us believe the lie that the harsh punishment which has been meted out is both justified and mandated by the people of the Soviet Union, some of whom were persuaded to demonstrate against the dissidents within and without the courtrooms. They would have us believe that these men are guilty of heinous crimes against the Soviet state, when in reality all they have done is to stand up for the rights which they were, however falsely, guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this deliberate suppression of the voice of individual liberty struggling in the Soviet Union is mandated by the vast majority of Soviet citizens, who realize that their Government is using these men as threatening examples of what will happen to those who might wish to follow suit. I believe that the Russian people are just as disheartened at this latest turn of events as we all are, and that they support the concepts for which Ginzburg, Scharansky, and the other brave dissidents stand—freedom of speech and the right to free movement in and out of their country. I doubt that they are given to believe that these causes are criminal despite the histrionics of their Government, and it is important for us to assure them that we will not be swayed from our support of these men and their cause by Soviet accusations and warnings against our interference. Human rights transcends political borders, and we cannot and must not tolerate the cruelty and anti-Semitism we have seen.

Mr. Speaker, other nations of the world have joined us in our outrage at the Soviet practice of trying dissidents. We must channel that frustration and anger into constructive policies which will prevent more of the same from the Soviet Government, and which will let them know in no uncertain terms that their inhumanity is deplored throughout the world.

As an important step, I would like to join my colleague Senator WENDELL ANDERSON in introducing a resolution urging that the 1980 Olympic Games be moved from Moscow. With the recent action taken against American newsmen

and in light of the Soviets' failure to guarantee the free access to the games for everyone, I feel that this latest test of our patience has mandated this resolution. I deplore the politicization of the Olympics, and I cannot abide by the abuse which the Soviet Union is doling out in all shapes and forms. The tradition of the Olympics, must be preserved in peace and freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in urging the U.S. Olympic Federation to bring this matter before the International Olympic Federation and to garner as much support as possible among its members for the relocation of the games. Because of time constraints, Montreal would be an ideal location, since the facilities are already constructed, and I feel strongly that serious consideration should be given to this and other sites for the 1980 Games. I intend to bring this matter to the attention of the President and Secretary Vance as well, and it is my hope that although time grows short before the start of the Olympics, the Federations and the President will take action to demonstrate the strength of the free world's convictions.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not take concrete steps to protest the abuse of human rights in the Soviet Union, then all of our well-intentioned words will have no practical effect. We owe it to Aleksandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Scharansky and the other courageous men and women who have dared to live out their convictions although they knew they would suffer for it. We owe it to the Olympic athletes who deserve to compete for the coveted medals without fear of exclusion or reprisal due to nationality or political beliefs. But most of all, we owe it to ourselves to help promote the freedoms without which our world would be intolerable. I urge all of my colleagues to participate in this resolution and to do everything possible to help free the innocent men and women who have been imprisoned for daring to speak their minds to their government and to the world. ●

#### OUR URBAN POLICY: A FIRST-RATE ANALYSIS

**HON. ROBERT GARCIA**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, recently, I read a series of articles by Robert Scheer in the Los Angeles Times that most accurately pinpointed many of the root causes that have led to the devastation of the Nation's cities. I think it is critically important, if we are to begin their revitalization, that we seek out and carefully analyze what happened before we unthinkingly make the same kinds of mistakes again.

Unfortunately, Bob Scheer has found that "the problems of the cities, in large measure, are matters of race," and he amply details his premise with examples ranging from school integration to neighborhood "restoration," which he calls a "people removal process," remov-

ing, of course, only the poor and minorities from central city communities, all contributing to increasing deterioration and polarization in our major urban areas.

I recommend this perceptive article, and one that I shall insert tomorrow that analyzes current approaches to solving our urban problems, to every Member of this body, from rural and suburban districts as well as urban. For these are problems we must all work on together if our country—not only our cities—is to have a future.

#### LIFE IN THE CITIES: SEPARATE, UNEQUAL—AN ASSESSMENT

(Each of the nation's metropolitan areas, North and South, is very swiftly dividing itself into two cities, white and black. This is not a matter of neighborhoods we have always had racial, ethnic, and economic neighborhoods; perhaps we always will. This is different. In each metropolitan area, we are setting up two geographically, politically and economically distinct civilizations—J. Skelly Wright, U.S. Court of Appeals judge in an address at Harvard law school in 1974.)

(By Robert Scheer)

A rather neat thing happened on the way to an integrated society. Neat in the sense of tidy, that is. Most of the poorer blacks and Hispanics ended up contained in the central cities—out of sight and out of mind.

It therefore is not true that the cities are no longer needed or terribly useful. They increasingly perform the function of vast holding cells for society's rejects. 60% of unemployed blacks, 60% of welfare recipients, 70% of robbers and the victims of robberies, 80% of youth gangs.

The civilization of the cities is marked by the life experiences of an underclass—people without options—children whose parents have never held a steady job, who themselves and whose own children most likely will not.

The cities, with their growing underclass, are ever more separate and unequal. When U.S. Court of Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright ordered the Washington, D.C., schools system integrated in 1967, the population of the city was 60 percent black and that of its schools was 90 percent black. At the time, he suggested that the white suburbs of Maryland and Virginia might be included in the busing plan—a metropolitan plan—in order to desegregate the schools. They weren't. Today, the population of Washington, D.C., is 76 percent black and that of its schools is 96 percent black.

The situation is similar throughout the country. The white "civilization" is located increasingly in the shopping malls, tract homes, country clubs, factories, new corporate headquarters and school systems of the suburbs.

The blacks and browns have the cities. The blacks have Newark, a city of desolate rubble with children playing unattended in fields of broken glass while a black mayor presides over the graveyard of decades efforts to renew and integrate.

The blacks have Atlanta, which Jimmy Carter held up during his presidential campaign as a city that knows how to leapfrog over the racial traumas of Northern integration. But the city "too busy growing to hate" now has a school system that is nearly 90 percent black surrounded by suburbs whose schools are 90 percent white. Many of Atlanta's civic boosters put their children in private schools.

The blacks have Oakland, which has lost almost half of its white students in the past six years and which Gov. Brown says he will now make his model of urban development, West Oakland, thanks to urban renewal, is an unpopulated wasteland in search of a freeway; overpopulated east Oakland

is in a dead heat with Harlem for the highest infant mortality rate in the nation.

The blacks have St. Louis, the most distressed city in the country, according to the Brookings Institution, and they have Cleveland, which may not have a school system in the fall.

And they have the nation's capital, with a school system that is almost all black because the very people in the federal government who must administer the plans for integration will not send their own children to the district's public schools.

The browns have the Bronx or at least they have what's left of it. And blacks and browns together soon will be a majority in Los Angeles and Chicago. A top Chicago official in the major's manpower office says there are now 600,000 illegal aliens in the Chicago area and adds, not for attribution:

"There seems to be a direct chain from Mexico to Chicago . . . at least half of the hotel staffs are illegals. Chicago is starting to become somewhat of a bilingual city. It's a curiously nondiscussed situation."

The cities are more segregated now because federal programs aimed at assisting and integrating the urban minority poor have accepted the borders of large cities as sacred lines drawn between stability and social experimentation, between order and violence, between Anglos and minorities.

Civil rights activists charge that busing, publicly assisted housing, job training programs effectively restrict the poor to the cities, to their ghettos and their barrios.

Such criticism of school desegregation programs has led to suits around the country—including Los Angeles—requesting the courts to adopt metropolitan solutions. This would permit pupil exchanges between central city and suburban school districts.

Judge Wright predicts that if the Supreme Court fails to endorse such metropolitan solutions "the national trend towards residential, political and educational apartheid will not only be greatly accelerated; it will also be rendered legitimate, and virtually irreversible, by force of law."

In any event, the two societies predicted in 1968 by the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders are becoming real. Only it is less the predicted division between the whites and the blacks than it is between the haves and the have nots.

In particular it is the have nots of the cities, mostly blacks and browns, who form an underclass of people outside of the economic mainstream, people without social options and, increasingly, without a sense of social responsibility.

One hears more optimistic reports. Some of President Carter's urban advisers claim that the cities are perking up, that middle-class whites are moving back. Some argue that the gloomy figures on the racial composition of the cities are from the 1970 census and that current figures would show a more integrated urban population.

But a Times survey of officials in 25 major cities reveals that the flight of whites from the cities has continued at a consistent pace. The 1980 census will show the cities to be blacker and poorer, according to the Times survey.

White flight has been the decisive residential, educational and occupational experience of urban America since the Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown vs. Board of Education.

In every city in the Times survey, the white population has declined; the increase in nonwhite population since the 1970 census averaged 8% for the cities surveyed.

This phenomenon cuts across geographical lines. Many central cities as disparate as Oakland and Cleveland have gone from being 25% black in 1960 to almost half black today.

The new growth sunbelt city of Atlanta is now 60% black, as is the old industrial city

of Baltimore. The nation's capital is 76% black, Newark has a nonwhite and Hispanic population of 87%, and Los Angeles, on the other side of the continent, is close to the point of having an Anglo minority.

Since a high proportion of the Anglos left in the cities are older retired people or younger professionals without children or who send their children to private schools, the nonwhite school population figures are even greater.

A city planner in Cleveland summed it up for a reporter in tones more resigned than agitated:

"The middle-income white middle-class families are leaving. The nonwhite, the poor, the elderly and the young—the dependent population in many ways—are the ones that remain. The part of the city that is leaving is the part that has given the city its historic stability. It's pretty much the trend, with the dependent population staying. They're dependent, but there's no one to depend on because everyone else is leaving."

The burgeoning black middle class is also involved in flight from the cities' underclass but, because of racial prejudice, it's not easy for them to get away.

Racism associates all blacks with, and holds them accountable for, the problems of the ghetto. Whites tend to hold all blacks responsible for urban crime and violence, but there is no such association of innocent whites with white criminals. White suburbanites are not held responsible for their children who turn to junkies or teenage prostitutes in the big cities.

Blacks are still caught by their skin color. Ernest Green, one of the black children who walked into that school in Little Rock in 1957 and who grew up to become an assistant secretary of labor in the Carter Administration, reports his own experience:

"You get on the elevator in your suit and tie and briefcase with somebody that is white, particularly a white female, and you immediately see fear in their eyes."

Even when blacks have the money, racial barriers make it more difficult for them to get out of the cities. Harvard social psychologist Thomas F. Pettigrew estimates that while only 8% of Chicago's blacks live in the suburbs, according to the 1970 census, 46% should be expected to live there on economic grounds alone. But middle-class blacks are slowly but surely leaving the central cities and, when they stay, are tending more often to use private schools, further isolating the minority underclass.

The progress of blacks into the ranks of the middle class has been real and substantial and fully 25% of black families had an income of more than \$16,000 per year in 1976 (as compared to 50% for whites). But there are also just as many poor black families and twice as many blacks out of work today as there were 10 years ago. These are the blacks who form the enduring underclass.

That underclass is marked by female-headed households and children born out of wedlock. In 1976, one-fourth of all black children were in families headed by women who were unemployed or not in the labor force as compared to 18% in 1969. In 1976, 28% of blacks were said to fall below the poverty line.

As the Labor Department's Green put it: "You have a class breakout. I mean, some of those—that's not true of all middle-class blacks—but some of those who have made it reply back much like some whites do; that (poor) people are in the condition they're in because it's their own fault . . ."

"I think the gap has widened. It seems to me what the country hasn't focused on is that the issue in the '60's clearly was that no blacks, regardless of economic class, could

do certain things . . . Now legally that's been thrown out and what that did was to open up access for those who had a certain amount of income and economic security. But still, for large numbers of people that didn't matter. Making that legal change didn't gain them any more access than they had before."

The type who hasn't benefitted, according to Green, is "a black kid who can find the support, can't find formal education, can't get out to where the jobs are in the suburbs, doesn't know how to deal with the system. Then you've got a continuous swirling black underclass that never understands how to manipulate the system."

While Green is quick to note the progress of some middle-class blacks and even famous ones, he observed with noticeable bitterness: "If the average black kid were to emulate O.J. Simpson in an airport he would be jailed. They would think the nigger was crazy, running through the airport, leaping over turnstiles."

A recent Washington Post series celebrated the fact that blacks are cast as typical Americans in television commercials and programs and cited this as proof of the nation's progress toward an integrated society, but in real life, when whites think of blacks, it is most often the ghetto underclass black whom they think about and whom they fear.

A Harris Poll conducted for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development showed that crime and poor schools were the most important reasons for people's rejection of life in the cities. And the two are obviously connected.

Urban crime, in particular urban school violence, is a reality. The most recent national study of school violence, for example, revealed that principals in one-quarter of the senior high schools in large urban areas reported that vandalism, theft and attacks represented a fairly serious or very serious problem.

This same report concluded that the risk of robbery of a teacher is three times greater in minority schools than in predominantly white schools, the risk of attacks even greater: "A typical teacher in an urban high school stands 1 chance in 55 of being attacked within a month's time while a teacher in a rural senior high school has 1 chance in 500."

The urban crime is robbery, which is the crime of poverty. People with options do not, as a rule, perform stickups. There's no percentage in it. It's a crime of desperation—a couple of bucks, a few credit cards and, for this, the prospect of murder, death, prison.

It's all too disproportionate. Unless you're young, black, male and unemployed. That's the FBI profile of the robber—Brechtian in its brevity and precision.

The FBI: "Robbery is primarily a large city crime. Seven out of 10 robberies in the United States occurred in the cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants. These cities experienced 521 robberies per 100,000 people."

Almost 60% of those arrested for robbery in 1976 in the entire nation were what the FBI still chooses to call Negro. Blacks accounted for 52% of the prostitution arrests, 55% of all arrests for gambling, 40% of weapons violations, 47% of rape and 53% of murder.

While arrest figures may be misleading, in urban areas where blacks represent a higher percentage of the population, the proportions are substantially higher.

It is also true that blacks account for a disproportionately high number of the victims of such crimes—47% of those murdered, for example. Blacks are the main victims of urban violence and they are the ones who must live near it.

It is not that blacks are, by nature, more violent than whites or that there are few

white criminals. (Whites account for 69% of all burglary arrests, 65% of larceny arrests and 51% of rape arrests.) And it is not that most blacks today are violent.

But a disturbing number of chronically unemployed and otherwise deprived young blacks have come to view violent, criminal behavior as an option for advancement in a way that seems wildly irrational to one who has other, more acceptable, options.

This bleak picture of ghetto life did not shock Georgia state senator and civil rights veteran Julian Bond, who said:

"I go out to the federal pen here a lot and people tell me that the age has just dropped so radically. The average age of the prisoners used to be in the late 30's. Now it's in the mid-20's. This is the federal system we're talking about, not the state system. The black-white ratio has almost reversed from being about 20% black some years ago to being 40% white now."

"And you see it in all these young guys out there—Vietnam vets, bank robbers, drug people and such. Small time—all of them small time. The prison used to be filled with organized crime figures. Now it's filled with bank robbers. It used to have a lot of moonshiners in it—white country moonshiners. Now it's got black bank robbers. Bank robbery is the crime of choice among black youth. Big money. And that's what happens to those people."

Those people are only a small minority of the black population and certainly of the urban one, but they seriously affect the civilization that is possible in the modern city, from the graffiti on the trains to the lifestyles in the schools. It would be stupid—and truly—to deny it.

Which precisely why the courts ordered desegregation in the first place—to permit minority children an escape from total immersion in that grinding ghetto life. If ghetto poverty remains frozen in place at the heart of America's cities, if the school present no real options, it is to be expected that hundreds of thousands of young people will grow up unable to do anything but make life miserable for themselves and their neighbors.

The problems of the cities are, in large measure, matters of race. Yet when President Carter and his potential rival, Gov. Brown, announced their respective urban programs last fall, neither program came to grips with race as a major factor in urban decline.

The impression was one of the physical decay of cities, outmoded plants, untenable designs, older building stock rendered even more obsolete by the public preference and government subsidy (FHA, highway funds, etc.) of suburban development.

Carter's urban policy conceded that the increased concentration of the poor and blacks was one of the reasons for urban areas being in trouble. But it went no further toward a solution other than to call for a "new partnership" that would somehow increase "access to opportunities for disadvantaged people."

Neither Carter's nor Brown's program dealt seriously with busing, white flight, segregation of the schools or with the connections between the racial composition of the cities and such problems as crime, welfare costs and the high proportion of unskilled, unemployable black and brown labor in the cities.

It is as if the "urban crisis" has become an acceptable euphemism for racial problems at a time when government officials are all too aware that most white Americans no longer have any patience or tolerance for dealing with numerous government officials remarked that it is politically safer to talk about neighborhood restoration, improving building stock and attracting industry than it is to focus on the racial core of the problem and the realities of white flight.

But a central problem with the city is that while most people want to use its facilities, they just don't want to live there or have their tax dollars go there.

The Harris Poll of public attitudes toward the city done this year for HUD found that most people still regard "the American city as that place where society's economic, cultural and intellectual needs, but not its residential needs, are best met.

The survey concluded that "large cities clearly offer the best shopping, the best employment opportunities, the best health care, the best colleges and universities, the best public transportation, the best restaurants, the best selection of movies and the best plays and cultural activities."

So much for the good news.

The report added: "However, the city's image today as a place to live and raise children is overwhelmingly negative." And yes, the two main reasons for the cities being poor places to live and raise children were schools and crime, not concrete and pollution or crowded buildings and subways.

The various government strategies for saving urban America beg this key point—that white flight is not a response to the physical decay of the cities but rather to the fact that poor people have been trapped there. Obviously, most Americans feel that they neither need, nor can afford to associate with, the poor and their problems.

Is this too bitter a characterization? Try that of Drew S. Days III, a black who is an assistant attorney general in the Carter Justice Department:

"The name of the game is getting ours and to hell with everybody else. We're not really concerned about the system; we're not concerned with those children who are in the center city who go to schools that are 90 and 100 years old—we just don't care about them.

"That's the great American way. If you've got enough money to move into a certain community or if you happen to be of a certain race and you're not going to have your home firebombed when you move there, then you've lucked out. You've really made it from the American standpoint. And anybody who wants to tamper with that is going to find you very resistant."

We reject the cities because we reject the poor.

If a neutron bomb were suddenly dropped on the poor of St. Louis, New York or central Los Angeles, the housing stock would be rediscovered by affluent home buyers as quaint, conveniently located and architecturally fascinating and they would pour in money to rehabilitate those structures that are now rejected.

A less drastic people removal process is under way in a number of cities and it's called neighborhood restoration. But the brownstones and Victorian houses that are restored in Washington, D.C., New York or San Francisco become valuable only because the neighborhood is changing. Which means that the balance has swung toward more affluent and white residents, and that a security zone has been thrown up around the "new" neighborhood.

This is true, too, in Atlanta's "revitalized" neighborhoods, where the poor are pushed out economically through rising home prices and then kept out with new private police forces and intensified patrolling by the city's police.

In Los Angeles, it's a fortress complex like Bunker Hill Towers with special security locks and 24-hour security patrols.

The new downtown hotel complexes are another example of this sort of restoration of a neighborhood. It is possible to sit in security in a Hyatt Regency in a downtown section that is a jungle one block outside of the hotel sanctuary; but conventioners need never encounter that reality.

The people-removal part of urban renewal

was not accidental to the policy. It was the policy.

By 1967 urban renewal had removed 400,000 housing units from U.S. cities and built only 12,000 new units of public housing for the people displaced.

The cities, more often than not, have been victims of federal programs designed to ensure their progress. The urban renewal of the '50's—the bulldozer tactic—left deserted areas in one side of town and overcrowding in the other.

Public housing projects of immense proportions planned as alternatives to the ghettos became ghettos themselves, further isolating the poor and minorities from the rest of the population.

Shortlived and underfunded poverty programs did little more than raise expectations and then deny them. The much-touted War on Poverty never cost more per year than what the government is now planning to spend on two aircraft carriers, according to Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D-Calif.).

Sometimes the programs for the cities continue because of bureaucratic inertia. Sometimes, being out of style or under momentary political attack, they are abandoned.

There seems inevitably to be a mindlessness that accompanies such efforts, an inability to summarize results, to monitor change, to evaluate.

This tendency to sporadic or fitful tinkering was attributed by Drew Days, the black assistant attorney general, to "a great tendency in America to go after a problem vigorously for a few years, determine that it's been solved, then walk away from it and then rediscover it maybe 10 years later and then go through the whole process once again. There's rarely been a sustained effort to deal with any of these social problems. . . . I think we're very big on ignoring it these days." ●

#### CYPRUS, THE BATTERED PAWN

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation magazine, in its July 8-15 edition, has an excellent firsthand account of what disillusionment the Carter administration has brought to this troubled island republic. Written by Christopher Hitchens who recently returned from a visit to Cyprus, the article points out that Turkish Cypriots are the victims of Turkey's occupation forces, which continue the unfortunate tradition of subjugating Cyprus to the interests of non-Cypriots.

I commend this article to my colleagues as we prepare to vote on the Turkish arms embargo which was imposed because those Turkish occupation forces, armed with American weapons supplied for NATO purposes, refuse to leave Cyprus to its own self-determination. The article follows:

#### CYPRUS, THE BATTERED PAWN

(By Christopher Hitchens)

When Carter won election, the Cypriots proclaimed a national holiday. They were exulting chiefly at the departure of Henry Kissinger, who had conspired against them, first with the Greek colonels and then, as they saw it, with the Turkish invaders. When I last saw Archbishop Makarios, shortly before his death last fall, he had a large Jimmy Carter personal medallion in pride of place on his desk. Now, in Nicosia and in Athens, the anti-American forces can once again say

"I told you so." Carter's decision to press for the end of the arms embargo, and administration support for the Turkish settlement proposals, have canceled the painful revival of trust on the Greek-speaking side of the argument.

Meanwhile, flushed with their temerity in refusing earlier to comply with discouraging advice from Washington, the Turks are now angry with Carter for not acting more decisively in their favor. Kissinger's intervention in the eastern Mediterranean in 1974 brought off the amazing triple feat of alienating Athens, Ankara and Nicosia all at the same time. The aftermath of that intervention displays the same features. And since it was Cyprus that paid the price for the overdue collapse of the Greek junta, Cyprus that paid for the apparent vindication of Turkish claims, Cyprus that still pays for Greek-Turkish rivalry over oil and minerals in the Aegean Sea, Cyprus seems the best place to start.

Not long ago, a visiting American Congressman was turned back by Turkish soldiers when he attempted to cross the "Attila line" (the name given by the Turks to their military border in Cyprus in a stunning feat of bad public relations). What angered the Congressman was not so much the peremptory treatment as the fact that the weapons being brandished at him were American.

Cypriots hear and retell this story with no little glee and Schadenfreude. They think that, ever since Dean Acheson made his famous proposal that the bulk of the island be unified with Greece, the Turks being given a canton and military base in the north to keep them quiet, America has wanted Cyprus partitioned and attached to the countries of the mainland. They know (we all know now) that the CIA overruled many within the State Department who warned against supporting the moribund Athens junta in 1974 when it attempted to annex the island. They also know that, after the failure of that scheme, the United States changed sides at the Vienna Conference and ceased to oppose a Turkish counterstroke. (The story is best told by Lawrence Stern in *The Wrong Horse*, Times Books.) That "peace-keeping" operation, as it was called by the Turks, killed thousands of Cypriots, made one-third of them into refugees, and took away the most fertile and prosperous 40 percent of their country. The persistence of this fait accompli is the key to what is known as the "Southern Flank" problem of NATO.

A version of the Acheson plan has indeed been consummated: Cyprus is partitioned. But whereas Makarios, backed by a huge majority of Cypriots, refused to surrender the island's sovereignty, the Turks today are in de facto possession of the bulk of it. This mutated version of the Acheson solution is causing no end of trouble for a simple reason: there are many more Greeks than Turks on Cyprus (the proportions are roughly 82 to 18 percent). And the Republic of Cyprus, instead of being a pliant appendage of Athens, has an independent government still recognized by the international community.

The Turkish case is based solely on the security of Turkish Cypriot citizens (although there are Turkish generals and politicians who say that the entire island belongs to Turkey by right from Ottoman days). That security, they say with some justification, was a low priority in Cyprus after independence in 1960. Yet a stay in their military protectorate in the North reinforces the impression that the grievances of Turkish Cypriots have been used as a cover for an entirely different policy. A visit to the "Museum of Barbarism," which commemorates the vile things done by Greek Fascists in the 1960s, is obligatory and salutary. But not all murdered Turks are remembered. There is no allusion to the killing of Hikmet and Gurkan, the editors of a magazine that advocated intercommunal solidarity, who were slain when their papers threatened to

expose Turkish extremist violence. Nor is there any mention of Dervish Kavazoglu, a leftist union leader shutdown for advocating bicomunal trade unions. These things took place under the same Turkish Cypriot leadership as now prevails. At least their Greek equivalents are in jail.

Then, as one travels around the North (it was my fifth visit since partition), there are even more depressing signs. The huge army presence prevents free movement off the main roads, but it cannot silence the Turkish Cypriot press. For some time, largely unnoticed by the outside world, elements of this press have been protesting against the settlement of colonists from mainland Turkey. Dr. Fazil Kuchuk, a former Vice President of the island and one of the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community, wrote in his paper on May 25 that the island was being turned "from paradise into hell" by this process, which may involve as many as 40,000 settlers in a population of 120,000 (who also have the 15,000-man Turkish garrison to support). Other opposition figures, like Dr. Berberoglu of the Republican Turkish Party, have told me that the distribution of expropriated Greek property is being handled in a corrupt and authoritarian manner, to benefit the imported supporters of the government and stifle Cypriot self-expression. This is to say nothing of the many Turkish Cypriots who have emigrated, and of the many more who have moved to Turkey rather than face the intimidation of the "Gray Wolf" Fascist youth movement, based on a mainland party which engages in armed struggle on the Right and was until recently a member of the coalition government. And there are the thousands of Greeks who did not flee their villages after the invasion, but who have been gradually bullied into crossing the border with whatever they can carry. Lawrence Durrell's old village of Bellapais, once predominantly Greek, has now been emptied by a "salami tactic" of intimidation and eviction. Turkish officers use it as a weekend retreat.

One stresses these points because it is often said, or implied, that the Cyprus problem is one of incompatible communities, and that the islanders have in effect brought the present disaster on themselves. This view, which has the merit of blaming the victims of the aggression they suffer ignores the way in which British, Turkish and Greek Governments have used factionalism to suit their purposes. By any standard, intercommunal relations in Cyprus were actually improving in the early 1970s. The Greek Putsch and the Turkish invasion shattered the picture, but even after both those two traumas one could see Turkish villagers crying and scooping up handfuls of earth as they were loaded onto trucks and taken to the North, leaving the keys of their houses with their Greek neighbors. Cypriots of both nationalities have learned the hard way that the differences between them are as nothing compared to their common differences with their cynical "motherland."

Bulent Ecevit, who was Prime Minister of Turkey at the time of the 1974 invasion and is now back in office after a period of isolation, finds himself in an almost classic social-democratic dilemma. The Islamic and military right-wing forces in Turkey do not like him at all, but he temporarily drew some of their teeth by moving troops into Cyprus. He is now the only man who can begin to make concessions, but if he does so he risks even more rightist violence and noncooperation than he has to bear already. He has appointed Prof. Mumtaz Soysal, a well-known radical and a political prisoner under the previous regime, as his personal envoy in the Cyprus negotiations. But even that has been too much for some of his coalition partners and not enough for the Greeks. In a sentence, Turkish proposals for the withdrawal from Greek territory offer no real concessions except on terms

that are wholly unacceptable. Thus, the empty city of Famagusta will be opened to its previous thousands of inhabitants only if the city is left under Turkish administration.

The idea that an island of the size and population of Cyprus should be expected to support two entirely separate state and military machines is an unhappy one, especially with the ethnic disparities involved and the crude version of apartheid lately enforced. Consideration of past wrongs will dominate discussion on both sides for a time, but everybody knows that if Cyprus were not cursed by its geography, and if it were not so small, none of this would ever have happened. As it is, Greek Cyprus may be scheduled to go the same way as Kurdistan and Armenia (two minority causes which do not receive very tender attention in Turkey itself).

If it did, who would mourn? Greece could probably live with it, though even the conservative Karamanlis has his public to consider, and after the seven black years of dictatorship that public has a very low opinion of American designs. Still, as one of Europe's most seasoned conservative crisis managers, he might ride the storm. The British Government has already washed its hands of its treaty obligations to Cyprus, and seems content to leave matters with Clark Clifford, Carter's special envoy on the Cyprus problem. NATO would relax, glad to be free of the great triangular screw-up that has dogged it since 1974. The Americans are only interested in removing the conflict as a source of intra-NATO friction and, of course, to prevent Cyprus from developing into an island of radicalism (over the years of negotiation with him the State Department took to calling Archbishop Makarios a "Cassocked Castro"). The Russians, who have been exploiting America's difficulties with Turkey, would resent a NATO solution in Cyprus but would be rid of the long commitment to the Cyprus cause that prevents their having an easy rapprochement with Ankara.

The problem is that Greek and Turkish Cypriots refuse to behave as if their island were uninhabited. Several years ago, when faced with apparently Byzantine intransigence from the Archbishop, George Ball banged the table and exclaimed "Goddamn it, your Beatitude"—remembering his protocol just in time. The Cypriots are no more convenient now than they were then, or than they were when Henry Kissinger referred to Makarios as "too big a man for so small an island." This is a population which is at one and the same time part of developed European culture and of the aspirations of the post-colonial world. Its traditions are generally radical, democratic and independent. To treat it as expendable would no more bring real peace between Greece and Turkey than did supporting the Athens junta. At that time, if you recall, Piraeus harbor was all-important for the Sixth Fleet and NATO. Now, apparently, it is as nothing compared to the vital strategic position of the Bosphorus. Those who originated this crisis have yet to show any evidence that they have learned from their mistakes. ●

#### AIRBUS AND THE AMERICAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY, PART I

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, the sale of 23 Airbus A300's to Eastern Airlines earlier this year greatly disturbed our American aircraft companies. This is because the French and German Gov-

ernments financed the Airbus sale to such a degree that our domestic corporations could not compete with the financing. The prospect of this situation being repeated should be of great concern to us, since many American airlines will be purchasing new aircraft in the coming months and continued Airbus success might have catastrophic consequences to our own aircraft companies.

On July 2, 1978, the Los Angeles Times published several informative pieces on our aerospace industry and the challenge of Airbus Industrie. Today I insert the first of three articles on this important issue.

#### FOUR CONTESTANTS ENTER RACE TO SELL NEW-ERA JETS

(By Linda Grant and Tom Redburn)

If, as the old saying goes, two's company and three is a crowd, the four firms in the commercial aircraft business must really be confused.

For years only two producers—Boeing Co. and McDonnell Douglas Corp.—have had any major success making jet aircraft for the world's airlines outside the Soviet Union. Lockheed Corp. belatedly reentered the commercial aircraft business in the late 1960s with its L-1011, only to find few airlines willing to invest in yet a third big plane at a time when the expected traffic growth on which they depended had failed to materialize.

But now, with the addition of the European consortium Airbus Industrie, there are four active companies vying for position in this incredibly risky business. (The British were actually the first to develop the jet transport but their planes have been commercial flops and they are no longer serious competitors on their own.)

At stake is a potential market of more than \$75 billion over the next 10 years. A little less than half of the sales will be made in the United States, with the rest spread around the world. Battles to win aircraft sales have been notoriously fierce, particularly for new orders overseas, since the builder that wins an initial bid is likely to benefit from a cascade of follow-up orders. Manufacturers have spent millions on influence buying in foreign countries, help from the builder's home government has been solicited, and in some cases bribes have been paid.

A new round of buying has already begun, but this time there are some significant differences. For the first time, airlines are being forced to replace most of their first generation jets, many of which are now almost 20 years old. In addition, the entry of Airbus into the competition has shaken up the traditional American monopoly.

Boeing is the dominant commercial aircraft maker—it has captured more jetliner sales than all the other companies put together. McDonnell Douglas holds about a 29-percent share of the market with its small twin-engine DC-9 and the widebodied DC-10 trijet. Lockheed has sold only about 4 percent of the world market, relying on its L-1011 Tristar, while Airbus, which only entered the arena during this decade, holds a 2-percent share.

But even though Boeing and McDonnell Douglas are riding much higher than Lockheed and Airbus, the new aircraft derby could shake up the whole field.

The new entrant, Airbus, is making the first serious foreign invasion of the American market since United Air Lines bought 20 French Caravelles in 1960. In April, Eastern Airlines became the first U.S. carrier to order the Airbus, when it agreed to spend almost \$800 million on 23 of the planes.

Airbus' virtues are being pressed on United, TWA, American and other U.S. carriers by the company's North American chief, George Warde, an ebullient, 56-year-old U.S. citizen who is a former president of American Air-

lines. He jets back and forth on the Concorde between Airbus offices in New York and Toulouse, France, to talk up "our little bird," as he calls the A300. For Airbus, a sale to United Air Lines, the industry leader, is crucial not only for its prestige but also because, says Warde, "We have to keep up our momentum (generated by the Eastern deal)."

The plane Warde is promoting would be one of the smallest wide-bodies, powered by two engines, and would seat about 200 passengers. The B10 would cost \$25 to \$30 million, and will be available by mid-1982 if Airbus, as expected, approves the program this summer.

It is a derivative of the larger A300 B4, which the Europeans developed in the early 1970s to fill the gap between the huge wide-bodies produced by the Americans and the smaller 727s and DC-9s which perform most of the work on shorter and medium length routes.

At the time it seemed likely a risky gamble. To the dismay of the U.S. manufacturers, Airbus forged ahead with only a few orders placed by government-backed airlines such as Air France and Lufthansa. The consortium needs to sell 360 planes to break even, and for years sales languished, the production line at Toulouse was cut back and some industry officials thought the program might die.

When world airline traffic rebounded, however, Airbus revived. Today South African Airways, Thai Airways International, and Iran Air, among others, fly the plane. The recent sale to Eastern Airlines brought orders, including options, to 138.

In contrast Boeing has sold nearly 3,500 jets in the last 20 years. One model alone, the 727, holds 25 percent of the world commercial aircraft market. With such success in the last few years, Boeing is currently sitting on over \$1 billion in cash.

After the troubles getting the 747 program off the ground, however, Boeing isn't about to move precipitously into an unknown future. The company has spent millions on slick projections of airline needs but still has only a vague idea of what the airlines will buy. "We can estimate the total passenger market," says E. H. (Tex) Boullion, president of the commercial airplane unit, "but we can't necessarily say what the mix of airplanes will be."

Boeing has spent countless engineering hours on its airplanes, changing the configuration to try to meet every airline demand. But all that time may pay off in a highly efficient and economic design. "We think we have an edge," says Joseph F. Sutter, vice president for product development in the commercial airplane unit. "We can get," Sutter claims, "10 percent less fuel burn (than the competitive A-300 B10) with our bigger wing, lighter nacelle (engine pod), lower-drag body and supercritical wing."

At the same time, Boeing is developing a family of airplanes using many of the same parts but allowing variation in the fuselage length and the number of engines.

Boeing's large customer base (nearly every airline in the world flies some Boeing planes) gives it an advantage over the competition. But Boeing may be depending on its head start too much. "The company has been moving too slowly to secure its future market position and may be counting too much on customers to loyally 'wait for Boeing,'" writes Edmund S. Greenslet, an aerospace analyst for Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith. "This approach did not work for Douglas in the 1950s and I doubt it will work any better today."

The new 767 program (the twin-engine, double-aisle model), Greenslet argues, has a lot going for it but Boeing has placed itself in the potentially dangerous position of of-

fering the plane as a defensive reaction to new competition rather than as an attempt to persuade airlines to dispose of other aircraft in favor of the 767. One reason is that Boeing's wildly profitable 727 would be one of the first programs affected by the shift. In addition, with Airbus also moving ahead on its new plane, Boeing could end up offering a "me too" product, which in the past has been a financial hazard.

"Why risk Boeing's net worth by reinventing the A300?" asks one industry magazine. "We'd be foolish to expect there won't be competition," replies T. A. Wilson, Boeing's chairman & chief executive. "Someone is going to launch into that market. I'd rather it be us." Adds Boullion: "You might also ask why Ford should make automobiles when General Motors already does."

Both Boeing and Airbus needs orders for their new planes soon to have them ready in the early 1980s, when the need for airplanes should peak. For Airbus, the problem comes down to continuing to grow in the shadow of a giant. "When you take on the leader of an industry, such as Boeing," says one industry official, "you treat him like an elephant and that means you eat him one bite at a time." For Boeing, the great fear is not so much that Airbus will capture a part of the growing market but that the airlines will hesitate too long worrying about a repeat of the bloodbath a decade ago. "The worst thing that could happen to us," says Boeing's Tex Boullion, "is not that United will pick the (Airbus) B10. In that case we'd just go back to our drawing boards. The worst would be if they decided to do nothing at all."

While the current focus is on United's and American's decisions about launching a new medium-sized jetliner manufactured by Boeing or Airbus, the other manufacturers also are counting on ample business from the coming re-equipment cycle.

The two California-based builders, Douglas Aircraft Co. and Lockheed, have adopted a more cautious stance than their competitors. Their widebodies—the DC-10 and the L-1011—were developed a decade ago for roughly the same market, and as a result, both companies were hurt. The L-1011 suffered so many difficulties that it nearly caused Lockheed to go bankrupt. To date 185 of the planes have been sold to ten customers. The DC-10 has fared better but the 295 sales to 43 customers have nevertheless disappointed management of Douglas' parent, McDonnell Douglas Corp. of St. Louis.

We do not intend to go head-on against anybody," says John Brizendine, president of Douglas. "The DC-10/L-1011 competition was enough."

As a result, Douglas is developing derivative planes from its two current programs, the hugely successful DC-9—nearly 950 DC-9s are flown by 51 operators, making it the company's only currently profitable program—and the DC-10.

Douglas last year announced the "Super 80" version of the DC-9, with 23 orders worth about \$400 million from Swissair, Austrian Airlines, and Southern Airways. (Southern later changed its firm order to options.) This narrow-bodied derivative will be much longer than other versions, capable of carrying up to 170 passengers on medium hauls. Douglas estimates its development costs at a modest \$120 million.

By launching the Super 80, Douglas stole a jump on the Europeans, who had aspirations for that market in their proposed Joint European Transports (JET) 1 and 2, and Boeing with its proposed 757.

In addition to the Super 80, Douglas is considering various stretched and long-range versions of the DC-10. Some carriers are already pushing the company to commit to a

stretched version, and Brizendine estimates that within 12 months a decision will be made. He emphasizes, "We will let the market determine what we do and when we do it."

Another proposed DC-10 derivative, the DC-X 200, is on the drawing boards with two engines and seats for about 230. But it bumps too closely in the marketplace against the A300 B4, so Douglas is no longer marketing it intensely. "We want to pick the right slot," says Brizendine.

Finally, Douglas is talking with British Aerospaces about the possibility of collaborating on an Advanced Technology Medium Range (ATMR) plane. The aircraft, which would rival Boeing's proposed 757, would be twin-engine, single-aisle aircraft that would seat 180 to 200 people. Brizendine refuses to comment on negotiations, and says only that "We will miss the market if we wait too long."

At Lockheed, derivative is also the name of the game.

Company executives believe derivatives of the basic L-1011 Tristar will eventually make the costly aircraft program profitable. In addition to the Tristar, which first flew in airline operations in 1970, Lockheed has proposed three L-1011 derivatives, one of which is already in production.

A long-range version, with a shorter body and enlarged fuel capacity, has been sold to British Airways and Pan American World Airways. Called the Dash 500, the first copy of this plane will be delivered next year.

Lockheed hopes to adapt basically the same design, with a lower-powered engine, to the gaping market segment now filled only by the European Airbus. Other manufacturers are also eyeing this segment, and Lockheed has yet to sign a customer for the design. But it could be put into production for about \$80 million in development costs, a comparatively small sum, and the company's executives are trying to persuade an airline to launch the program this year. The key disadvantage for Lockheed is that the plane, designated the Dash 400, would retain the three-engine design of the other L-1011s, which would mean the aircraft would burn slightly more fuel than its competitors.

Other alternatives, however, are impractical. Even though Lockheed has a twin-engine version under consideration, it will be much costlier and will require numerous engineering changes. And with about \$400 million in start-up costs still to write off against the present L-1011 program, Lockheed supply isn't in a position to consider starting from scratch with a new plane.

Not that they would want to, company executives argue. The technological gains that are being incorporated in the L-1011 should overcome most of these drawbacks. Moreover, there should be enough business to go around, they say, given the huge need for new airplanes to replace aging fleets and permit airlines to meet growing demand.

"The clock is ticking for the airlines," says Lockheed California Co. vice president Richard W. Taylor, "and the best way for us to meet their deadlines is with versions of our basic plane adapted to the carriers' needs."

For a while it was doubtful whether Lockheed could continue in the commercial airplane business. But with the bitterly contested sale of 12 long-range Tristars to Pan Am, Lockheed is once again a serious competitor.

"We're going to be around in the 1980s," says Roy Anderson, Lockheed's chairman, "and that's when this market should really take off."

The big question remaining for all the manufacturers, from giant Boeing down the line to McDonnell Douglas, Lockheed, and Airbus, is whether the airlines are going to be willing—and able—to support four airplane builders. ●

## THE CASE FOR PREGNANCY DISABILITY

**HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI**  
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an article by Willard Wirtz, "Pregnancy Pay, a Step Toward Equal Rights," which appeared in the Washington Post on July 17. Mr. Wirtz, a former Secretary of Labor and now a member of the Commission on Working Women, states that the passage of H.R. 6075 is a crucial step toward equal employment rights for women. H.R. 6075, the bill to include coverage for pregnancy in all disability plans, will come to the floor for a vote tomorrow; I urge my colleagues to support the bill. Women are over 40 percent of the entire work force. It has been well documented that women work for economic reasons. Thus it seems only fair that women should be covered when they are absent from work to have children since employees are presently covered when they have elective surgery or sustain injuries from voluntary activities, such as football games.

PREGNANCY PAY, A STEP TOWARD EQUAL RIGHTS  
(By Willard Wirtz)

About two years ago, the Supreme Court was called on to decide whether a woman employee is entitled to payment under a collectively bargained disability plan for the time she has to be away from work when her child is born. The short of the court's answer was "no"—that the employer's action under the benefit plan involved in the case was not discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

So last September the Senate passed, by a vote of 75 to 11, a bill amending Title VII to clarify the point that discrimination because of pregnancy is discrimination because of sex. The effect of this amendment would be that any sick-pay plan for non-job-related disabilities must include pregnancy disability in its coverage. This same bill—H.R. 6075, to "prohibit sex discrimination on the basis of pregnancy"—is due to come up soon in the House of Representatives.

The action taken on this bill will be a fair measure of whether we really mean what we have been saying to each other about equal-employment rights for women.

In the course of what has become an understandably emotional argument, a number of points have been emphasized that are important but probably don't go to the heart of the matter:

Sherrie O'Steen, one of the plaintiffs in the case that went to the Supreme Court, had a particularly hard time of it. Her husband had left her. When she went on unpaid leave she had to go on welfare, and the first welfare check didn't get to her until three weeks after her baby was born. Her electricity was cut off and her oil deliveries were stopped when she didn't pay her bills. She and her 2-year-old daughter and the new baby suffered a cold winter in rural Virginia.

Those factors are important. Too many women face the Sherrie O'Steen situation. But the real argument for pregnancy disability pay would be just as strong in the case of a more fortunately situated mother.

A good deal has been made of the inconsistencies that result from the present administration of disability-payment plans. Assistant Attorney General Drew S. Days III

testified in support of the pending bill, pointing out that under the plan that excluded O'Steen, payments were in fact made "for elective surgery, for disabilities resulting from an employee's commission or attempted commission of an assault or battery or felony" and for "disabilities resulting from voluntary activities such as sports injuries."

The federal government's brief in the Supreme Court case noted that the "net result of the pregnancy exclusion" was to "subject only women to a substantial risk of total loss of income because of temporary medical disability."

These distinctions are ridiculous. Yet they are actually caricatures of the real point involved here.

A Department of Labor and Department of Commerce study shows that the cost of including coverage of pregnancy and related conditions in existing disability plans would be less than one-tenth of 1 cent for every dollar of wages paid. But that somehow cheapens the issue as much as it does the costs of the bill.

The real issue is simply whether loss of earnings that comes with having a baby should be borne by the working mother or whether it should be covered by the disability-compensation plans so many responsible companies and unions have agreed on as proper costs of doing business.

H.R. 6075—like the bill already adopted by the Senate—does not require any company to pay any benefits for non-job-related disabilities. It was not intended to raise benefits, but to attack discrimination. The bill says only that, if it is decided to make compensation for losses of earnings resulting from other such disabilities, those losses resulting from childbirth and related conditions cannot be excluded.

The issue comes down to whether we are ready to recognize in practice what we have agreed to in principle: that women are now equal partners in the work force. Or are we still going to hang on to a little bit of tradition's blindness and bigotry?

Women now hold 40 percent of all jobs in this country and represent 70 percent of the net growth in employment in the last decade. That makes it time—past time—to stop carrying in our thinking the baggage from a past in which men dominated the jobs that were recognized as employment, and women's work was thought of as being in the home.

Many people wish the issue being faced here were—but it is not—whether loss of earnings from temporary non-job-related disability (including pregnancy disability) has to be covered by insurance protection. Five states have already taken that step.

Since the issue presented in H.R. 6075 is only whether pregnancy disability must be included in plans adopted voluntarily and by private agreement, the basic principle of equal-employment rights written into the Civil Rights Act of 1964 seems unquestionably applicable.●

DEVISING A RESPONSIBLE SOCIAL POLICY FOR AMERICA'S ELDERLY

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of every 10 Americans today is 65 years of age or older. In terms of impersonal numbers, that represents 23.5 million individuals. And we are changing from a "young" society into an "older" one—population experts believe that within

the next 50 years, one of every five Americans will be 65 or over. It is time that we shape a national policy equally as dedicated to improvement in the quality of life of our older Americans as our educational system is to the overall well-being of our youth.

As a nation, we have made significant strides in the right direction. Fifty years ago, social security was still only a revolutionary concept that spawned great controversy. And it was only little more than a decade ago that medicare came into existence. Today it is difficult to imagine our country without these basic programs which help assure the financial stability of elderly persons. We have come a long way, but we have a long distance still to travel before we can be totally satisfied that we have a policy that is both compassionate and realistic at one and the same time.

A well-conceived social policy for our senior citizens must include adequate health care at affordable rates, and our health care delivery system must be re-prioritized to enable older Americans to maintain living arrangements of their choice. We must pursue efforts to make in-home health care a realistic alternative to institutionalization. Perhaps most importantly, we must dismantle the myths attached to "growing old"—myths which too often lead to erosion, through bias and neglect, of well deserved dignity and pride.

This year the Congress was able to play an instrumental role in demythologizing retirement. Previously, large waves of our most experienced and capable workers were forced into retirement at age 65. Whether the individual did or did not wish to continue working was immaterial—the arbitrary age cut-off indiscriminately ended the careers of all. Now, however, under the terms of the legislation enacted in this session, older persons will decide their own destinies, and make the all-important retirement decision on their own.

But there is a great deal more that the Congress can and must do to honor our commitment to elderly Americans. There are presently pending a number of initiatives that would expand the options of those senior citizens who want to remain self-sufficient as long as possible. I have cosponsored these measures, and commend them to my colleagues for their support. The Older Americans Long-term Care Act, H.R. 11571, would provide substantial Federal funds to establish long term care centers in numerous communities throughout the country. The centers would provide, coordinate and monitor a variety of home services such as nutrition, homemaker, and home health service to neighborhood senior citizens.

Another approach I have endorsed is embodied in H.R. 10738 which would remove the visit limit and certain other requirements under medicare thereby making home care services more available. The bill would also make homemaker-chore services possible. The congressional budget resolution for fiscal year 1979 includes additional outlays for medicare program improvements, and I

believe we should use the bulk of this funding for expanded home health programs. Many of the home health proposals are relatively inexpensive, particularly when viewed against the alternative of assuming the cost of greater institutionalization. Most important of all, efforts aimed at bolstering home health care preserve the freedom of choice of older Americans to utilize the health approach that best serves their physical and emotional needs.

Our medicare program is sound, but it is not as comprehensive as it must be to meet some of the most basic needs of the elderly. Three measures now pending before the Ways and Means Committee would go a long way toward making medicare the full-scale health care reimbursement system that it ought to be: H.R. 2020 would extend medicare coverage to eye care; H.R. 4368 would cover prescription drugs; and H.R. 10727 would extend coverage to foot care. Critics of these proposals charge that they would cost too much. I suggest that the critics have lost sight of the fact that people are America's greatest resource, and a vast number of our senior citizens are experiencing difficulty in making ends meet. If we are to scrimp, it should not be on health services desperately needed by our elderly, and that is why I have cosponsored these bills as well.

A final cornerstone of a coherent national policy for the elderly must be a responsible approach to the housing needs of senior citizens, one which recognizes that most individuals over 65 live on fixed incomes that cannot be stretched to cover ever-surging rent increases. Nowhere has inflation been more severe than in the costs of housing.

We should therefore continue and expand our subsidies for the development of decent housing for senior citizens at rents they can afford. In my capacity as a member of the Housing and Community Development Subcommittee, I have pushed hard for higher levels of funding for these programs, and for continual improvements in them. Among the changes we proposed this year—which the full Congress will hopefully approve within the next 2 months—is a provision to provide an \$80 million program for services in senior citizen housing complexes that offer nutrition and other services to the elderly apartment dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals I have enumerated here deserve the attention and support of our colleagues. As a nation, we have the means to create a comprehensive and workable social policy to meet the needs of our senior citizens. They deserve the best we can offer. ●

#### UNCOVERING THE HAZARDS OF NUCLEAR TESTS AND NUCLEAR WASTES

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 years ago the United States

conducted nuclear tests in the atmosphere over Nevada. From 1951 until 1962, when the tests were moved underground, 87 such tests took place. For a large number of persons who were exposed either to the test blasts or dust clouds from the blasts, these atomic tests have been more than just a memory. A disproportionately large number of such persons, living in Utah and Arizona towns near to the Nevada testing site, have died of leukemia. A large number of soldiers involved in a 1957 test have suffered cancer, as have persons on the island of Rongelap, near to the former Bikini atomic test site in the South Pacific.

A perfunctory investigation in the 1960's of possible hazards from such testing proved negative. The new findings have led, however, to the reopening of the earlier investigations and to a full-scale inquiry into all the aftereffects of nuclear testing as well as exposure to nuclear wastes.

Bill Curry of the Washington Post has performed a great service in uncovering this story in two recent articles—July 2 and July 16. At a time when our military planners are seeking funds for the development of all sorts of miniaturized nuclear and neutron weapons, and are attempting to win respectability to the incredible notion that such weapons are the only things standing in the way of all-out nuclear war, an inquiry into the radiation effects of nuclear tests, weapons, and wastes ought to be given full throttle and the most searching scrutiny. The articles follow:

#### THE CLOUDS OF DEATH HAUNT THE MESAS

(By Bill Curry)

ST. GEORGE, UTAH.—LeOra Hafen remembers well the day in 1956 that her 15-year-old daughter died. It was back in the days of the U.S. government's atomic bomb tests 100 miles west of here, days when her daughter would walk home from school oblivious to the mushroom cloud forming a state away.

"She was on the sofa," recalls Hafen, "and she cried 'Momma, call Dr. Kon. I'm gonna die.'"

"Why, Karlene," Hafen tried to reassure her, "you are not either."

"Yes, I am, Momma," replied the pretty girl, who was in her final and fatal moments of acute leukemia. "This room's just full of angels." And she closed her eyes and never moved again.

Only a month earlier, Karlene's uncle Paul, a rancher with the look of a Marlboro man, had been diagnosed as also having leukemia. Paul Hafen was a cowpuncher, rode hard, sometimes for weeks on end, to move his cattle across the rangelands of nearby Arizona, where at least once he got caught in broad daylight under the dust of a test blast cloud.

But Hafen somehow survived his leukemia until the spring of 1963, and, after his death, Max Brinkerhoff, a rancher friend out on that Arizona grazing land, began helping Hafen's widow, Helen, run the ranch.

Last Feb. 27 Max Brinkerhoff also died of leukemia. He was the fourth in a group of schoolboy chums—the others were LaVier Tait, Gaynel Mackelprang and Gail Heaton—to die of leukemia.

A collective coincidence of individual and random tragedy?

Or do their deaths, and those of so many others across this region of mesquite and mesas, represent civilian casualties of atomic weapons, people killed by their government as it tested the arms that were supposed to protect them?

From 1951 until the nation's bomb testing was moved underground in 1962, 87 above-ground nuclear tests were conducted at the Nevada proving grounds, west of here. Dr. Joseph Lyon, who runs the Utah State Cancer Registry, says that 20 to 26 of those tests sent fallout clouds into Utah.

While the southwestern part of the state received heavy fallout, wind currents carried radioactivity over an area stretching from the Grand Canyon almost to Salt Lake City. Some 20,000 people lived in the Nevada, Arizona and close-in Utah areas alone.

The true extent of any health problems is virtually unknown: the government has long maintained that there have been no adverse effects, but then no long-term or widespread study has ever been conducted here, despite decades of controversy?

But many of the people whose deaths or illnesses were examined by The Washington Post in the last month shared the common experience of having been out of doors when dark blast clouds moved overhead, and their friends and families have few doubts of the relationship between those clouds and subsequent illnesses.

"I remember one time, against a hill here in Hurricane (Utah), somebody, my mother or father, saying, 'Look, you can see the cloud,'" recalls Jimmie Humphries, 30. Eleven days ago his 32-year-old brother, Randy, a highway patrolman, died of leukemia.

Randy, Jimmie and other family members attribute the leukemia to the test blasts, and when the disease was diagnosed last summer they all joined the many others here who had long been convinced that the A-bombs were shortening the lives of many people here.

That fear has only been heightened by recent disclosures of leukemia among soldiers present at a 1957 test blast, "Project Smoky."

They are not alone. President Carter in May assigned the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to examine the effects of low-level radiation on participants in nuclear tests and workers in government nuclear facilities, citing those leukemia cases among soldiers.

In addition, HEW soon is expected to begin a high-priority reopening of the only major investigation ever conducted into the health effects of nuclear testing on civilians, which involved 2,000 schoolchildren in two southern Utah counties here.

That '60s investigation, which officials at the time acknowledged may have stopped too soon, found no adverse impact on the youngsters tested for thyroid abnormalities. Despite the admitted limits of the investigation, it has always been relied on by nuclear testing officials as proof of the safety of the nation's test activities.

But even a renewal of the HEW effort would fall short of the widespread investigation that one radiological health expert at the University of Utah says is warranted in light of the soldiers' leukemia.

"We had a whole damn region subjected to one after another of these fallout patterns over a long period of time," said Dr. Robert L. Pendleton, "and some of [the radiation] was rather high."

"There's a lot of potential health damage ticking like a bomb," he said, "and nobody's even trying to find out if there's a problem."

Both Pendleton and Dr. Dan Hoffman, an epidemiologist with HEW's Bureau of Radiological Health, also cite the 10-year-or-more delay in the appearance of thyroid abnormalities, some of which were cancerous, among residents of a Pacific island downwind of test blasts there.

Those exposed on the island of Rongelap were accidentally covered with radiation in 1954, during atomic testing on the island of Bikini, 110 miles away, when the wind shifted just before detonation.

A year before that, on May 19, 1953, a wind shift at the time of the "Project Harry" test blast in Nevada sent an unusually hot



cloud over this city, which then had a population of 4,500. Traffic was blocked, and residents were told to stay inside for hours.

Marden Brown, a painter, still remembers the Atomic Energy Commission officials washing down his half-ton blue GMC pickup truck that day, rinsing it repeatedly, trying to get all of the radioactivity off.

About 10 years later, Brown said, his malignant thyroid gland was removed.

"Harry" also possibly caught Helen Reichmann, who was out working in her garden one day about that time. Suddenly she became ill and, vomiting and feeling weak, she left her garden to lie in bed. According to her son, Lawrence, a doctor, only then did she hear on the radio the warnings to stay inside because of fallout.

She died last February of cancer, which apparently started in her stomach. "Medically, I don't know," says Dr. Reichmann about whether his mother's death was caused by the atomic tests. "But emotionally—yes, I do think so."

Those whose lives have been touched by the cancer deaths here are unanimous in their opinion that the cause was the testing, but the emotional response is varied.

There is the fear expressed by Darrell Nis-son, whose 13-year-old Sheldon died of leukemia in 1959, that the human race is destroying itself. He had recognized the look of leukemia in his son after having watched 9-year-old Jessilyn Turner, two blocks away, die of leukemia.

There is frustration felt by Stanford Stahel that lives have been lost here to develop weapons that went unused when they could have ended wars. Thus, he says, the death of his son, Mason, of leukemia in 1959, was "pretty much in vain."

There is the outright bitterness of Jimmie Humphries, who says: "I'll tell you, I've been in the National Guard for 12 years and [now] it's damn hard to go down there and put that uniform on, and if I didn't think someone had to protect this country, I wouldn't do it anymore."

There is also the effort to forget, to blot out the excruciating events of death. Lorna Brush does not even care to remember the year her husband, Arthur, then president of Dixie College here, died of leukemia. The college puts the date as July 5, 1964, less than a month before Gayneid Mackelprang's death.

There is, too, the unavoidable sense of having been cheated out of life. "It has cost me my life, practically," says Vonda McKinney, whose husband, Len, died of leukemia in 1962. "Everything my husband and I had worked for for 20 years was lost. For seven years I was walking around in a state of shock."

The McKinneys live out along that same stretch of Arizona rangeland near Fredonia, where Paul Hafen and Max Brinkerhoff ran livestock, where Gail Heaton cleared land for grazing until he died last November, where LaVier Tait worked loading logs onto trucks until his death in 1975, and where Mackelprang, a school superintendent, used to hunt rocks in the valleys and in the mountains.

It is also the place where Odessa Burch could look out her bedroom window in Fredonia and see the dust clouds from the bomb blasts. She died of leukemia on Aug. 29, 1961, at age 15.

That was also near where Elmer Jackson raised cattle for years. On a late winter day in 1953, Jackson was out gathering his herd when there came from the sky "the dirtiest snow he ever saw," according to his son, Norman. There was a burning sensation. He picked up some snow and squeezed. It felt hot.

By the time Elmer Jackson could drive the 35 miles home, he could hardly see, the son said. His face was red and burned. Burns opened on his left ear and the left side of his neck, and they never healed. For the next 19

years, said Norman Jackson, the father continually dressed them with salve.

On Nov. 11, 1968, Elmer Jackson was diagnosed as having thyroid cancer, the son said, and later the family filed a claim for personal injury with the federal government. It was denied. According to the son, doctors said the skin condition was due to exposure to sun, and developed on the left side because Jackson drove south to his ranch in the morning, and north to home at night, and so his left side was more exposed to tanning.

A testing program spokesman said he could remember only one injury confirmed as having been caused by atomic testing. A man was startled by a blast and cut himself while shaving.

The Atomic Energy Commission and its successor agencies long maintained that the nuclear testing program has not been hazardous. Complaints of high leukemia incidence in this area have been investigated briefly by the government and dismissed as not unusually frequent.

"We were guinea pigs," says Irma Thomas, a St. George resident who has tried to get the government to examine its own citizens here as extensively as it has monitored fallout recipients in Japan or Rongelap and on Bikini Island.

And with the prospect of health investigators returning to this picturesque valley for follow-up study of the 2,000 schoolchildren once checked for thyroid abnormalities, Thomas remembers the time years ago when the government cars pulled up to the high school to examine children.

She remembers the as-yet-unanswered question posed by a schoolteacher back then, a question that has since become a mourning cry among many of those who grew up here:

"What have you done to us?"

#### VICTIMS LIVED NEAR URANIUM "TAILINGS" PILES A SMALL UTAH TOWN AND FOUR LEUKEMIA DEATHS

(By Bill Curry)

MONTICELLO, UTAH.—It takes only a minute to drive past the houses where the four leukemia victims lived; they're all just a few blocks from each other.

Una Manzanara, 12, was the first to die, Gail Barber, 11, the last. In between were Renae Heaton, 7, and Alan Maughan, 16, the captain of the high school basketball team.

They all lived within a half-mile of the old mill for where the Atomic Energy Commission for 11 years processed uranium ore for nuclear weapons. The mill put enough junk in the air, local residents say, to dirty the wash hanging out to dry, enough to corrode the chrome on automobiles and enough to literally dissolve the screens in house windows.

All in the national defense, all to keep other nations at bay with the threat of nuclear death. But some residents here say that when the threat became an actuality, it occurred here in Monticello, where in the 1960s a mysterious incidence of leukemia took four young lives in a town of 1,900 and left a former resident now living in Salt Lake City battling for his life against the disease. Statistically, there should have been only one case in 25 years.

"He was exposed to radiation somewhere or some way along the line," says Alan Maughan's father, Dale, as he cruises the quiet streets at the foot of the San Juan Mountains in southeastern Utah and points to the houses of the victims.

"If I hadn't moved here to Monticello, my boy would still be alive," he says of his move from Logan, Utah. "I firmly believe that."

Instead, Alan died of leukemia on July 5, 1966.

The mill is gone, closed in 1960. Gone too are the days when it sent readings of highly

dangerous radium in South Creek to more than two times the acceptable levels and gamma radiation levels along the edges of the mill site up to 20 times those of the surrounding area.

But such facilities as this are not a matter of bygone concern, for the mill's radioactive wastes, called "tailings," remain—as they do in bizarre fashion elsewhere in the United States. In Salt Lake City, where an abandoned mill still spreads radiation across the landscape, a firehouse built on fill matter of uranium wastes is so "hot" it would be declared hazardous and closed if it were a uranium mine.

In Grand Junction, Colo., more than 600 buildings built on such fill have construction crews airhammering basements and house slabs to remove radioactivity. In Canonsburg, Pa., 120 industrial workers have been exposed to one form of radioactivity from the wastes under their buildings.

So the off-orange and dead grass on the old uranium mill site here in Monticello is only a marker similar to those elsewhere in the country. In all the U.S. government has identified 22 locations which, like Monticello, saw the grinding, crushing and extracting of uranium for national defense and remain today as toxic repositories of radioactive leftovers of the atomic age.

Their presence, and those of some 30 other former nuclear facilities, has put uncounted thousands of unwitting people nationwide on an atomic fault line, not knowing when or whether tragedy may rock their lives. Some 5,000 people in South Salt Lake City alone live within what is generally considered the danger zone of a uranium processing site—a half-mile.

There, 100 acres containing millions of tons of uranium tailings stand as a monument to the now-defunct Vitro Chemical Co.'s uranium processing facility. The Won-Door Co. next to the site recently has even abandoned its three-structure manufacturing facility to escape the health threat from the mounds of uranium waste piled up next to the buildings.

Heightened concern over these uranium mill sites comes at a time of new awareness of the delayed but potentially fatal effects of exposure to small amounts of radiation considered acceptable years ago.

For example, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was recently directed to oversee a broad study of civilian and military personnel involved in the nation's atomic bomb tests after a startlingly high number of soldiers at a 1957 test developed leukemia.

HEW is also expected to undertake soon a major reopening of a long-completed study of thyroid abnormalities among southwestern Utah schoolchildren exposed to radioactive fallout in the 1950's bomb tests. The original study concluded there was no increase in the abnormalities, which can lead to cancer, but officials now fear that enough time had perhaps not passed for all abnormalities to become apparent.

The Washington Post recently reported that residents in southwestern Utah and northwest Arizona blame the nuclear tests for a continuing incidence of leukemia and cancer among longtime residents.

And yesterday, health officials in Salt Lake City began examining firemen long exposed to radiation from five feet of fill hauled in 20 years ago from Vitro.

The firehouse, where about 60 people work, is the one that is so "hot" with radiation that if it were a uranium mine federal mine safety officials would close it as hazardous. Three towns in southern Utah were studied in 1967 by federal health officials for unexplained increases in leukemia. Findings were inconclusive. Some areas of the firehouse, generally the living and sleeping quarters, record five times the amount of allowable radiation that uranium miners are permitted to be exposed to.

And last week Colorado state health officials were in Grand Junction, Colo., in an effort to determine whether leukemia—occurring at twice the expected rate and concentrated in the elderly—is at all related to the old uranium processing operation there or to the extensive use of its radioactive remnants as fill matter in construction projects in Mesa County.

"We asked the powers-to-be, and he said there were no qualms—the AEC wouldn't let them [give out fill] if it wasn't safe," says Soren Sorensen of Grand Junction, remembering the days in 1966 when he obtained 10, 10-ton truckloads of uranium wastes from the old Climax Mill for the home he was building. "I called the AEC and they said there was no problem."

Seven years later, the fill under his house was removed in a federal and state-funded program that evolved from fear of the possible long-range health effects of the radioactive sand that Sorensen and others had used to level their lots.

"I kind of got scared over the deal," George Biggs said of the tallings that were under the front part of his house. The Biggs family wonders whether the radiation was related to the breast cancer of Mrs. Darlene Biggs.

"You don't know," said George Biggs. "But the quicker the tallings were gone, the better I felt. [The radiation] was pretty high, especially right in that corner"—he points to where a visitor is seated—"where the wife always set. That's why we thought maybe it caused the cancer."

All told, 6,000 structures in Grand Junction have uranium tallings deposits not counting the streets and sidewalks. G. A. (Bud) Franz, a senior health physicist with the state health department there, says some 650 buildings have been recommended for removal of the radioactive wastes.

In some houses, he said, residents were receiving as much radiation beyond normal as they would if they were to get two or three unnecessary whole-body X-rays a year.

Some \$12 million is expected to be spent for the removal of the radioactive tallings in the Grand Junction area, three-fourths of the money provided by the federal government and the rest by the state.

Rep. Dan Marriott (R-Utah), citing past federal "neglect" in management of uranium mills and waste disposal, says a "serious health hazard" now exists in Salt Lake City near the Vitro wastes and elsewhere in the country.

The health threat can be either overall radiation to the entire body or from radon gas that deposits radioactive particles in the lungs and can cause cancer there.

Here in Monticello, the old uranium operation was owned by the AEC, which processed ore from 1949 to 1960. The ore was trucked in from mines around the area and stacked in mounds in an open field. After processing, the radioactive leftovers were returned to the field, and the winds, predominantly from the south, carried to the north—where all of the leukemia victims resided.

Jon Lee's mother, April, grew up in the south sector of town, right on the edge of the uranium operation. Although her son was born in 1964—after the mill had been closed and radioactive tallings covered with dirt—she believes his leukemia is somehow related to her exposure over the years to the radioactive uranium site.

Now 16, Jon, who used to live around the corner from Alan Maughan and now is a Salt Lake City resident, has been fighting leukemia for eight years, although he was once given only two years or so to live.

But the other four leukemia victims have long been gone, youngsters who spent most of their brief lives growing up so close to the uranium mill.

So unusual were their deaths that federal health officials investigated them in 1967.

Although all of the children had leukemia that can be associated with radiation, "no relationship" was found with the uranium mill, Dr. Glyn Caldwell, a cancer specialist with the Center for Disease Control, quoted from a final report on the deaths.

Caldwell acknowledged, however, that the investigation focused on viruses then thought to spread cancer.

Monticello was one of three southern Utah towns examined in 1967 for unexplainable increases in leukemia, Caldwell said. The other towns were Parowan and Paragonah in the southwestern part of the state in Iron County, which, along with Washington County, was subjected repeatedly to nuclear fallout from atomic testing in Nevada in the 1950s.

Parowan and Paragonah, with a combined population of 1,800, experienced four cases of leukemia from 1956 to 1967, two to three times the expected rate, Caldwell said. As in the case of Monticello, findings in those two towns were inconclusive.

So today the doubts and fears expressed by relatives of the Monticello victims remain over what impact the processing of uranium for nuclear arms has had on this town. "For a place this small," said Dale Maughan, "there had to be something." ●

### THE BRONX—A BALANCED PICTURE

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, "The Bronx"—Bronx County, N.Y., has long suffered from poor public relations. Some years ago, Ogden Nash wrote a couplet, as follows:

The Bronx?  
No Thonx.

That summed it up.

And in the last year, with widespread TV coverage of fires in the South Bronx, the American public got the impression that the entire Bronx was a disaster area.

In the New York Times for July 6, Francis X. Clines wrote a fine story, which gives a balanced picture of my home country. I am glad to share it with my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ABOUT NEW YORK: A "HIDDEN" SIDE OF THE BRONX

(By Francis X. Clines)

As good as the last World Series should have been for the Bronx, it is remembered by the Borough President for the night Howard Cosell kept showing a burning building on television.

In a Roone Arledge age, in which news and diversion are blurring together, the burning building viewed by America from a blimp offered sociological graphics that didn't eat up a lot of costly air time. The orange flame over a ways from the stadium's bright dish of light was a neat segue for the attention span that nicely set up more popular events in which Reggie finally hit those home runs and established that winning is an egocentric fact, not a boroughwide one.

"Howard Cosell," Robert Abrams, the Bronx Borough President, fairly sighs. "I can't tell you what that picture did. It reinforced the image people have of the Bronx. It is devastating in the board rooms of banks. And the TV kept showing it."

We should hasten to point out, however, that it might have been just that kind of thing that got President Carter to visit the South Bronx, for whatever that gesture may turn out to mean, and to stand there moodily as if he were Lincoln at Gettysburg.

America is like that: One quick picture is worth a thousand documentaries. And Mr. Abrams wearily acknowledges that there is nothing like the South Bronx for a quick picture, for your standard empty building as death's head, for a few lines of urban thantopsis.

The trouble is, there is more to the Bronx than the South Bronx, but the world doesn't know it. There are dozens of solid, quiet, healthy neighborhoods north of that fistula, and Mr. Abrams is wincing lately as he goes upstate on his campaign to be elected Attorney General and finds a great recognition factor for the Bronx as South Bronx.

"I stand on this street here, and I could be in—where?—Roslyn or Jamestown," Mr. Abrams says. Actually he is in a neighborhood called Country Club over in the northeast Bronx, a place remarkable for its middle-class quietude and proud shade trees, a place kept clean and strong by a great number of civil-servant residents, among other quiet New Yorkers.

"Look," Mr. Abrams says, driving slowly, "the lawns mowed, garbage cans tight, people in their backyards. The commonplace is not news, but it's beautiful."

The worst effect of the South Bronx image, he says, is on the people still living in the rest of the borough. "They run into old friends and keep hearing, 'Oh my God—the Bronx? You're still in the Bronx?' Perception and imagery are very important in life and have a great influence on whether a person keeps a commitment to a neighborhood."

Sooner or later, everyone passes through the Bronx, but most never know it is complicated and beautiful. Chief among the ignorant are some of its own inhabitants. Mr. Abrams, for example, said he never saw a Bronx neighborhood called Riverdale until he ran for Borough President eight years ago.

"Your neighborhood was your universe," he says: "I grew up playing stickball on my block and leaving it only to go to Madison Square Garden or Yankee Stadium."

His roots are in the Pelham Parkway area, which is still looking well by the lattice-shadows of the subway el. He seems entitled to his vanity as he points to the sidewalk at White Plains Road and Lydig Avenue, where his grandmother sat on a milk crate and gave out his first political pamphlet when he ran for the State Assembly 13 years ago.

"I never knew this!" Mr. Abrams says some pleasant miles later to the west, gesturing at an immense, moody-looking cooper beech street in Riverdale. He points to old estate houses in this melange of upper-income nooks and millionaires' tracts overlooking the Hudson. He stops at jewel-like carriage houses on country-lane streets. "The Bronx? This?"

He laughs, but he lives in Riverdale now. (Anyone who thinks moving from Lydig Avenue to Riverdale is mere upward mobility needs to visit the Bronx.)

As the city's boroughs go, the Bronx seems to have proportionately more ethnic yeast. The great tales of Puerto Rican and black survival in the South Bronx are still being lived, but they doubtless will rival the mythic levels of old Manhattan's Lower East Side.

Likewise it is possible to argue that in terms of spirited numbers, New York City's real Little Italy—despite the savory, better-known antecedent down in Manhattan—is now in the Belmont section of the Bronx, where Our Lady of Mount Carmel parish operates like a civic powerhouse. Just so, the Irish-Americans have Gaelic Park over in Kingsbridge, where old-country sports and politics run thick as the brogues and where

Federal agents have been known to track operatives of the Irish Republican Army.

Equally fascinating is a neighborhood called "The Amalgamated"—a middle-class, union-built stretch over by the reservoir whose Jewish labor-intellectual roots are deeply evident in social-work offices named after people like Eleanor Roosevelt and in a school district, No. 10, that is one of the best in the city.

It is a separate adventure trying to fathom the stolidity of Bronx architecture. But it is clear the city will never again have residential bargains in rooms and brick-wall quietude that the squat, six-story apartment houses of this borough supplied in Art Deco fleets in that last great growth period before the suburbs struck the city like Visigoths. Contagion creeping up the Grand Concourse from the South Bronx is eating well into some of these buildings, but healthy miles of them fan out from the upper Concourse.

The borough is so big that it contains, almost as a wildly tangential afterthought, the world's largest residential unity—Co-op City, the towered middle-class project that grew instantly and somewhat tragically by vacuuming out great residential stretches of the West Bronx. Change is just that sporadic but drastic in the Bronx.

Yet the borough is bigger than Co-op City or the South Bronx or any of its parts, and the record should note that you can wander quietly through middle-class mile upon mile, so commonplace these real parts of the Bronx that they would look boring through a zoom lens from a blimp. ●

WENDELL GUNN'S TESTIMONY IN BEHALF OF THE KEMP-ROTH TAX REDUCTION ACT AND THE EFFICIENCY OF HUMAN CAPITAL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1978

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Senate Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management heard extensive testimony on the proposed Tax Rate Reduction Act, H.R. 8333 and S. 1860, known as the Kemp-Roth bill.

This is the legislation to provide for an average 33-percent tax rate reduction, across the board, for individuals over the next 3 years; for a reduction in the combined corporate normal tax and corporate surtax from 48 percent to 45 percent during that time frame; and for a permanent increase to \$100,000 in the corporate surtax exemption. The legislation has 179 cosponsors in Congress.

Testimony was heard from Members of Congress, the administration, economists, business, and labor. It dealt with every conceivable aspect of this legislation, and I invite all my colleagues to examine the hearing record thoroughly, for it reinforces what I have been articulating before this House. I refer to the immediate need for permanent tax rate reductions.

Support for enactment of this legislation is broad; it is very broad. I think an awareness of that is why we have seen such an orchestrated attack upon it over the past 2 weeks. Its opponents have seen the 194 votes for the measure in March, the growing editorial support, the extensive news coverage, endorsement by

national taxpayer organizations, the depth of the sound economic logic behind it and the consequences of that, and they have panicked.

There is no better evidence of support—and of the sound economic underpinning of it—than last week's testimony by Wendell W. Gunn, a black leader from New York and New Jersey. Mr. Gunn addressed himself directly to two very important questions: The costs to the consumer of taxes paid by the providers of goods and services, and the effect high tax rates have upon the use of human capital. Human capital is the application of the resource within each person—how much they are willing to do.

Mr. Gunn gave this example:

Following a visit to my doctor recently, I was presented with a bill. "What you did was worth only half that much," I said to him, to which he replied, "Precisely. That's exactly my share of what you pay. The IRS gets the rest." Query: Who pays the doctor's taxes.

The answer is obvious: The patients. Taken as a whole, the consumers. And it is those same consumers who lose the benefit of the work which others would produce were not it for the disincentive of higher and higher tax rates on additional dollars earned.

Mr. Gunn's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY WENDELL WILKIE GUNN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND DEBT MANAGEMENT OF THE U.S. SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

I wish to thank the members of this distinguished committee for this opportunity to share with you my personal views on the vitally important issue of taxation, specifically the Roth-Kemp tax reduction proposals. I appear before you as an interested private citizen, not representing an organization or other individual.

My reason for appearing is that I am deeply concerned about the continuing real economic contraction, and its attendant social ills, which our country has been experiencing during the last ten or twelve years. Unfortunately, a disproportionate share of the resulting hardship always falls on people who, for reasons beyond their control, are late entrants into America's economic mainstream. In addition, economic contraction necessarily pits groups and individuals against each other as they compete for shares of a shrinking pool of resources, thereby substantially negating prior social progress.

I see your deliberation here as part of a continuing search for methods of achieving the economic growth we need and, at the same time, avoiding inflation and its obviously destructive consequences. Kemp-Roth claims to be the answer. The proposal must be examined as to its effect on economic activity, unemployment and the budget deficit, and to its fairness. Kemp-Roth claims to pass on all counts. Any initiative which makes such strong claims should obviously be examined very closely. I wish to do precisely that.

The private marketplace has a remarkable ability for overcoming the so-called "inequities" in the tax code. Through private negotiations and transactions, the after-tax returns to production are distributed "equitably", in spite of government attempts at manipulation. The one thing that the marketplace cannot successfully adjust for is the total amount of its production that is taken away by the government in taxes. Therefore the only truly meaningful tax reform is either a decrease of an increase in tax rates. So except for the few among us who believe that

tax rates are currently exactly where an all-wise divine ordinance would have them, we must only decide whether we are for tax rate decreases or tax rate increases. These are the only choices.

My own case for tax rate decreases is embodied in the following conceptual framework.

THE FRAMEWORK

The framework, based on the relationship between tax rates and tax revenues, is briefly stated as follows:

(1) For each level of government tax revenues, there are two (2) different tax rates which will produce it, i.e., a low rate at a high level of production and a high rate at a low level of production. The extreme example is that no tax revenue is collected at a zero tax rate, even though production is at a maximum. No tax revenue is collected at a 100 percent tax rate because all economic activity ceases (or takes place out of the sight of the tax collector).

(2) As tax rates increase in the low end of the range, tax revenues increase, in spite of the fact that marginally profitable enterprises are forced out of business. This occurs because the loss of tax revenues from these now-defunct enterprises is more than offset by the incremental revenues from those enterprises which remain. In the high end of the range, the opposite occurs, i.e., the loss of the tax revenues from the now-defunct enterprises exceeds the incremental revenues from those which remain, thereby leading to lower tax revenues (See Figure 1). The converse is that in the upper end of the tax rate range, lower tax rates should lead to an increase in tax revenues due to an exchange in the production base. This occurs because of the incentive effect on the marginal decision to invest or not to invest, to work or not to work, to invest in the U.S. or invest in some place offshore, etc.

(3) Because of the co-existence of high marginal tax rates and an extensive system of income transfers (welfare and unemployment benefits), changes in tax rates will have a much more pronounced effect on the supply of goods and services than on demand (see Figure 2). The sequence is as follows: tax rate rise, marginal firms go out of business, remaining firms cut back on investment, unemployment results, tax revenues decline. Because the newly unemployed must now depend on welfare and unemployment benefits, precisely the same policy change which caused a decrease in the government's ability to spend also causes an increase in the government's need to spend. The budget deficit is therefore twice adversely affected. The production of the laid-off worker drops to zero while his demand for goods and services drops only to a level commensurate with his welfare or unemployment compensation. The net effect is a simultaneous increase in unemployment and inflation commonly known as "stagflation". Conversely, a cut in marginal tax rates produces exactly the opposite effect. Support for this notion can be found in recent experiences in India, West Germany, Canada, and in our own experience following the Kennedy Administration tax cuts in 1962-63.

(4) In order for tax rate cuts to have the desired results, they must be perceived by the private marketplace as permanent. Temporary tax rate cuts can only affect temporary investment decisions.

(5) I must emphasize the distinction between the aforementioned cuts in marginal tax rates and the quite-different notion of tax rates. All of the benefits of the former accrue because of the effect on the expected profitability of production and investment. These benefits do not result in the case of a tax rebate, simply because it is related only to previous production, which obviously cannot be altered in response. The net effect, therefore, of the tax rebate is the same as

that of a simple transfer payment, having no positive effect whatsoever on production.

#### TAX BURDEN AND DISTRIBUTION

Following a visit to my doctor recently, I was presented with a bill. "What you did was worth only half that much", I said to him, to which he replied, "precisely. That's exactly my share of what you pay. The IRS gets the rest." Query: Who pays the doctor's taxes?

A close look at a typical business income statement reveals the answer. The success of the business is measured by the extent to which the first line item, revenues—payments by consumers of the product—covers the sum of all the lines which follow, i.e., all expenses, including taxes. The taxes included here are of several types, but for purposes of this discussion, we shall ignore all but the most obvious. Wages and salaries include personal income taxes and employees' contribution to social security taxes. Corporate taxes include employer contribution to social security taxes and corporate income taxes. The cost of materials and supplies includes (from the supplier's income statement) all of the above plus any applicable sales and excise taxes. Not reflected in the statement are personal income taxes on dividends and sales and (in most cases) excise taxes on the final output.

Either all of the above are covered by payments from consumers of the product, with some left over for the investors, or the enterprise soon ceases to exist. All of the participants in the production process, workers, suppliers, consumers and investors, base their participation decision on their expected after-tax returns from the enterprise. In other words, they bargain with each other for a share of what remains after the government takes its share in the form of taxes listed above. They do so through price negotiations, wage and salary negotiations, buying and selling of the firm's stock, etc. Whenever one of the above taxes—any one—is increased, the equilibrium is disturbed, setting off a new round of negotiations. For instance, an increase in personal income tax rates leads to higher wage demands (workers' response), lower stock price (investor's response). An increase in corporate income tax rates or employer contribution to social security taxes leads to lower wages and salaries offered and/or higher output prices asked. In any case, everyone in the production and consumption process is worse off than before because they will distribute among themselves a smaller after-tax total.

Stated somewhat differently, a tax imposed on any factor of production is ultimately borne by all factors of production.

There has been much talk lately about integrating corporate and personal income tax, or eliminating the double taxation of dividends. As the foregoing discussion indicates, the market itself does the integration. It does not matter how many times corporate income is taxed. What matters is the total amount of tax, corporate plus personal, that is levied on income. Cut either rate and the beneficial effects will be exactly the same.

The single most destructive feature of our tax system is the graduated personal income tax. The apparent rationale is that those who earn more can afford to pay more. Ironically, the destructive effects of progressivity fall most heavily on those who earn less. As inflation increases nominal earnings, the higher tax rates lead to losses in real wages. Highly productive workers (evidenced by their high earnings) are taxed at such high marginal rates that, at the margin, leisure becomes a more attractive option. Investors, who can be taxed up to 70%, have strong

incentives to invest offshore, invest in tax shelters, or simply choose more current consumption and less investment. Proponents of so called "soak-the-rich" schemes should consider the following. Increased tax rates on the rich cause the rich to become a little less rich and invest less, and cause the poor to lose vital opportunities to work at all.

#### KEMP-ROTH

The primary rationale of the Kemp-Roth proposal appears to be based on the conceptual framework just discussed. By cutting marginal tax rates on individuals across the board and on businesses, it would provide for non-inflationary private-sector economic expansion. It would signal abandonment by liberals and conservatives alike that inflation must be fought with unemployment and vice versa. It would release the enormous pool of energy and individual initiative that has characterized our great country since its inception. New employment would result and those Americans who, for obvious reasons, always seem to bear a disproportionate share of unemployment, would be among the greatest beneficiaries. And, believe it or not, it contains the only hope of ever achieving the elusive balance in the Federal Budget. ●

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

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

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

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 18, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 19

9:00 a.m.

Energy and National Resources

To continue consideration of proposed legislation designating certain Alaska lands as national parkland.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

To hold hearings on S. 3223 and S. 3241, to establish a general stock ownership plan.

2221 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 3229 and H.R. 7700, proposed Postal Service Amendments Act.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the ICC's price regulation in the motor common carrier industry.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting on pending calendar business.

322 Russell Building

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

To mark up H.J. Res. 1024, making urgent supplemental appropriations for the A.S.C.S. Department of Agriculture; S. 3085, extending through FY 82 the special supplemental and child care food programs; H.R. 13125, FY 79 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture; and on proposed second supplemental appropriations for FY 78 for the Department of Agriculture.

1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for FY 78 and on proposed FY 79 budget estimates for the District of Columbia.

S-126, Capitol

Environment and Public Works

To consider S. 3077, extending until September 30, 1983, the authority of the Export-Import Bank to make new commitments.

4200 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

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

5110 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

To resume mark up H.R. 11318, authorizations for the SBA through FY 1980; S. 836, to improve the surety bond program provided by the Small Business Investment Act; S. 2156, proposed Minority Enterprise Venture Capital Act; S. 2259, to revise procedures for insuring small business participation in Government procurement activities; and S. 3179, to create a small business and capital ownership development program.

424 Russell Building

Special on Aging

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

6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Conferees

On S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

3110 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

To mark up H.R. 12927, FY 79 appropriations for construction at certain military installations; H.R. 12935, FY 79 appropriations for the Legislative Branch; H.J. Res. 1024, making urgent supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture; and S. 3085, extending through FY 82 the special supplemental and child care food programs.

JULY 20

- 9:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
To continue consideration of proposed legislation designating certain Alaska land as national parkland.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- Finance  
To continue hearings on S. 3223 and S. 3241 to establish a general stock ownership plan.  
2221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs  
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations  
To hold hearings on fraud, abuse, and waste in federally-supported health programs.  
6226 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Governmental Affairs  
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 3229 and H.R. 7700, proposed Postal Service Amendments Act.  
3302 Dirksen Building
- Joint Economic  
To continue hearings to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.  
2168 Rayburn Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
235 Russell Building
- Environment and Public Works  
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of P.L. 94-472, the Toxic Substances Control Act.  
4200 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee  
To resume markup of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.  
4232 Dirksen Building
- Select Intelligence  
To resume hearings on S. 2525, to improve the intelligence system of the U.S. by establishing a statutory basis for U.S. intelligence gathering activities.  
5110 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.  
Select Ethics  
To hold an open followed by closed business meeting.  
235 Russell Building
- Conferees  
On S. 9, to establish a policy for the management of oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- JULY 21
- 9:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on H.R. 12536, Omnibus National Parks Amendments.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Immigration Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3093, to provide for the seizure of vehicles used to illegally transport persons into the U.S.  
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

- Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas F. Moakley, of Massachusetts, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner.  
235 Russell Building
- Environment and Public Works  
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of P.L. 94-472, the Toxic Substances Control Act.  
4200 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources  
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee  
To continue markup of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.  
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 24

- 9:00 a.m.  
Joint Economic  
Economic Growth and Stabilization Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on alleged mismanagement of Conrail's personnel and financial resources.  
5110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Finance  
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed tax legislation of general application (S. 869, 1674, 2128, 2393, 2452, 2628, 2825, 3007, 3037, 3080, 3125 and 3301).  
2221 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Production and Supply Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3078, providing financial assistance to certain States to aid in the stabilization or disposal of radioactive materials.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on S. 1449, proposed Grand Jury Reform Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 25

- 9:30 a.m.  
Joint Economic  
To hold joint hearings with the House Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on the City to review economic conditions, and to discuss the future outlook.  
2168 Rayburn Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Budget  
To hold hearings on the second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.  
6202 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Production and Supply Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 3078, providing financial assistance to certain States to aid in the stabilization or disposal of radioactive materials.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs  
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2189, proposed Nuclear Waste Management Act.  
1114 Dirksen Building

JULY 26

- 9:00 a.m.  
Joint Economic  
Economic Growth and Stabilization Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on alleged mismanagement of Conrail's personnel and financial resources.  
5110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Consumer Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on auto odometer requirements.  
235 Russell Building
- Finance  
Administration of the Internal Revenue Code Subcommittee  
To resume joint oversight hearings with the Small Business Committee on operation of the Tax Reduction and Simplification Act (P.L. 95-30), and on Administration proposals for a new jobs tax credit.  
2221 Dirksen Building

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

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

- Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on H.R. 12536, the Omnibus National Parks Amendments.  
3110 Dirksen Building

- Environment and Public Works  
Water Resources Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 1592, to terminate further construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project.  
4200 Dirksen Building

- Governmental Affairs  
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 2189, proposed Nuclear Waste Management Act.  
1114 Dirksen Building

- Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on the FBI Charter as it concerns undercover operations.  
2228 Dirksen Building

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

JULY 27

- 9:30 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on conglomerate mergers and their effect on the economy, on a community, and on employees.  
2228 Dirksen Building
- Veterans' Affairs  
To mark up S. 2828, the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefits Act; S. 1643 and H.R. 4341, to eliminate the requirement that the VA inspect the mobile home manufacturing process; and H.R. 12257, to furnish memorial headstones to honor certain deceased veterans.  
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

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

## Budget

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

## Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

## Governmental Affairs

## Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2189, proposed Nuclear Waste Management Act.  
3302 Dirksen Building

## Select Intelligence

To resume hearings to receive testimony from former Secretary of State Kissinger on S. 2525, to improve the intelligence system of the U.S. by establishing a statutory basis for U.S. intelligence gathering activities.  
5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 28

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue hearings on conglomerate mergers and their effect on the economy, on a community, and on employees.  
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 31

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on H.R. 12536, the Omnibus National Parks Amendments.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 1

9:00 a.m.

## Judiciary

## Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee

To hold hearings on arbitration in U.S. district courts.  
2253 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2590, to amend P.L. 91-505, relating to land claims by the U.S. in Riverside, California, and S. 2774, to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 2

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

## Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.  
3302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 3

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

## Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.  
3302 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 4

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on H.R. 12536, the Omnibus National Parks Amendments.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 7

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2475 and H.R. 10587, to improve conditions of the public grazing lands.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 8

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2533, proposed Gasohol Motor Fuel Act.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 9

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to receive testimony from officials of the Department of Energy on nuclear waste disposal.  
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 2533 proposed Gasohol Motor Fuel Act.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 10

8:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2560, to expand the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.  
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee  
To continue hearings to receive testimony from officials of the Department of Energy on nuclear waste disposal.  
235 Russell Building

AUGUST 14

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2860, proposed Solar Power Satellite Research, Development, and Demonstration Program Act.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 15

9:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 16

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings to receive testimony from officials of the Department of Energy on nuclear waste disposal.  
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 17

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1449, proposed Grand Jury Reform Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 18

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources  
Parks and Recreation Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on H.R. 12536, the Omnibus National Parks Amendments.  
3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 22

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1449, proposed Grand Jury Reform Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 28

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the FBI Charter as it concerns undercover operations.  
2228 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 29

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the FBI Charter as it concerns undercover operations.  
2228 Dirksen Building

## CANCELLATIONS

JULY 27

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2873, proposed Ocean Shipping Act.  
235 Russell Building

AUGUST 2

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on H.R. 6503, to provide for a just and reasonable rate of return or profit for common carriers by water in intercoastal commerce.  
235 Russell Building