and insert the following: "not later than January 20, 1979".

On page 17, line 20: strike out the period after "section", insert a comma and the following: "together with such recommendations as he may wish to make for the withdrawal of additional United States ground troops in subsequent periods." And strike out "Each such" in line 20, and insert "Such".

On page 18, at the end of line 4, add the following new sentence: "Such report to the Congress shall also include assessments of the effect of any proposed withdrawal of further troops from Korea on preserving deterrence in Korea; the reaction anticipated from North Korea; a consideration of the effect of the proposed additional withdrawal on increasing incentives for South Korea to develop an independent nuclear deterrent; the effect of any further troop withdrawals on our long-term military and economic partnership with Japan; the effect of any proposed further withdrawals on the United States-Chinese and the United States-Soviet military balance; and the possible implications of any proposed further withdrawal on the Soviet-Chinese military situation."

H.R. 12514

By Mr. WOLFF:

—Page 19, immediately after line 20, add the following new section:

UNITED STATES RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

SEC. 22.(a) The Congress finds and declares that a sound and stable relationship with the Soviet Union will help achieve the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act, strengthen the security of the United States, and improve the prospects for world peace.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that the President, in cooperation with the Congress and knowledgeable members of the public, shall make a full review of United States policy towards the Soviet Union. This review should cover, but not be limited to—

(1) an overall reevaluation of the objectives and priorities of the United States in its relations with the Soviet Union;

(2) the evolution of and sources of all bargaining power of the United States with respect to the Soviet Union and how that bargaining power might be enhanced;

(3) what linkages do exist and what linkages should or should not exist between various elements of United States-Soviet relations such as arms control negotiations, human rights issues, and economic and cultural exchanges;

(4) the policies of the United States toward human rights conditions in the Soviet Union and how improved Soviet respect for human rights might be more effectively achieved;

(5) the current status of strategic arms limitations talks and whether such talks should be continued in their present framework or terminated and renewed in some other forum;

(6) the current status of other arms control negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union;

(7) the challenges posed by Soviet and Cuban involvement in developing countries and a study of appropriate policy responses and instruments to meet those challenges more effectively;

(8) the impact of our relations with the People's Republic of China on our relations with the Soviet Union;

(9) the impact of strategic parity on relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and on the ability of the United States to meet its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty;

(10) United States economic, technological, scientific, and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and whether those relations are desirable and should be continued, expanded, restricted, or linked to other aspects of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union;

(11) the evolution of Soviet domestic politics and the relationship between Soviet domestic politics and its foreign policy behavior, especially towards the United States; and

(12) what improvements should be made in the institutions and procedures of United States foreign policy in order to ensure a coherent and effective policy towards the Soviet Union.

(c) The President shall report the results of the review called for by subsection (b) to the Congress not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

—Page 19, immediately after line 20, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 22. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should be responsive to the defense requirements of Israel, and sell Israel additional advanced aircraft in order to maintain Israel's defense capability, which is essential to peace."

H.R. 12931

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

—On page 6, line 23, strike "$1,827,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,737,000,000".

On page 7, in line 1, immediately after "Egypt," insert "and";

On page 7, in line 2, immediately after "Jordan" strike all that follows through the end of that line and insert in lieu thereof a colon;

On page 7, in line 13, strike the period at the end of the line and insert in lieu thereof a colon;

On page 7, immediately after line 13 insert the following new proviso: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used to provide assistance to Syria."

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## WANT TO RUN THE POST OFFICE?

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most educational columns in recent years on the Postal Service was one by the veteran columnist Roscoe Drummond, writing in the Christian Science Monitor of July 26. May I add that not only members of the press but also Members of Congress very often do not understand nor appreciate the complex situation effecting the Postal Service. The article follows:

WANT TO RUN THE POST OFFICE?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Postal Service has millions of disgruntled customers. You are probably one of them—and with good reason. Your mail usually arrives late. It is often misdirected and travels back and forth across the country. The price of stamps rises faster than inflation. In many cities companies have to hire messengers to deliver their letters in a radius of 10 to 20 miles in order to transact the day's business; don't depend on the mailman.

No improvement is in sight.

It's a mess all right, and while columnists affect to have good answers for almost everything—which we usually don't have—I am at a loss for any clear solution.

But I can see what has been going wrong. Seven years ago Congress shed itself of all responsibility for running the Post Office because it was running it into the ground and couldn't wait to assure the voters that the politicians weren't to blame any more.

They just bundled it up in one big package called the Postal Reorganization Act and told the new Postal Service to run itself, to borrow billions of dollars to modernize, to bargain with labor, and to price its services so that it could soon pay its own way.

The mandate didn't work—and probably couldn't be made to work the way it was set up.

The new electronic, fast-moving, automatic equipment helped; some worked badly, some worked well and in a few years 63 percent of the letter mail went through sorting machines compared with 5 percent in earlier years.

But what about greatly needed savings if the Postal Service was ever to get in the black? Reduced personnel, yes; the number of workers down from 729,000 to 655,000 and this during an increase of mail volume from 87 billion to 92 billion pieces a year.

But hear this: labor cost under the old Post Office amounted to 83 percent of total operating expenses. And after all the modernization, the labor share of total operations rose to 84 percent.

The reason: the collective bargaining provision of the so-called postal reform act caused postal wages (once too low) to climb from $10,000 a year to $18,000 a year (a level far out of line). Mostly as a result of these high labor costs, it took $9 billion to operate the mails in 1971 and $15.3 billion last year. No wonder we have been witnessing the most rapid rise in postal rates in history—and there is no end in sight.

One thing needs to be understood. Individual letter writers no longer provide much of the postal business. They constitute a small part of the mail. At least 80 percent of first-class mail comes from or goes to businesses. Thus it is the senders of mail which do most to support the Postal Service and, if the Postal Service is ever to get into the black, the income will have to come overwhelmingly from business firms. Already for some of them postage is one of the largest costs of operation.

In many ways businesses pay the freight for most of the Postal Service costs and the household recipients do most to put the service in the red. This is why the postal authorities want to cut back deliveries to private residences to thrice weekly and business deliveries to five days a week.

Congress shrinks from this measure. There are too many recipients who vote. Perhaps Congress should face the prospect of subsidizing public service mail and let business mail pay only its fair share.

I suspect you don't want to run the Postal Service.●

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., ●

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES SUPPORTS AIRPORT AND AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION ACT AND URGES PROMPT AND POSITIVE ACTION

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have been furnished a copy of a letter from Mayor Tom Moody of Columbus, Ohio, president of the National League of Cities, and Alan Beals, executive director written to the Honorable James J. Delaney chairman of the Committee on Rules. The letter forthrightly supports H.R. 8729, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act and its companion Ways and Means bill, H.R. 11986, which is proposed as title III of the former.

The National League of Cities represents a constituency located in every congressional district in the country. Their support of titles I, II, and III cannot be taken lightly. It represents an affirmation not only of the seriousness of the problem but of well-considered action to solve the problem.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
*Washington, D.C., July 19, 1978.*

Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Rules,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National League of Cities urges the Rules Committee to report out the Airport and Aircraft Noise Financing Bill (H.R. 8729) and its Ways and Means Committee companion, the Noisy Aircraft Revenue Act (H.R. 11986) as soon as possible. The National League of Cities has supported and helped develop this bill to abate noise around the Nation's major airports. Some 7 million people who live in urbanized areas are affected by high levels of airport and aircraft noise pollution. There is growing and convincing evidence that this noise is detrimental to emotional and physical health.

This legislation represents the best chance to enact meaningful aircraft noise reduction legislation during this session of Congress. Title I of H.R. 8729 provides for $15 million in noise mapping and planning grants for FY 79 and FY 80 with an additional ¢400 million of noise implementation grants for FY 79 and 80. These grants noise impacted land around busy airports. will help airport operators purchase severely Title II contains additional authority for construction and safety grants for airports. Title III seeks to reduce noise at its source which is the aircraft engine. NLC's policy has long supported abatement of pollution at the source.

We urge your Committee to take prompt and positive action on reporting these two bills to the Floor. Our membership across the country supports them fully and it is hopeful that Congress will take this first step toward combating aircraft noise pollution.

Sincerely,

TOM MOODY,
*President.*
ALAN BEALS,
*Executive Director.*●

## THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO DEBATE, NO. 3

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in their third letter to Members of the House of Representatives, the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey argue that lifting the embargo would be extremely dangerous to vital American security interests abroad and that keeping the embargo is the only way to bring about the full participation of both Greece and Turkey in NATO.

I attach for the attention of my colleagues the third letter from the proponents of the embargo and my rebuttal. I argue in a rebuttal that the predominant view of defense experts and our defense leaders is that it is essential to lift the embargo and that the question is not whether Turkey stays in NATO but at what strength. In addition, it is noteworthy that we need both Greece and Turkey in NATO but lifting the embargo is more likely to bring Greece back in full NATO participation on the terms Greece seeks.

This exchange of letters follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., July, 1978.*

THE EMBARGO AND NATIONAL SECURITY

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In its attempt to lift the Turkish arms embargo, the Carter Administration has avoided discussing the requirements of American law and has focused instead on what it claims are overriding national security considerations.

The Administration's strategy is understandable. For to focus on the law, and on Turkey's continuing violation of the law through its continuing occupation of Cyprus, would make ending the embargo at this time unthinkable.

As a result, the Administration speaks of Turkey's importance to NATO and of the need to do whatever is necessary to preserve U.S. relations with Turkey.

We yield to no one in our support for NATO. Yet it is clear to us that, even on "national security" grounds, the Administration's current tilt toward Turkey is shortsighted and extremely dangerous to vital American security interests abroad.

We know that both Turkey and Greece are necessary for the security of NATO's southeastern flank; the Administration has conceded as much in its recent testimony before the House International Relations Committee. It is not, therefore, a question of choosing one country over the other—we must do all we can to insure that both participate fully in NATO.

As matters now stand, Turkey is a full member of NATO, while Greece has partially withdrawn from NATO as a result of U.S. mishandling of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974.

The Greek government has made it clear that it wishes to return to a full role in NATO, but that it cannot do so unless the embargo is maintained as a way to encourage a just settlement on Cyprus.

The Turkish government, meanwhile, has made it equally clear that it will remain in NATO regardless of the outcome of the embargo vote in Congress.

Therefore, a vote to continue the embargo is the only way to bring about the full participation of both Turkey and Greece in NATO. Statements made by the leaders of the two countries on their recent visits to Washington make this conclusion obvious.

Mr. Karamanlis told Members of Congress that, despite Administration claims to the contrary, a lifting of the embargo would be a major political issue in Greece, would further damage U.S.-Greek relations and would make the reintegration of Greece into NATO far more difficult. Mr. Karamanlis also revealed that a vote to lift the embargo—and the American abandonment of Greece such a vote would imply—could topple his pro-Western Government, with untold consequences for American security interests in that vital region of the world.

Mr. Ecevit, for his part, set forth Turkey's position quite plainly:

"We do not intend to leave NATO in any case, because we believe that the front in which we have a stake is based on a rather delicate balance, and Turkey has a responsibility to maintain that balance." (The Today Show, Interview held May 30, 1978)

And again:

BARBARA WALTERS. "Mr. Prime Minister, suppose the arms embargo is not lifted. Would you pull Turkey out of NATO?"

Mr. ECEVIT. "No, I have always said explicitly that we would still want to remain in NATO." (ABC Evening News, Interview held June 1, 1978)

Mr. Ecevit's statements should not be surprising. Mr. Ecevit knows that continued participation in NATO is to Turkey's benefit. He knows, too, that the embargo has not been as harmful to Turkey as some have claimed—Turkey has received more than $600 million in American military equipment for NATO purposes since the embargo began. And he knows, finally, that Turkey has been permitted since 1975 to purchase additional American-made equipment in unlimited amounts through U.S. commercial channels.

Yet, despite this, Administration officials have suggested that voting an end to the embargo is the only way to keep Turkey in NATO. In light of Mr. Ecevit's statements on this issue, these Administration claims are difficult to accept. We have, in fact, only two choices:

We can assume that Mr. Ecevit is telling the truth when he says that Turkey remains committed to NATO—in which case the Administration's arguments are groundless and Congress need not fear voting to maintain the embargo.

Or we can assume that he is not telling the truth—in which case the credibility of any of his commitments respecting Turkish flexibility on Cyprus or Turkey's reliability as an ally are themselves open to serious question, and Congress has no reason to lift the embargo.

The Administration simply cannot have it both ways, disputing Mr. Ecevit on this major concern and yet vouching for his reliability in all other respects.

We believe the statements of both Mr. Ecevit and Mr. Karamanlis on this issue: Turkey will remain in NATO regardless of the embargo vote, while Greece will only be able to rejoin NATO if the embargo is maintained. The need to have both Turkey and Greece play full roles in NATO leads to only one conclusion: that the embargo must be maintained.

We ask you, therefore, in the name of America's security interests abroad, to cast

your vote in support of the Turkish arms embargo.

Sincerely,

Dante B. Fascell, Edward J. Derwinski, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, John Brademas, Charles Rose, Parren J. Mitchell, Norman Y. Mineta, Paul E. Tsongas, Donald M. Fraser, James J. Blanchard, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin A. Gilman, Mario Biaggi, George M. O'Brien, John L. Burton, Robert W. Edgar, Wyche Fowler, Jr., James J. Florio, Norman E. D'Amours, Martin A. Russo, Charles B. Rangel.

---

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This letter is in response to the third letter sent to you by the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey. Their third letter addresses the interrelationship between the arms embargo and our national security.

Arguments made by the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey:

1. The Administration's tilt toward Turkey is shortsighted and extremely dangerous to vital American security interests abroad;

2. A vote to continue the embargo is the only way to bring about the full participation of both Turkey and Greece in NATO.

Counter:

1. There is no "tilt" toward Turkey in United States policy.

We seek to lift the arms embargo against Turkey precisely because we seek to treat our two allies, Turkey and Greece, equally. Today there is an embargo against Turkey, but not Greece, and that is a "tilt" toward Greece.

2. The predominant—if not unanimous—view of defense experts and our defense leaders is that it is essential for our security interests to lift the embargo.

Five former Allied Commanders, all NATO members except Greece and almost all present and past United States military leaders support the lifting of the embargo. Both Presidents Ford and Carter support the lifting of the embargo.

3. The question before the Congress is not whether Turkey remains in NATO, but with what strength.

Turkey, with the second largest standing army in NATO, is of great importance to both the alliance and the United States. But the decline of Turkey's force since the embargo went into effect leaves all of southeastern Europe more vulnerable to Soviet penetration. Conservative intelligence estimates indicate that Turkish forces are today 40 percent combat effective and that if the embargo continues, by 1980 the combat forces in Turkey will be only 20 percent effective. It is doubtful now that the Turks can fulfill their NATO mission.

4. We need both Greece and Turkey in NATO and lifting the embargo is more likely to bring Greece back fully into NATO.

The argument that a vote to continue the embargo is the only way to bring about the full participation of both Turkey and Greece in NATO is patently wrong. The embargo is on today and the result is a severely weakened Turkey and a Greece which partially withdrew from NATO in 1974. We must pursue a policy which encourages both these valued friends and allies to participate fully in NATO, and that requires a policy that treats them equally.

5. Lifting the embargo is in the long term national interest of Greece and United States-Greece relations.

Lifting the embargo may cause short-term strains in our relationship with Greece, but putting behind us the complications of the embargo, which now serves as a wedge between us, will in the long run promote reconciliation between Greece and Turkey.

The Greek Government seeks to maintain a pro-West and pro-NATO stance and we should seek to reinforce those policies. By getting the embargo issue behind us and working for a Cyprus settlement, we will be able to restore trust and confidence to US-Greek relations

6. For both the short and the long run the strategic and military importance of Turkey cannot be minimized.

Since the embargo went into effect, our loss of intelligence on missile tests and troops movements in the Soviet Union has been significant. Our intelligence information in certain key areas covered from Turkey has been degraded by about fifty percent since 1975.

In addition, the strategically important Turkish land mass separates the Soviet Union from the Middle East and the Mediterranean. Today, well over 20 Soviet divisions are tied down by Greece and Turkey. The cooperation of both states is needed to inhibit the Warsaw Pact. Without the full commitment of Turkey to NATO and its full combat readiness, our national interest suffers measurably and American friends in the region, like Israel, are made more vulnerable.

The United States has many important national interests in the Eastern Mediterranean region and we need a carefully orchestrated set of policy initiatives in order to rebuild confidence and trust in our relations with Turkey, Greece and Cyprus. Lifting the embargo is only part of the answer. Striving for a Cyprus settlement is also part of the answer. What is essential is that we start now, with a new approach, to address the present unacceptable situation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

I hope that you agree and will vote to lift the arms embargo against Turkey.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON, M.C.●

---

## SALUTE OF JOHN ERICSSON AND SOLAR ENERGY

### HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a time when many still feel solar energy is exotic and will not be practical for many years into the future, I think it is important to share with my colleagues one of the many accomplishments of John Ericsson.

For today marks the 185th anniversary of the birth of the brilliant inventor who listed among his many contributions to mankind the Sun motor.

Ericsson, a man of great foresight, wrote in 1868:

> I cannot omit adverting to the insignificance of the dynamic energy which the entire exhaustion of our coal fields would produce, compared with the incalculable amount of force at our command, if we avail ourselves of the concentrated heat of the solar rays.

He continued by writing:

> It is true that the solar heat is often prevented from reaching the earth. On the other hand, the skillful engineer knows many ways of laying up a supply when the sky is clear and the great store-house is open, where the fuel may be obtained free of cost and transportation. At the same time, a great portion of our planet enjoys perpetual sunshine. The field therefore awaiting the application of the solar engine is almost beyond computation, while the source of its power is boundless. Who can foresee what influence an inexhaustible motive power will exercise on civilization, and the capability of the earth to supply the wants of our race?

It fascinates me to look back to the mid-19th century and see someone expounding on the potential good of solar commercialization.

We in Government are facing a critical stage in our country's development through the debate over a national energy plan. I hope we do not lose sight of Ericsson's words and deeds for we must make it our national policy to fully develop the vast potential of our greatest resource—the Sun.

Tapping this potential will take the dedication and ingenuity of both the public and private sectors, and only by working together can we realize the promise of this clean, inexhaustible resource.●

---

## EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR THE FOREIGN AID BILL

### HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the foreign assistance appropriations bill will soon come before the House for consideration. As every Member is aware by now, numerous amendments will be offered to reduce funding and to restrict how our assistance may be used in a variety of ways.

I am opposed to these amendments, Mr. Speaker, and for the last week I have been inserting into the RECORD some examples of the many thoughtful and responsible editorials that have been published in newspapers across the Nation opposing these amendments.

Given the volume of editorials that have been written in support of the bill as reported from committee, it has been impossible to include all of them. However, for the benefit of those Members who may not be aware of the extent of editorial support for the bill, I am including in the RECORD at this time a list of newspapers that have indicated their support for it and their opposition to the various amendments that will be offered.

I might add that there is no way of knowing if this list is comprehensive. It includes only those editorials that have come to my attention:

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Boston Globe.
Chicago Sun-Times.
Christian Science Monitor.
Cincinnati Journal.
Des Moines Register.
Houston Post.
Los Angeles Times.
Louisville Courier-Journal.
Miami Herald.
Milwaukee Journal.
Newsday.
New York Times.
Portland Oregonian.
Reading (Penn.) Eagle.
Republican (Minn.) Eagle.
Salt Lake City Tribune.
St. Petersburg Times.
Washington Post.●

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SHOULD RELY ON LOCAL SMALL BUSINESSES

### HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, small businesses in my district and around the country are becoming increasingly concerned because the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) appears to be cutting back on the Federal Government's reliance on small firms for high technology commercial products.

If GSA goes ahead, Federal agencies will find themselves cut off from local repairs, local supplies of replacement parts, and local help in setting up and operating equipment.

Up until now, GSA has negotiated with manufacturers to gain special prices for Federal agency buyers. These prices are then published throughout the Government as the multiple awards schedule. Any manufacturer willing to give the Government a favorable discount is listed in the schedule. Under this multiple awards procedure, local Federal agency buyers purchase from a selection of models and prices. The multiple awards products are available from those local firms which represent the listed manufacturers. But GSA's Federal Supply Service is moving toward awarding sole-source contracts to one rather than a multiple of manufacturers and in doing so forcing Federal agencies to buy direct from the factory rather than through local dealers and distributors.

I feel strongly, as do many Members, that wherever possible, Federal agencies should buy locally. And because the multiple awards schedule gives a preset discount price, I see no reason why GSA should discontinue reliance on local companies as long as these companies adhere to the multiple awards schedule of discount prices.

Right now, this whole matter is being studied by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (Office of Management and Budget) and the General Accounting Office. There is also legislation in the Senate (the Federal Acquisition Act, S. 1264, reported by the Senate Government Affairs Committee) which calls for greater reliance on small businesses for commercial off-the-shelf products.

Because of all of this study, I feel it is inadvisable for the GSA to make further switches fom the multiple awards schedule to single, sole-source awards. Therefore, I am introducing a bill which would place a 2-year moratorium on switches from the multiple awards schedule. This will assure that while the whole matter is being widely studied, Federal agencies will continue to purchase locally from small businesses, that GSA will be restrained from entering into cozy relationships with single manufacturers, and that rather than centralizing all Federal buying decisions under the GSA umbrella, individual agencies will have some latitude to select among items which can be bought at special Federal Government prices.●

## NUCLEAR BALANCE MAY BE EVEN—DO RUSSIANS KNOW IT?

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, writing in the Chicago Tribune of July 25, Peter Reich, the internationally respected science columnist, discusses a subject which I deem especially important in light of strategic arms negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. I commend the article to the attention of the Members:

NUCLEAR BALANCE MAY BE EVEN—DO RUSSIANS KNOW IT?

(By Peter Reich)

Remember the old story about the two guys who are walking in the park when a big, fierce-looking dog runs towards them?

"Don't worry," one guy reassures the other. "See, his tail's wagging. That's a sure sign he won't bite."

To which the other guy, unconvinced, replies, "I know that, and you know that—but does the dog?"

I was reminded of that when Sen. John Culver [D., Iowa] released an unclassified Central Intelligence Agency analysis of the Soviet Union's civil defense system the other day.

The analysis concluded, he said, that the Soviet civil defense system does not provide sufficient protection to encourage the U.S.S.R. to risk starting a nuclear war.

Specifically, Sen. Culver said, the study shows that Soviet civil defense efforts "are not sufficient to prevent millions of casualties and massive industrial damage in the event of a nuclear war."

Thus, the senator argued, "Soviet [civil defense] programs are not enough to tip the strategic balance against us."

The senator forgot to mention a few facts.

For example, it is generally agreed that the Soviet Union today has about 600 more intercontinental ballistic missiles on station, capable of hitting the United States, than we have ICBMs capable of striking them. What's more, the Soviet missiles are bigger, longer-ranged, and carry heavier, much more powerful nuclear warheads.

The Soviets also have pulled ahead of the United States in submarine launched ballistic missiles—an area in which we for many years had held the lead.

We still are ahead in manned, intercontinental-range bombers—but our Strategic Air Command's B-52s are aging fast, and, since President Carter decided not to build the B-1, we have nothing to replace them.

It seems to me, then, that when Sen. Culver talks about civil defense not tipping "the strategic balance against us," he forgets that the balance already teeters toward the Soviet side.

Ergo, how much more would it take to convince some future Soviet hothead that a nuclear war would be far less devastating for the Soviet Union than for the United States—and tempt him to push the button?

Sen. Culver also seems to forget that what really matters is not how much retaliatory force we have now, but how much we will have left after Russian missiles clobber us.

If a substantial portion of our land-based missiles, and at least some of our manned bombers, are wiped out by a Soviet first strike, is it not possible that the same hypothetical Russian hothead might conclude that the U.S.S.R.'s civil defense gives him just the edge he needs to come out ahead in a nuclear exchange?

"Despite widespread claims that Soviet leaders might launch a nuclear attack because they expect to suffer only moderate damage and few casualties . . . the professional judgment of our intelligence community is that they would not be emboldened to expose their country to a higher risk of nuclear attack," Sen. Culver asserts.

He contends that a U.S. retaliatory strike would "devastate the Soviet Union and kill more than 100 million people."

A lot of military people disagree. They figure United States dead would top 100 million, but they think Soviet casualties—because of such things as dispersal of factories, anti-missile missiles, very good anti-aircraft defense [including superb jet interceptors], plus civil defense measures—might turn out to be a lot less.

The Soviet Union, many people seem to have forgotten, suffered some 25 million dead in World War II.

Yet the country survived, and emerged victorious. So, how many casualties would its Communist leaders deem "acceptable" in a future war that could spell the end of the United States? ●

## ARSON CONTROL IN SEATTLE

### Hon. John E. (Jack) Cunningham

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since I represent a portion of the city of Seattle, I point with pride to the greatest job done by our city in the field of arson control. One year ago, I was privileged to have a Seattle firefighter on my Washington, D.C., staff, Mr. Bob Clark of West Seattle. Bob acquainted me and my staff with the efforts of the city to control the growing disease of arson.

Now these efforts have been nationally recognized, in the Washington Post for July 29, 1978, in an article by Mr. Neal R. Pierce. In submitting his remarks to my colleagues and hope that we learn from this local community that all solutions do not, and cannot, come from Washington, D.C.:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1978]

IN SEATTLE "IF YOU START A FIRE, YOU'RE GOING TO GET CAUGHT"

(By Neal R. Peirce)

SEATTLE.—While headlines proclaim that arson is spreading like a prairie fire, this city has demonstrated how concerted action can dramatically reduce arson incidents and the losses to property—and often life—that go with it.

Only a handful of other cities—among them Houston, Los Angeles, New York's South Bronx, Boston and Lynn, Mass.—have launched anti-arson campaigns in any way comparable ot Seattle's. But the formula, explains City Councilman Randy Revelle, is deceptively simple:

"Make arson a priority crime. Establish a specialized arson unit within the fire department; combine its investigative work with that of the police department. Provide arson investigations training—that's absolutely critical. And involve local insurance companies and the media in anti-arson campaigns."

Richard Hargett, commander of "Marshal 5," the Seattle Fire Department's arson unit, says that by 1975 arson had become "the

most serious problem facing the fire force." Between 1971 and 1974, losses in Seattle had soared from $621,000 to $3.2 million. It was feared they would hit $4.4 million in 1975.

But with its new program, Seattle reduced fire losses to $2.6 million in 1975. Last year the figure was down to only $1.7 million and will probably be less in 1978. Arson incidents were down while arrests and convictions went up: In 1974, there were 622 arson incidents, with only 73 arrests; last year, incidents were down to 518, arrests up to 217, and 196 of those arrests resulted in convictions.

Seattle's turnaround stands in stark contrast to the epidemic-like spread of arson nationwide. The insurance industry estimates that national losses last year were close to $4 billion, up from only $634 million in 1975 and a mere $68 million a decade before. Arson accounts for 40 percent of all property losses, the insurers believe, and now kills about 1,000 people a year and injures 10,000 more.

How did Seattle turn the table on the arsonists?

The credit begins with Fire Chief Frank Hansen, who reasoned that the causes of arson were so complex that no single "cure" would work. So he persuaded then-mayor Wes Uhlman to set up a task force including representatives of the city fire and police departments, the mayor and city council, the county prosecutor, Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the state's insurance council.

Early on, the task force discovered arsonists had good reason to believe they would get away with it. Nationally, for every 100 cases of known or suspected arson, only nine persons are arrested, only two are convicted and seldom is anyone actually jailed. The reason: Arson is difficult to detect because incriminating evidence, such as fingerprints, is often destroyed in the fire.

But Hansen publicly laid down the gauntlet to would-be arsonists. Many city and private agencies would be watching them, he said. "From now on, if you start a fire, you're going to get caught And when you're caught, you're going to jail."

Delivering on that promise required tackling a problem that has plagued effective anti-arson work everywhere, lack of cooperation between police and fire departments. Typically both agencies claim authority, but neither gives arson proper attention or manpower.

Fire fighters rarely have the investigative skills to solve the more sophisticated cases, and police find arson "unglamorous" compared with robbery and murder. Jurisdictional confusion means neither department pursues arson to the point of prosecution.

Hansen solved the problem by convincing the police to give the fire department authority over arson from initial investigation through prosecution. But he persuaded the police to assign to the fire department two detectives to assist in investigations. Police/fire department tensions melted away; today, police and fire fighters share tips on arson and other crimes and the police often back up the fire department with assistance in surveillance and stakeouts and use of police helicopters, district patrol cars and communications systems.

Training for all arson-squad members includes basic law-enforcement techniques and sophisticated crime labwork. The Marshal 5 squad investigates all fires causing over $1,000 damage, and can crack seemingly insolvable arson cases. "Arsonists tend to believe they have destroyed all traces of their crime in the flames; what they fail to realize and what gives us the edge is that the very ashes that are left are where we find our clues," says Inspector Jack Higham.

The motives for arson are several: A business competitor or a disgruntled employee or even a shunned lover may seek revenge. A burglar or murderer may try to cover up another crime. A child playing with matches may be mentally disturbed or making a bid for attention. A would-be "hero" may set fires to receive accolades for discovering them. "Arson is just another means of assault," Hargett says. "It's less risky—there's no face-to-face conflict. The chances of being identified are almost nil."

Finally, there's arson for profit by financially troubled businessmen or homeowners seeking to collect insurance money. Despite the publicity surrounding such events as the arrest of 33 "respected" Bostonians in an arson ring last year, the number of fraud fires is actually small. But the dollar losses are great.

Seattle attacked the motives one by one. Since 50 percent of Seattle fires were set by juveniles, reaching them was a top priority. A United Way agency was hired to counsel children who displayed an "unusual" interest in fire; the fire department created an "arson rat" as the symbol of arsonists and received more than 5,000 entries in a campaign to name him. The winning entry: "Sinder Sid."

Neighborhoods and business districts with high arson rates were identified; each night between 11 p.m. and 3 a.m. fire fighters travel through them in highly visible vehicles, clearly marked "Community Fire Alert/Arson Patrol." The patrol operates on tips from private citizens, employees of ailing businesses, or health and liquor inspectors who may learn that a bar or restaurant owner is contemplating arson. "If we've been given a tip a building might burn or see four garbage-can fires in a small area, it's often a way for us to catch arsonists and put out a fire quickly," Hargett says. The presence of vehicles with red lights on top and spotlights makes some residents nervous, "but we want everyone to know they're there," he adds.

Insurance companies agreed to withhold payment of large-loss fire claims when the policyholder may have been responsible. And the benefits of the Seattle effort spread statewide when the insurance industry set up a $5,000 pot to reward "secret witnesses" and underwrote a statewide toll-free arson hotline. The program is particularly valuable to small towns where residents often don't know who to call to report information, or are afraid of being traced.

Finally, Seattle newpapers and television stations cooperated in a long-term publicity campaign about the arson problem and the success of investigations. A four-week television series on arson produced by a local station even won an award for investigative reporting.

But the cost to the taxpayers of the entire Seattle effort is only $100,000 a year. It's an investment even the most ferocious taxpayers' association might find worthwhile.●

---

## AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION EFFORT SUPPORTED BY 2,500 PILOTS

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, It is important that I call the attention of the House to a telegram which I have received today concerning H.R. 8729, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act; and H.R. 11986, which the Rules Committee is considering as title III of H.R. 8729. The telegram is indicative of the broad support this bill has among labor as well as industry and public officials. The telegram follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
*July 27, 1978.*

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

2,500 pilots of Pan-Am urge your support for H.R. 8729 and H.R. 11986 as written.

Captain PR METCALF,
*Chairman, Pan American Master Executive Council.*●

---

## FDA'S PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON ANTIBIOTICS: CONGRESS OBJECTIVES—PART III

### HON. CHARLES ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to submit the first part of a report, "Antibiotics in Animal Feeds: Risk vs. Benefit," outlining the history of FDA's proposed restrictions on the subtherapeutic use of antibiotics in animal feed. The information contained in this very well-done editorial feature was distributed by Watt Publishing Co., and written by Ian McNett and R. Frank Frazier. It speaks for itself. Part IV shall present the second part of this report dealing with the scientific and economic concerns:

ANTIBIOTICS IN FEED: RISK VERSUS BENEFIT

PROPOSED BAN—A VEXING MAZE OF POLITICS, SCIENCE, AND ECONOMICS

Dr. Donald Kennedy, FDA Commissioner: "Our actions should be viewed as a first step toward FDA's ultimate goal of eliminating, to the extent possible, non-therapeutic use in animals of any drugs needed to treat disease in man."

The U.S. Food & Drug Administration is proposing restrictions on the use of antibiotics in animal feed.

Some experts think these restrictions threaten modern, mechanized production of poultry and red meat. Producers would have to spend more for feed and consumers would have to pay more for meat, even though the quality would be lower. This would contribute to inflation.

As with any issue concerning food and human health, this one stands a good chance of becoming obscurred in a blizzard of fear, rhetoric, and supposition. But, the basic question remains: Do the health and economic benefits of using antibiotics in animal feed outweigh the risks to human health of their continued use?

The proposed restrictions of penicillin and the tetracyclines have already prompted three Congressional hearings, a study by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, a request for another study by the National Academy of Sciences, threats of court action, and a great deal of concern in the poultry, meat, and animal health industries.

The controversy probably will last several years before the administrative and judicial machinery grinds to a conclusion.

The economic implications are substantial.

One integrated broiler producer and processor from Maryland's Eastern Shore estimates that the proposed regulation of penicillin, which he uses in broiler feed, would increase his costs by $100,000 annually.

Robert K. Wagstaff told the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the House Agri-

culture Committee that costs would increase $600,000 if penicillin and tetracyclines could not be used in the treatment of broilers, and if substitutes were not available. Wagstaff is executive vice president of Golden Pride, Inc., Berlin, Md. He estimated that the subtherapeutic (low level) use of a variety of antibiotic compounds yielded annual economic benefits of $4,778,000 to Golden Pride, Inc.

FDA'S JUSTIFICATION

Just eight days after he assumed office, FDA Commissioner Donald Kennedy announced that he had decided to restrict the use of penicillin and tetracyclines in animal feed, although the process leading to his decision had been in the works for seven years. Dr. Kennedy said, "The theoretical possibility that drug-resistant pathogens can be produced by antibiotic selection has become a real threat with the emergence of human disease (typhoid and childhood meningitis) caused by ampicillin- and chloramphenicol-resistant *Salmonella and Haemophilus*.

"The point is," he continued, "that known routes of transfer exist by which antibiotic use in animals can contribute to such threats."

However, Dr. Kennedy said he was not suggesting that typhoid and childhood meningitis were caused by strains of bacteria that gained their resistance through the use of antibiotics in animal feeds.

THE BRIEF FOR CONTINUED USE

Representatives of the meat production industry, animal health scientists, and the drug industry, claim that Dr. Kennedy's hypothesis is refuted by more than 25 years' experience in the use of antibiotics in animal feed.

"So far as we are aware, there is no evidence that these low-level uses, which have been practiced for nearly 30 years, have created any human hazards," Edward H. Covell, chairman of the board, National Broiler Council, testified before the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee.

Apparently, the antibiotics do not even cause long-term resistance in animals that eat them. Thomas H. Jukes, professor of medical physics, University of California, said, ". . . When we first started to use (antibiotics) I thought that they would be only good for a year or two and then resistance would catch up and their use would die off. However, to our astonishment, for some reason this did not happen. The animals kept responding year after year."

Dr. Kennedy conceded that "we can point to no specific instance in which human disease is more difficult to treat because drug resistance has arisen from an animal source." He maintains however, that "it is likely such problems could have gone unnoticed."

Dr. C. D. Van Houweling, director, FDA's Bureau of Veterinary Medicine, speculates that the bacteria which become resistant may not be the ones on which antibiotics work to produce a growth effect. He cited experiments in which oxytetracycline was fed in the same pig operation for 15 years. "The results at the tail end were as good as at the beginning; there was no evidence of reduced effectiveness," Van Houweling said in an interview.

THE NEXT STEPS

The proposals to restrict the use of penicillin and tetracyclines are merely a step along a road that we took seven years ago. We could continue down this road for another six years. Publication of the proposed regulations in the *Federal Register* gives affected parties an opportunity to ask for hearings.

Manufacturers of affected products almost certainly will request hearings, according to Fred Holt, executive vice president of the Animal Health Institute, a trade association of companies that manufacture animal drugs.

Dr. Van Houweling has said that the FDA would prefer not to hold hearings. It must determine whether the issue raised is sufficiently material to justify holding hearings, he said.

Despite its reluctance, FDA now feels it must hold hearings anyway. When it decided not to hold hearings on withdrawing approval for the use of DES (diethylstilbestrol, a synthetic hormone which causes cancer in rats when used in high concentrations) its decision was successfully challenged in court.

The hearings could stretch out for a year or two, Dr. Van Houweling said. After all the facts were presented, an administrative law judge would make a recommendation to the Commissioner, who could accept or reject it. Any final decision by the Commissioner could be challenged in court. Once into the judicial process, with many opportunities for delay and appeal, another three or five years could be consumed before the issue was finally resolved, Dr. Van Houweling said.

Commissioner Kennedy announced his decision April 15, 1977. Within the next few months the following Congressional actions occurred:

Rep. Charles Rose (D-N.C.), chairman of the House Agriculture Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee, held three days of hearings on antibiotics and other food issues.

Sen. Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.), chairman of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, asked the Office of Technology Assessment to undertake a thorough study of the use of drugs and chemicals as feed additives.

Rep. John Moss (D-Calif.) held hearings before his House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the FDA's regulation of antibiotics used in animal feed. Chairman Rose was among those who testified.

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) held hearings September 21 and 22 in his Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation.

The General Accounting Office issued a report that sharply criticized FDA for moving too slowly on the issue of antibiotics-in-feed. In addition, GAO criticized FDA for using its National Advisory Food & Drug Committee to study and make recommendations on a technical issue. The committee was created to deliberate on broader policy ranges, the GAO report said. The GAO investigation and report had been requested by Rep. Moss.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Chairman Rose characterized his hearings as a fact-finding effort. Witnesses were invited from FDA, from the dairy, poultry and red meat industries, from drug companies, from consumer groups, and from the agricultural scientific community. Rose said he believes "there should be a clear ability for the poultry business and agribusiness generally to use antibiotics and other necessary drugs in feeding animals."

Rose said in a key point emerged in the hearings: "Dr. Kennedy feels that while there has been no evidence of resistant pathogens harmful to humans resulting from the subtherapeutic feeding of antibiotics to animals over the past quarter century, there is a theoretical possibility that it could occur and that therefore he has a moral responsibility to guard against that theoretical possibility.

"As a member of the legislative branch, my immediate reaction to that has been and still is that God help us if the executive branch is now setting forth to save us from theoretical possibilities and not from clear and present dangers that are currently in front of us."

Chairman Rose said he plans no further hearings, but would not be "bashful" about holding more if the situation called for it. He said he asked the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council to study the issue with funding support from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The Academy was willing to do the study, but USDA asked that it wait until other studies now under way are completed. Rose also asked the Office of Technology Assessment to evaluate what impact the proposed ban would have on the dairy and poultry industries.

THE OTA ASSESSMENT

Congress established the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) to provide it with objective, scientific information about important technological issues. Behind the establishment of the OTA was a suspicion of the objectivity of executive branch experts, on whom Congress had relied in the past for scientific information.

The OTA study of animal feed additives will be a broad-gauged investigation of the benefits and risks. Principal investigator for the study is Dr. T. C. Byerly, a prominent animal health scientist, who formerly served as USDA's Assistant Director for Science and Education.

OTA will analyze thoroughly the available evidence on the benefits and risks of using drugs as feed additives. In a major departure the OTA will analyze the economic impact that banning the use of drugs in feed will have on the structure of the poultry and meat industry.

Walter Wilcox, project leader of the OTA study, said it would have three aspects: "One, we will try to integrate and look at all the information, both pro and con, all at once, not just one side. Two, we will try to get all the latest information, published or unpublished. And three, we will try and make a better benefit/risk evaluation than has ever been done."

J. B. Cordaro, program manager of the study and the first draft of the study would be ready by the end of March, with the final draft expected in late June, 1978. The report will list the options open to Congress for improving regulations of drugs used as animal feed additives.

The persons interviewed for this article were not prepared to say in what direction legislation affecting the regulation of feed additives might go. While not commenting on specific legislative proposals, Cordaro noted that the question of antibiotics in animal feeds was part of a larger issue that embraced the use of saccharine, environmental contaminants, and other drugs.

Cordaro said, "The danger as I see it is that in every instance where there is a specific chemical or a specific food additive, Congress will set itself up as the arbiter and try to legislate. My personal judgement is that that's not the way the issue ought to be handled."

THE CONTENDERS

The issue of antibiotics in animal feeds has been chewed over for a half dozen years, but not much interest has been evoked from the public, the press, or consumer groups. No consumer or environmental advocates turned up at the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee hearings or a September, 1977 public proceeding of OTA. Chairman Rose said he had heard no "consumer outcry," demanding the regulation of antibiotics in animal feed.

Generally, the issue has pitted the Food and Drug Administration against the animal production and animal health industries. Knowledgable observers in Washington expect Commissioner Kennedy to stick to his guns on the issue.

Representatives of the poultry, red meat, and animal health industries turned out in force for the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee hearings and the OTA proceeding. They can be expected to fight the FDA proposals to the last ditch.

The political climate in the country and in Washington has changed substantially in the 25 years since antibiotics were first used in animal feeds.

The past 10 years have witnessed the growth of the environmental and consumer movements.

Consumer advocates represent both a danger and an opportunity for those who benefit from the use of antibiotics in animal feed. Consumers are interested in health and pocketbook issues. A few years ago, consumers were picketing supermarkets in a protest against high meat prices, which are likely to occur again if the use of antibiotics is severely restricted.

Carol Forbes, counsel to the House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee, said she believes that consumers can be reached on the antibiotic issue. She noted the need to distinguish between synthetic chemical food additives that are potentially cancer-producing and antibiotics which occur in nature and do not cause cancer.

In addition to the volatile potential represented by consumer advocates, there is another trend in the political climate. That is a questioning of the scope, powers and roles of the regulatory agencies. Indeed, there are proposals to break up FDA by sending its food divisions to USDA. In addition, there is a sizeable and growing body of opinion that the federal government does entirely too much regulating. This is balanced by a large body of opinion that more, not less, regulation is needed to protect consumers from dangers, health hazards and fraud in an increasingly complex society and economy.

Generally, the forecast for the feed additive issue is an extended period of political turbulence. There will be conflicting viewpoints on the scientific, economic, legal and political aspects of the issue. From these conflicting views the public must sort out the facts.●

## AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the July 31 issue of the Washington Post has in its lead editorial laid out in a concise way the very serious problem of declining productivity in American industry.

The Post notes that we are dropping behind other countries, at a time of stiffening competition from abroad. The editorial expresses concern over deteriorating productivity, a view that I have been espousing for some time.

The Post piece is an excellent capsulized summary of this alarming trend in our productivity. I urge my colleagues to read this review, and to note particularly that the Post suggests that Congress may want to cut the capital gains tax to stimulate investment in productive facilities.

Text of the Post editorial is as follows:

AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY

Throughout most of the years since World War II, productivity in the American economy has risen briskly. As it went up, it carried with it people's earnings and standards of living. But the rise began to slacken about a decade ago, and for the past year and a half there has been hardly any rise at all. Of, all the changes overtaking the American economy, the behavior of productivity is one of the most peculiar—and one of the most disquieting.

The immediate consequence of no productivity gains is that inflation will become harder than ever to control. But if the present pattern continues, it will also ignite uncomfortable political questions about dividing the pie in a country that has come to expect, and to count on, steady increases in both public and private wealth. Nobody really knows why productivity has stopped rising. All explanations are, to one degree or another, speculative. But the evidence suggests that it is no minor passing blip on the chart. The causes seem to lie deep in the changing structure of the national economy.

Productivity is simply the average output per hour of labor. The Labor Department computes it every three months, and it has just published the figures for the spring quarter of this year. They show that productivity was rising at the minuscule rate of 0.1 percent a year, after having fallen during the winter. Through the 1950's and most of the 1960's, it was going up at an impressive pace of nearly 3 percent a year. In the years after 1968, the trend dropped to half that rate Since late 1976, it has been almost flat.

That departure is consistent with two other surprises. Inflation has been running considerably higher in recent months than most people expected, and unemployment has been considerably lower. Output over the past year has been raised by putting more people on payrolls, not by improving each person's capacity to produce.

It's a striking departure, and one explanation may well lie in the rather low rates at which business has been investing new capital. That, in turn, may be the result of low profits. Another possibility is the cost of the new environmental and safety rules, requiring industry to invest heavily in equipment to control air and water pollution.

Whatever the influences controlling productivity, they vary enormously from one country to another. In international competition, the United States is currently not doing well. The following brief table compares the increases in productivity in manufacturing, for the decade 1967–77, among some of the major industrial powers:

United States 27 percent, France 72, West Germany 70, Italy 62, Japan 107, Canada 43, Great Britain 27.

There is a tendency in this country to regard Britain as the world's great example of industrial decline. But you will note that the rate of productivity gain in British factories over the past 10 years has been the same as in American factories.

Since no one is quite sure why the American rate has fallen, no one is in a position to offer a sure remedy. But these latest productivity figures may well strengthen the impulse in Congress to cut taxes on capital gains, in an effort to increase investment. Beyond that, it's also necessary to consider the possibility that some of this change may lie beyond the reach of government policy. A good many Americans' ideas about work, incomes and economic growth began to change around 1968. These new attitudes may now be showing up in the statistics on the nation's economic performance.●

## GOLD MEDAL STUDENTS RECEIVE GOLD MEDAL

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year the eighth world music contest was held in Kerkrade, Holland, during the separate periods of June 24 to 25, July 1 to 2, 8 to 9, and 15 and 16. The World Music Festival lasted nearly a month and is held every 4 years under the auspices of the National and International Music Federations. It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, for me to have in my congressional district the South Broward High School which is located in Hollywood, Fla. The South Broward High School band and its Browardettes drill team participated in the World Music Festival this year and was a gold medal winner.

The hard work of the teachers, students, parents, and the many others which resulted in this victory is to be commended. In fact, it is with great pride that I, myself, am able to tell my colleagues of this outstanding achievement and the winning of this gold medal by the students of the South Broward High School marching band and drill team, since in doing so they had to compete with 27 other bands from throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for me and others, to congratulate and to offer our plaudits to these young people who won this honor, but I am sure all of my colleagues know that champions become champions because of their desire, hard work, and willingness to overcome the many difficult obstacles that are placed in their paths. Champions, in other words, are not born, they are molded together by desire, and hard work, and by overcoming those who say "It cannot be done." The champions that I am talking about had to raise funds for their trip. They had to plan and work long and hard, not only by practicing, but by participating in many community fundraising affairs. To raise the money needed for their transportation, the students and members of the band as well as others held car washes, spaghetti dinners, participated in raising art objects for sale at flea markets and solicited moneys from public and private groups. I am sure the thrill of winning at this international competition will be a lifelong memory for all the students, parents, and teachers who participated and cannot be replaced, and thus, the effort was well worth every ounce expended. The students while on tour visited Holland, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Austria; and in each town and place they visited they gave performances in the town square which brought happiness and delight to thousands of people who came to see this great high school band and drill team from the United States. The students, as young people generally are, were warm, friendly, and exuberant and their attitude indicated their pride in themselves and in the country from whence they came.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, in order to become a champion, it takes hard work and with this group of young people this was no exception. Before they could even participate in the World Music Festival in Holland, where they won a gold medal, they had to first participate and win in competition with other bands from the United States. It was from this partici-

pation and competition with these other bands that they were selected as one of the 10 outstanding school bands in the United States and was thereby justifiably invited to participate in the World Music Festival contest. In winning the gold medal, they did so by outperforming 27 other bands from nations throughout the world. And finally, during the performances on July 8 and 9 in the finals, they openly disclosed their own mettle by winning the gold medal over the other 27 bands from throughout the world. Thus, the 178 students who participated with the South Broward High School Band and Browardettes Drill Team brought everlasting fame not only to their own high school but to the city of Hollywood, Fla., and indeed, to the entire United States. But the students alone, like all champions had to be molded in the crucible of champions by others and in this case by, Edward Parsons, the band director, and by Lynn Baker, the drill team director, and by Elizabeth Bousfield, principal of South Broward High School. I am confident the students will agree that without the guidance of so many outstanding people, Edward Parsons, Lynn Baker, and Elizabeth Bousfield, and the assistance and guidance of so many others that their victory which they so gallantly won would not have been possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride, therefore, that I congratulate these outstanding students of South Broward High School, Edward Parsons their band director; Lynn Baker, director of the Browardettes Drill Team and the other faculty members, students, directors, parents and the many boosters who helped in so many ways not only in raising funds for the trip, but also by the love and encouragement which made this outstanding feat possible for the champions.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I submit herewith the separate names of the South Broward High School Band students and the South Broward High School Browardettes majorettes and to each individually, I extend my sincere congratulations. The names of those who are individually and as a group, champion "gold medal" winners in their own right are:

SOUTH BROWARD HIGH SCHOOL BAND STUDENTS

Nancy Adams, Sec., Steve Adler, Georgene Avitabile, Debbie Barrow, Dan Block, Joanne Bolly, Band Manager, Chuck Bowers, Wes Bowers, Carrie Burckhartt, Patty Cagney, Pam Carey, 2nd Lt., Anne Catalano, Lory Chadwick, Jeff Coats.

Dan Collodel, Andy Cowdery, Denise Davis, Phillip Davis, Chantal Desrosiers, John Dewild, Mike Dorsey, Carl Dubberly, Jane Foody, Richard Fray, Jim Garand, Jean Garand, Ken Garand, Colleen Gibbons, Roger Golden.

Jon Goodman, Sharon Gordon, Mike Grandinetti, Jeanette Guker, Shirley Guker, Mark Hancock, Capt., Regina Harrison, Rhonda Hartmann, Katrina Hayes, Tony Hayes.

Roger Kobert, Sean Heston, Cindy Jennessee, 1st Lt., Richard Johnson, Drum Major, Wendy Landon, Chris Jordan, Karen Kine, Beth Krothenberg, Mark Lawson, Sean Lawson, Kim Landon.

Brinda LaRiviere, Scott Levy, Todd Lewis, Al Lexow, Brian Lisle, Kregg Lupo, Sgt. at Arms, Mike Lynch, Russ Madio, Kathy Marsh, Pete Marsh, Sharon Miner, Danny Moran, Curtis Noble.

Debra Parsons, Kelly Padgett, Kirk Pappa, Jim Parker, Mary Phillips, Leslie Phipps, David Quillen, Karen Quillen, Ruth Quillen, Jerome Ravenna, Jim Renn, Ray Rivet, Bob Ross, Jim Sanders, Cindy Santamaria, Treas.

Doug Sherron, Randy Shopoff, Jim Silvernale, Brad Smith, Richard Smith, Pete Sobota, Kathy Sprague, Dave Stewart, Colleen Sullivan, Shelley Talotta, Danny Teixeira, Suzy Tieger, Tony Turturici, Greg Vazquez, David Walters, Jackie Zenobia, Mrs. Olive LaRiviere, Pres. Parents Assoc.

BROWARDETTES MAJORETTES

Julie Arendas, Deanna Lee Baker, Laura Ann Barbato, Cynthia Bartlett, Robin Belew, Elaine Chernoff, Teri Lynn Coats, Jean Elizabeth Cobb, Beverly Cook, Linda Corriveau.

Cheri Lea Cory, Kathy Lynn Farmer, Cindy Fatout, Julie Anne Fields, Sandra Foster, Shari Ann Gooden, Janice Lynn Goodman, Kimberly Groat, Beth Hartzell, Tracy Hilton, Brentley Hlay, Kathleen Ingallinera, Gina Itzkowitz, Mary Ann Keener, Kathryn Kelly.

Georgeanne Kohn, Tami Larro, Barbara Losh, Mary Ann Masuzzo, Carrie Meek, Maua Milcyzynski, Denise Mongo, Michelle Mongo, Elizabeth Nugent, Sharon Pakula, Antonia Protano.

Catherine Reside, Elizabeth Roberto, Kathy Rogers, Cindy Ellen Roth, Jacauelin Rusciano, Carol Sadler, Lisa Janine Sharp, Carla Simmons, Marva Simmons, Kerry Spaeth, Deanna Stenger, Kimberly Wayne, Mr. Jim Hilton, Pres. Parents Assoc.●

## WHY DOES $2.20 PER BUSHEL CORN FROM IOWA SUDDENLY BECOME WORTH $6 IN ROTTERDAM?

### HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, agricultural exports make a sizable and significant positive contribution to the balance of payments of the United States. Exports are important to farmers in Iowa and other parts of the country. However, the question keeps coming up as to why corn which sells for $2.20 per bushel in Iowa sells for $6 per bushel in Rotterdam. An excellent article appeared in the July 22, 1978, edition of the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman addressing this subject. The article details the costs associated with the various marketing phases needed to get corn from Iowa to Rotterdam, Japan, and Odessa, Russia. It is important to note the variable levy applied by the European Economic Community which keeps the price of corn arriving in Rotterdam at $6 per bushel no matter what it sells for in Iowa. The text of the article follows:

WHY DOES $2.20 PER BUSHEL CORN FROM IOWA SUDDENLY BECOME WORTH $6 IN ROTTERDAM

(By Robert N. Wisner, C. Phillip Baumel and John A. Wallize)

After finishing corn planting in May, a Greene county farmer's attention turned to old crop corn still in storage. Prices had moved up a bit and he'd heard a nearby elevator was buying corn for shipment to Europe.

The bid at the local elevator was $2.20 per bushel in mid-May. But the Greene county farmer learned of another price from a market report in his reading materials that had accumulated during the planting season. That item was the price of corn in Rotterdam—the destination for corn he was selling to a nearby elevator. Rotterdam prices were an astonishing $6 per bushel.

How could his corn sell in Europe for almost three times as much as the local price? He wondered and asked questions.

The Greene county farmer asked enough questions to reach the Iowa Farm Bureau headquarters in Des Moines and marketing specialists at Iowa State University. The main question: How can corn from West Central Iowa sell for more than $6 per bushel in Rotterdam?

Here's the answer: First, after paying the farmer $2.20 for the corn, the country elevator must add 5 to 10 cents per bushel as a merchandising margin. This margin covers interest, insurance and handling costs of the corn, any shrinkage or change in grade that may occur, taxes, labor expenses, penalties the elevator must pay for late delivery, overhead costs and, of course, the elevator's profit.

The merchandising margin varies with transportation and supply-demand conditions, and in mid-May was a bit larger than usual. A shortage of railroad cars was creating the risk of penalities for late deliveries. In addition, country elevators faced increased storage costs and lower export bids for shipments that would be delayed to 8 weeks. Merchandising margins tended to increase to cover these added costs. Margins shown in Table 1 are based on reports from trade sources and are believed to be reasonably typical, but may not cover all situations.

UNIT TRAINS

Usually, the least expensive way to move large volumes of grain from Central and Western Iowa to Rotterdam is by 75-car rail shipments to the Gulf of Mexico export elevators. In May, the 75-car rail rate to the Gulf was 37.2 cents per bushel from West Central Iowa. This rate increased to 38.6 cents per bushel on June 17.

Not all Iowa elevators can use the 75-car rates. Some may have the rate available, but don't have the facilities to load that many cars. If the elevator must ship at a more costly rate, the elevator operator has to either reduce merchandising margins or reduce bids to farmers—or a combination of the two.

In May, the 50-car rate from West Central Iowa to the Gulf was 39.5 cents—2.3 cents per bushel higher; the 25-car rate was 42.3 cents or 5.1 cents per bushel more than the 75-car rate; and the single car rate was 47.3 cents or more than 10 cents a bushel higher. These rates increased about 2 cents per bushel on June 17.

The elevator assembling the Rotterdam shipment was using the 75-car rate. But with its merchandising margin and freight to the Gulf, the cost of $2.20 corn rose to $2.67 per bushel as it arrived at the Gulf port by rail.

EXPORT ELEVATOR

At the export elevator, additional costs and marketing margins are involved. The port elevator's markup is much like the country elevator's merchandising margin—except that costs can be higher. Markups at this point cover demurrage—a charge beyond the time allowed for loading and unloading or sailing on ships waiting to be loaded, demurrage on rail cars or barges waiting to be unloaded, the costs of receiving, handling, inspecting, official grading and loading out the grain, as well as interest, insurance and overhead costs, shrinkage and grade changes.

TABLE 1.—MID-MAY CORN PRICES AND MARKETING COSTS FROM IOWA TO OVERSEAS MARKETS

[Via Gulf ports]

| | West central Iowa to— | | | East central Iowa to— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Japan | Rotterdam | Odessa, Russia | Japan | Rotterdam | Odessa, Russia |
| Corn price per bushel | $2.20 | $2.20 | $2.20 | $2.22 | $2.22 | $2.22 |
| Country elevator margin | 0.05–0.10 | 0.05–0.10 | 0.05–0.10 | 0.05–0.10 | 0.05–0.10 | 0.05–0.10 |
| Freight costs to ports | .372 | 0.372 | .372 | 0.35–0.55 | 0.35–0.55 | 0.35–0.55 |
| Total | 2.622–2.672 | 2.622–2.672 | 2.622–2.672 | 2.62–2.87 | 2.62–1.87 | 2.62–2.87 |
| Port elevator margin | 0.08–0.22 | 0.08–0.22 | 0.08–0.22 | 0.08–0.22 | 0.08–0.22 | 0.08–0.22 |
| Ocean freight | .287 | 0.152 | .406 | 0.287 | 0.152 | .406 |
| Unloading margin | 0.08–0.20 | 0.08–0.20 | 0.08–0.20 | 0.08–0.20 | 0.08–0.20 | 0.08–0.20 |
| Total | 3.069–3.379 | 2.934–3.244 | 3.188–3.498 | 3.067–3.577 | 2.932–3.442 | 3.186–3.696 |
| Variable levy | 0 | 2.77 | 0 | 0 | 2.77 | 0 |
| Approximate price to foreign buyers | 3.069–3.379 | 5.704–6.014 | 3.188–3.498 | 3.067–3.577 | 5.702–6.212 | 3.186–3.696 |

There's also the export elevator profit and costs of required air pollution control equipment. Trade sources indicate marketing margins at the Gulf generally range from 8 to 22 cents per bushel for corn. Here again, strong demand, limited handling capacity and transportation problems boost costs and tend to widen the margins.

In mid-May, marketing margins at Gulf ports reportedly were at or near the upper end of this range because of heavy shipments and transportation problems. The loss of two Gulf port elevators from explosions last December also increased congestion at the remaining elevators and contributed to wider than normal margins.

Table 1 spells out the costs of moving grain from West Central and Eastern Iowa to three overseas destinations. This article concentrates on the second column of that table—moving grain from West Central Iowa to Rotterdam via the Gulf of Mexico.

The other columns provide comparisons on cost to Japan and Russia. Transportation from Eastern Iowa to the Gulf is based on unregulated truck-barge rates, which fluctuate with changing supply and demand conditions.

Total costs for the Greene county corn were about $2.89 per bushel at the export elevator as it was being loaded into ships in mid-May.

Next, ocean freight must be added to get the grain to foreign buyers. In mid-May corn could be moved from the Gulf of Mexico to Rotterdam for just over 15 cents a bushel. It cost nearly 29 cents to move it to Japan and about 41 cents to Odessa, Russia, on the Black Sea in United States' flag ships. Shipping cost to Odessa via foreign flag lines generally would be about 5 cents per bushel cheaper.

Our grain from Greene county is now approaching Rotterdam and is valued at more than $3 per bushel.

At Rotterdam, another markup is added at the receiving elevator—an unloading charge. Trade sources indicate it ranges from 8 to 20 cents per bushel and involves costs similar to those encountered at U.S. ports.

Figuring the maximum costs within the ranges given, the $2.20 corn from Greene county is now valued at nearly $3.25 a bushel in the elevator at Rotterdam. That's still considerably below the $6 per bushel our Greene county farmer heard about. But there's one more charge to come.

VARIABLE LEVY

The final charge is a $2.77 variable levy or import tax applied to corn imported into the European Economic Community (EEC—or the Common Market). The basic goal of the EEC levy is to protect farmers and agriculture in nine Western European countries. A specific goal is to keep corn at about $6 per bushel in the EEC.

The system works well for the Europeans. Adding the $2.77 levy—which varies with world price—the $2.20 Iowa corn is now priced at $6.01 per bushel in elevators at the receiving port of Rotterdam.

When world prices go down, the EEC variable levy goes up to keep EEC corn prices at the $6 per bushel level. Consequently, reduced transportation costs make U.S. grain more competitive in most areas of the world—but in the European Common Market. Without the variable levy, U.S. corn could have been sold at about half the domestic EEC price in mid-May.

Ultimate goal of the duty and $6 corn is to encourage more grain production in Europe. Nearly doubling the price of imported grain is expensive for European consumers. But Europeans are willing to make that sacrifice and subsidize agriculture in order to gain self-sufficiency in production.

EEC SUBSIDY

There are a number of reasons for the EEC subsidization. First, European agriculture consists of many small farms. So there's a larger percentage of farmers in the population, compared to the United States, to back the import duty.

Also, the subsidization has existed long enough that corn prices are now capitalized into land values. This, too, provides great resistance to change.

Finally, many European consumers have experienced risks in addition to those of the Greene county farmer. Twice in this century, the continent has been the scene of the world wars. Consequently, Europeans may place a higher value upon food security and self-sufficiency in agriculture than their U.S. counterparts.

For the Greene county farmer, exports represent the most rapidly growing area of demand for corn in recent years. Exports, along with domestic feeding, production and government price support programs are the key elements in grain prices. Since exports influence the ability to maintain higher grain prices in the U.S., farmers oppose any restrictions that tend to limit exports.

In Europe, of course, there are different attitudes and values. Those differences spell $2.20 corn in Greene county and $6.01 in Rotterdam.●

## ANDREW YOUNG DOES NOT LIE

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the recent controversy over Ambassador Young's remarks on political prisoners in the United States, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, LOUIS STOKES, has written a hard-hitting, intuitive commentary in support of Ambassador Young. So that my colleagues in the House can share its message, I submit to you Mr. STOKES' editorial piece which appeared in the July 27, 1978, edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

REPRESENTATIVE STOKES: "YOUNG DOESN'T LIE"

(By LOUIS STOKES)

A newspaper article said White House press secretary Jody Powell hinted that U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young will have to clear future statements on human rights with the White House. The article said Young was reprimanded by President Carter for telling a French newspaper there are "hundreds, even thousands of political prisoners" in American jails.

I find this disturbing. Had the President reprimanded Ambassador Young for lying I would understand his reprimand. I do not understand how President Carter can, pursuant to his policy of human rights, express strong objection to the trials of Scharansky and Ginzburg in the Soviet Union for speaking out against their government and simultaneously squelch Andy Young for criticizing his government.

We cannot have one human rights policy for the residents of the Soviet Union and another for our own country. Lost in the hue and cry for Andy to be reprimanded, silenced, impeached or fired in the fact that no one has refuted him on any issue.

When examined, it is apparent that now, as on previous occasions, the hue and cry is not over Andy telling untruths; it is that he spoke at a time when Cyrus Vance was beginning the SALT talks and President Carter was decrying the trials of Soviet dissidents Scharansky and Ginzburg.

One also cannot ignore the element of racism in the zealousness of the attack on Young. If not racism, then why was there was not a similar uproar from the media when the author of Nixon's benign neglect policy toward blacks, former Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan, on occasion after occasion embarrassed the United States by using his U.N. forum to insult Third World nations?

Let us now examine some of Young's previous statements which created such a furor in the press. In each case, it is necessary to note that in spite of the uproar, nobody has yet to call him a liar.

On one occasion, he was assailed for calling former Presidents Nixon and Ford racists. On that occasion as now, the media chose to take his statement out of context. What Andy said was Nixon and Ford "were racists not in the aggressive sense but in that they had no understanding of the problems of colored peoples anywhere."

But what if he did call them racists? What's wrong with that?

It was Nixon who had this writer and 11 other black congressmen on his enemies list.

It was Nixon who didn't have a single black in his cabinet. It was Nixon who in spite of his boasts of expertise in foreign affairs didn't even have an African policy.

And what about Gerald Ford who during 25 years in Congress became a leader in offering crippling and dismantling amendments to every piece of civil rights legislation ever passed? As president, he too did not even have an African policy.

That's what Andy meant when he said that "they had no understanding of the problems of colored peoples anywhere."

Let's examine another of his statements which caused consternation. He is supposed to have insulted Great Britain by making reference of its having a history of racism. Well, history tells me that it was the British themselves who boasted that "the sun never sets on the British Empire." It is not a lie that Britain colonized people of other colors from Africa to Asia to Hong Kong.

And now let's examine Andy Young's statement that the South Africa government is illegitimate. Well, isn't that the tuth? What else is it when 2.3 million whites rule 26 million blacks in their own country? What is legitimate about the policy of apartheid?

What is legitimate about denying 26 million blacks citizenship in their own country and confining them to sections of their own country designated as "Homelands"?

Now let us examine the current controversy. In an interview in a French newspaper Young is alleged to have said, "After all, in our prisons there are also hundreds, maybe even thousands of people I would call political prisoners."

He continued: "Ten years ago, I was sentenced myself in Atlanta for organizing a protest movement. And three years later I was in the Georgia legislature. It's true things don't change so quickly in the Soviet Union, but they do change there, too."

According to the article, the ambassador also said: "While there is nobody in prison in the United States for criticizing the government, there are all varieties of political prisoners." In support of this, Young is alleged to have further said: "In the United States people can be in prison much more because they are poor than because they are bad. But that's a problem we are working on and one on which we are making great progress."

Now if his critics are contending that he lied, about what did he lie? If, on the other hand, it is the contention of his critics that he told the truth, but he just should not have told it right now, then we are confronted with an entirely different matter.

Young has had the extraordinary experience of being a black man in a racist society who rose to the top. He didn't rise to the top by mouthing what somebody told him to say, and I predict that if he is ever told what he must say, he will quit.

No one can refute his statement that he has been in jail and has himself been a political prisoner in America. No one can deny that Dr. Martin Luther King and hundreds of civil rights activists in the 1960s were jailed as political prisoners in America, and no one in his right mind can deny the ugly truth that today in America there are jails full of poor people, a majority of whom are black.

Many of those are guilty of no crime except that of being black and poor. The Amnesty International report for 1977 verifies Young's statement that there are political prisoners in jails in America. Whether their figures agree with Young's as to the number of political prisoners in American jails is really not important. The fact is that this Nobel Peace Prize organization corroborates the ambassador's basic premise.

The tragedy which we cannot hide from the world, even by firing, muzzling and gagging Ambassador Young, is that America does have political prisoners. The Carter administration is to be applauded for its campaign to highlight human rights violations around the world. But if Mr. Carter and the American people are to be credible, he cannot speak out about injustices in the Soviet Union while being silent about human rights violations in North Carolina.

It would seem that Mr. Carter would be equally vocal about the outrageous imprisonment of Rev. Ben Chavis and the Wilmington 10 which is cited by Amnesty International as a human rights violation in America.

It would also seem appropriate that while protesting the treatment accorded Scharansky and Ginzburg he would also protest the human rights violation of the Charlotte Three and the others in the 14 cases of American prisoners now adopted by Amnesty International.

The president and the rest of America should realize that Andrew Young's speaking out did not create the problems he addresses, and silencing him will not solve them.

Until America can give free speech to Andy Young, it cannot in good faith protest the suppression of free speech in other nations.●

---

## CONGRESSMAN WOLFF ON SUNSET LAWS

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the testimony I offered to the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House Committee on Rules regarding its consideration of "sunset" legislation and reauthorization measures to improve program review.

I believe the concept on which "sunset" laws are based is a vital one to the improvement of Congress budget authorization procedures. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my testimony will help my colleagues in their consideration of this important issue:

TESTIMONY OF LESTER WOLFF

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and this committee for giving me the opportunity to offer my views on the need for sunset legislation to be considered and enacted by the House. I believe that a free exchange of views on the issue will prove helpful to the committee, the Congress, and the public at large.

It is quite fashionable today, Mr. Chairman, to say that the American people are in "revolt" against excessive taxes and government excess. In a sense, I think they are. But many have responded to this sentiment with simplistic, superficial proposals. When considering tax reform, we must be responsible, not simplistic. I would urge the House to consider tax reform in that spirit.

But today I want to express my sympathy for one manifestation of revolt: the public outcry against waste and inefficiency in government.

Simply stated, I believe the people of American want "big government" off their backs and bad government out of their pockets.

Inefficient government. Wasteful bureaucracies. Excessive regulation. These are elements that make up a large part of many an American's perception of his institutions and elected officials. This is a fact to which Congress must face head on. Waste must be trimmed, outmoded programs reevaluated, the bureaucracy whittled down to its necessary elements. We must distinguish between the essential and the excessive.

There is spending reform legislation which answers the cry of the taxpayer effectively and justly. I refer to H.R. 1756, H.R. 9533, and H.R. 10421, those bills which embody the concept commonly known as "sunset". I should like to say here that I also endorse the budgetary procedure known as zero-base budgeting, a similar method of fiscal frugality.

The concept of "sunset" laws offers Congress and the President the opportunity to fulfill their pledge to tame the wild bureaucracy.

The major provisions of "sunset" legislation which I support are:

The implementation of a fixed period for review and reauthorization of all Federal programs under the jurisdiction of the sunset laws. This would prohibit the authorization of new budget authority for more than this fixed period.

It would also prohibit authorization for a subject program for which a sunset review has not been conducted within this fixed period.

The requirement that all covered programs file a statement of objectives and a list of the costs and accomplishments of each programs to Congress;

The requirement that committee reports identify the effectiveness of authorized programs, potentially duplicitive programs, and previous efforts to accomplish the objectives of the program;

The requirement that the President's budget indicate the justification of any program subject to sunset review in light of previous examination of that program under sunset law.

The objective here is to institutionalize reevaluation. I should say that I see "sunset" as a concept designed, through its powerful threat of termination, to make programs more responsive to the desires of the authorizing committees, and thus the people. I do not see the goal of sunset to be the termination of agencies just for the purpose of termination. The simultaneous objective of tax dollars saved and taxpayers served can be best achieved by holding these agencies and programs accountable for the tight, efficient, and responsive administration of their authorized duties.

Congressional oversight has a history of support in the Congress. Unfortunately, it is an undistinguished history, full of rhetoric and intent but devoid of effective action. True, attempts at oversight have been made. Begining with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which directed authorizing committees to "exercise continuous watchfulness" over the programs under their auspices, there has existed the recognition that ongoing performance evaluation plays an important role in assuring effective and efficient tax dollar utilization.

In 1970, the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office were ordered to investigate the effectiveness of Federal programs. And in 1974, the oversight role of committee was strengthened with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

Yet, despite these measures, ongoing performance evaluation has not been a characteristic element of Congress' budget authority. Unfortunately, the practices of incremental budgeting and interminable authorization without regard to cost-effectiveness have continued. It is time for performance to live up to promise.

One innovative method of Congressional oversight is offered by the concept of "sunset." Already, twenty-five states now have such legislation on their books.

In 1976, Colorado introduced the nation's first sunset law. There, "sunset" has been aimed at regulatory agencies, and the first review, of 13 of the state's 43 agencies, took place in 1977. Of those thirteen, three were terminated: the Board of Professional Sanitarians, the Board of Shorthand Reporters, and the State Athletic Commission. The State Boards of Barber Examiners and Cosmotologists were consolidated, and four other agencies were reestablished with modifications designed to improve their accountability and responsiveness to the public interest while reducing the ties between the regulators and the regulated.

Other states have reported similar success with their "sunset" implementation efforts. State "sunset" programs have proven that the concept, when properly implemented, can effectively spot bureaucratic waste and take positive measures to curb it.

"Sunset's" primary corrective power lies in its "action-forcing device, the threat of termination. It requires positive action to renew a program, placing the burden of justification on the programs themselves. If this does not keep agencies on their toes and responsive to the dictates of the committees, then nothing will.

I believe that it is now time for the Congress to explore the "sunset" concept. A recent Harris poll reported that 72 per cent of Americans "no longer feel they get good value from their tax dollars." The blame for the prevalence of this atitude rests primarily with those that allocate these dollars, Congress and the Executive branch. Federal programs have been allowed to stagnate and become institutionalized, acting under open-ended authorizations and antiquated statutes. Simple common sense dictates that certain agencies will need periodic reform as the nature of the functions they are responsible for change and progress. "Sunset" will give us, and it will give the American people, an opportunity to continually oversee the performance of the institutions to which we entrust our welfare. "Sunset" offers our government a real possibility of reaching a new dawn for governmental effectiveness and efficiency.●

## TRIBUTE TO BILL DONNELLY, MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE COORDINATOR

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, minority business enterprise programs are serving a very important role in Federal-private business relations in recent years. One of the very successful programs is conducted by the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. It has been my privilege through the years to know Bill Donnelly, the present coordinator of the Bureau's minority enterprise program. Bill is a very capable individual and has distinguished himself in this position in the relatively short time he has served in this position.

Bill has worked for the Federal Government since the days of the Kennedy administration. Throughout his career in Government, he has always been a loyal and dedicated public servant. He has done this while at the same time overcoming serious and crippling injuries suffered in World War II.

It is my pleasure to recognize the important efforts of Bill Donnelly as a minority business enterprise coordinator. To outline his accomplishments, I ask that the July 17, 1978, letter written by Charlotte Spann, Chief of the Department of the Interior's Branch of Minority Procurement, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
*July 17, 1978.*

CHUCK DOZOIS,
*Bureau of Mines, Columbia Plaza, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHUCK: On Wednesday, May 19, 1978, I had the pleasure of discussing the Department of the Interior Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) Program with your Bureau Director, Dr. Morgan and the Program Assistant Directors. The exchange of information and ideas was most beneficial to me and, I hope, of some value to the Bureau of Mines managers.

My first meeting, in fact, my first contact with Bill Donnelly occurred on that same day. At that time, I expect that many of the "how-to's" of the MBE program were as unfamiliar to Bill, the Bureau's Minority Business Enterprise Coordinator (MBEC), as they were to the program managers. However, Bill has been a very fast and a very enthusiastic learner. The purpose of this letter is to express to you and other appropriate Bureau officials my appreciation for appointing a person such as Bill Donnelly to the MBEC position.

As you have probably noted in the draft regulations, the MBEC function is essentially a three-way liaison among the procurement personnel, program technical personnel, and the minority vendor community. The purpose of that liaison, of course, is to ensure maximum awareness understanding, and participation in the MBE program by all three elements.

During the past forty-five days, I have noted that Bill Donnelly has not only understood the MBEC functions, but has carried out many of those duties in an exemplary manner. I have received very positive comments from Bureau of Mines personnel and from minority business representatives regarding Bill's aggressive and effective pursuit of increased minority business contract awards. My staff and I are delighted to be able to refer vendors to an MBEC who is knowledgeable about Bureau programs, as well as sincerely interested in the MBE program.

I appreciate the cooperation and support that you have given Bill by ensuring that he has the information and training needed to continue his performance in an outstanding and effective manner.

Please contact me whenever I can be of any assistance to you in your MBE efforts.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE SPANN,
*Chief, Branch of Minority Procurement.*●

## CIVIL SERVICE CHAOS IN THE NAME OF REFORM

### HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11280, the civil service "reform" bill, has been reported from the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on which I serve.

H.R. 11280 is a comprehensive bill with a noble objective, to "reform" the civil service system. It presented to the committee and to me a serious challenge which I was prepared to meet when the bill was submitted on March 3, 1978.

Yet I was compelled to vote against the bill, because I believe it is fatally flawed: It will open the door to politicization.

Cleaning up and streamlining the operations of the Federal Government is a worthy goal, an effort I support fully. Citizens should not have to wade through layers of bureaucracy to get their questions answered, to track down their social security check, or understand our tax laws. Government should be understandable; Government should be accessible. Government should not be a bureaucratic monolith impossible to cope with. Government should be responsive with decisions based on justice, not political intrigue or pressure.

Pursuant to the goal of developing a sound bill, I participated in 15 hearings, 12 in the Congress and 3 in agency headquarters here in Washington, and 10 days of markup. Additionally, I personally held three "town meetings" in my district to hear the views and suggestions of the citizens of the Washington area, Federal employees and non-Federal employees, individuals probably most familiar with the operations of the Federal Government.

The most persistent thread in the comments we heard from rank-and-file workers was that various provisions of this bill were a threat to the morale and structure of a nonpartisan, professional civil service system.

On February 27, 1978, I introduced H.R. 11165 which contains several strong provisions that would make innovation possible, but insulate the Federal Government against a spoils system. During the committee markup, after discussing these provisions with Civil Service Commission officials and other witnesses during the hearings, I attempted to get the safeguards embodied in my bill into H.R. 11280. Most were rejected.

I am dismayed that this committee has apparently articulated the thesis that politicizing the system is essential, in fact, is the centerpiece of a responsive and revitalized government. In fact, it was said of my amendments to prevent politicization that some would be a "bodyblow" to the bill.

I am afraid that in the name of "civil service reform" the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has developed "civil service chaos." While the bill has some sound provisions, many elements which would have made it a true landmark for good government are lacking. My primary fear is that this bill will begin a slow unraveling of our merit system, a system that insures the impartial administration of our laws. This conclusion is inescapable: This bill opens the door for the politicization of the civil service system.

AN OPEN DOOR FOR POLITICAL MANIPULATION—SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

The committee's adoption of an amendment to implement the Senior Executive Service in three agencies over

a 2-year period is an appropriate go-slow approach. However, the Senior Executive Service, while meritorious in purpose in many ways, will allow too many career jobs to become political, because of a fundamental flaw in the way appointments can be made. Currently, there are important safeguards and procedures that keep the designation of career and political positions at the high levels of Government quite distinct. Congress decides which jobs will be filled by political appointees at executive levels. For those GS-16, 17, and 18 pay grade levels, the President can designate which jobs should be political according to clear standards.

I offered a substitute to title IV, the Senior Executive Service, which would have made the SES a career service only. My substitute failed. If the President wished to designate certain jobs at these levels to be filled by political appointees, the duties of the job would have had to meet certain standards prescribed in law, such as engaging in the advocacy of administration programs or serving as a confidential assistant to a political appointee.

Under this bill, although there is a numerical limit on the number of jobs that can be filled by political appointees, this limit has no relationship to the responsibilities of the job. Thus, the head of a division handling grants, contracts, or tax returns can be a political appointee. By adopting my substitute, Congress would have been exercising clear controls over which positions are filled by career individuals and which by political appointees. And it would have provided that the type of appointment—career or political—would be determined by the responsibilities of the job, not an arbitrary agency- or Government-wide "magic" number.

EXCEPTING POSITIONS FROM THE CAREER SERVICE

Similarly, my amendment to provide clear criteria for excepting positions from the career service for all general schedule jobs would have insured against manipulation of jobs. Under the current law, which this bill does not change, the President can put a "competitive service" position in the "excepted service" (individuals not hired by competitive examinations and appointment) by only determining that "conditions of good administration warrant" this action. There are standards in regulations which can be changed any time. But my amendment would have firmly fixed strong standards in law.

We have heard too many stories of a "buddy system" and end runs around the merit system, stories of jobs being "moved" from a competitive hiring designation to excepted to accommodate a favored candidate. There is room and there is a need for noncompetitve positions in the executive branch. But there should be strong controls. My amendment, which was defeated, would have provided these controls.

POLITICAL INFLUENCES IN PERSONAL ACTIONS

The section of the bill on merit employment would have been strengthened has the committee adopted my amendment to clearly bar unwarranted political recommendations in hiring, promotions, and other personnel actions. Under my amendment, political recommendations from Members of Congress, their staff, White House officials, and political appointees in the executive branch would have been clearly prohibited. The notion that elected and other political officials ought to "determine who gets what jobs" in the career merit system is simply wrong. Some argue that it is a "fact of life." If so, it is wrong. It is time to stop winking at it. If we are going to have true civil service reform, then we must get politics out—once and for all. It has not been that long since the very foundations of our Government were almost pulled out from under us by inside political manipulation. My amendment would have greatly improved this bill.

The bill allows the new Office of Personnel Management to delegate to agencies various personnel functions, such as examining, hiring, and promotions. While allowing agencies to perform personnel functions previously centralized in the Civil Service Commission may speed up these procedures. I am concerned that here again the floodgate may be opened from improper political influences. This is why I offered an amendment to require that every chief personnel official be a career employee. I cannot see any reason why a personnel official, clearly performing an administrative function, should be a political appointee. This was another effort to keep politics out of the merit system; yet the committee rejected this provision.

AN IMPARTIAL MERIT SYSTEM PROTECTION BOARD

The bill establishes a new Merit System Protection Board to handle alleged violations of civil service rules and regulations. I believe the composition of this board would have been strengthened by the requirement that one member be from the career ranks of the Federal Government as I proposed. As it stands, these three political appointees, can be the former board chairman of a corporation or the former head of a campaign. While the bill rightly insures a political mix, I believe that a career employee could have provided an important career employee perspective in the board's proceedings.

Similarly, the selection of the chairman of the board is faulty since the bill provides that "the President shall from time to time designate one of the board members as the chairman of the Merit System Protection Board." My amendment, which was defeated, would have required the board members to elect a chairman every 2 years. Under the bill, the President can choose one chairman, and the next month choose another. This, I believe, is a loophole that can lead to political shuffling and reshuffling.

CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY AT THE TOP FOR THE MERIT SYSTEM

Under the bill submitted by the administration, the delegation of personnel administration caused me great concern. The bill allowed the President to delegate responsibilities to the director of the Office of Personnel Management who in turn could delegate to agencies. The General Accounting Office could investigate violations of the merit system if requested by Congress. The special counsel could investigate complaints and the board could hear them. But the bill was very fuzzy as to who, in fact, was responsible—where did the buck stop?

I offered several amendments which were accepted that make it clear that the director of the Office of Personnel Management is the individual responsible for compliance with civil service laws and procedures. Thus, for example, if an agency adopts a hiring procedure that gives favoritism to certain applicants, OPM cannot "get off the hook" by saying the agency was in charge. OPM cannot turn a blind eye. OPM is responsible for seeing that merit system principles are enforced and that corrective action is taken when violations occur.

EMPLOYEE RIGHTS AS PRIVATE CITIZENS

I continue to believe that employees should be able to engage in voluntary political activities as private citizens, and I helped draft H.R. 10, which would revise the current Hatch Act prohibitions on those rights. However, I do believe it is wrong to tie those revisions to a legislative vehicle that opens the door to politics within the system. The Hatch Act has never protected employees from on-the-job political pressures; a strong, impartial merit system provides that protection. But this bill severely weakens many of those protections.

OPEN AVENUE OF COMMUNICATION FOR OPM AND THE BOARD

I am pleased that the committee adopted my amendments to allow both the OPM and the Merit Protection Board to express their views directly to Congress without clearance by another agency. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has too often been frustrated by the Office of Management and Budget's stranglehold on agency statements to Congress. Under my amendment OMB can make its views known; there is no barrier. But these agencies can express their views on policies, answer questions directly, and present testimony to congressional committees without first getting their views cleared and laundered by OMB. This is a most important Government reform.

EMPLOYEE PAY: A MIXED PICTURE

The committee adopted my recommendation that supervisory employees in GS-13 to 15 grades continue to receive annual comparability adjustments. Keeping Federal pay rates competitive with those of private industry is a sound principle, established by the 1970 Federal Pay Comparability Act. Had we deprived employees in these grades of annual comparability, I believe we would have violated the basic principle of our Federal pay system.

However, the committee did not accept my amendment that would have guaranteed true comparability. My amendment would have removed the loophole in the current law that has allowed Presidents of both parties to deviate from true comparability six times since 1970. We understand the President will follow this unfortunate precedent again this year. The concept of comparability is negated if in-

herent in the law is an escape hatch allowing the President to thwart it.

The new merit pay system, to reward GS-13, 14, and 15 supervisory employees for performance on the job, is a worthy concept. However, it would be a new system and I believe Congress needs to know in the future whether it is actually working, whether it is in fact improving performance. Thus, I am pleased that the committee accepted my amendment to require the Office of Personnel Management to report in 3 years on whether it is working and how. My amendment requires OPM to show us in quantitative terms if it is achieving the purposes set out in this legislation. It is my hope, for example, that we can determine that because of merit pay incentives, social security claims processing has been speeded up or decisionmaking on grants has been expedited and that such improvements are saving taxpayer dollars. My amendment also requires OPM to recommend changes in the law to improve the new pay system. Instead of letting a program grind on interminably without close scrutiny, this amendment will provide a proper mechanism for a review in 3 years.

CONTROLLING GOVERNMENT GROWTH

I am pleased that the committee has essentially incorporated my bill, H.R. 8332, which begins a process of curbing the growth of top, political appointive positions. There has virtually been no control in the growth of executive level positions in the Federal Government, since Congress has created them sporadically without any sense of overall planning or consistency. In fact, the Civil Service Commission is unsure of the exact number of executive level positions.

Creating a new Assistant Secretary position at executive level III or a Deputy at executive level IV may be justifiable. Yet we have the questionable situation of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at level II ($57,500) and the Administrator of the General Services Administration at level III ($52,500).

Under my bill and the provisions added to H.R. 11280, the number of positions becomes fixed and the President is required to send to Congress a plan in 2 years for bringing some order and coherence to what is presently a hodgepodge.

Similarly, the committee has incorporated certain provisions of H.R. 5054 which will bring some sense to the "supergrade sprawl." This bill reaffirms the concept of a central supergrade pool and repeals the many "extraneous" authorities outside the pool that have been enacted.

Both of these sections represent an attempt to have a government that is controlled, orderly, and rational.

I am concerned and will continue to oppose an amendment adopted on a voice vote to require the Office of Personnel Management to conduct a study of the location of Federal agencies and a review of the possibility of relocating agencies out of the Washington, D.C., area. First, this is an inappropriate mission for the OPM. Second, the amendment does not provide clear direction for the study by specifying the criteria that should be considered, for example, the effect on employment or unemployment, the need for access to the President and Congress, cost to the taxpayer, environmental considerations, or delivery of services. Third, there is no apparent purpose or demonstrated need for the study. Another useless study will not improve Government efficiency.

Despite these meritorious changes, the bill adds up to a minus—not a plus—for the Federal employee and the American taxpayer. This bill is an unfortunate chapter in the history of an impartial, nonpolitical Federal Government. It may shake the very foundations of our merit system. It suggests that political affiliation is more important than competence. By creating cracks for political influences to seep into the system, it makes the argument more valid that Federal employees should be denied rights of citizenship in order to protect them. Should H.R. 11280 be enacted into law, protections for the employee will be greatly diminished and the merit system will be placed in great jeopardy.●

---

## THE ANIMAL SAVING ASSOCIATION

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of meeting with several young constituents who are members of the Animal Saving Association which is dedicated to the preservation of wildlife.

The president of the Animal Saving Association, Liza DiPrima of Madison, Wis., presented me with a copy of the organization's philosophy and wildlife protection program. Since a number of the Animal Saving Association's interests are pending before the Congress, and are deserving of our support, I would like to share their concerns as expressed by Liza with my colleagues.

MONDAY, JULY 24, 1978.

We are speaking for the children of the world who are concerned about the welfare of animals and do no want to see them brutally murdered. We are also speaking for the animals, who have no voices of their own

For thousands of years people have been using animals for their own enjoyment. When it pleases a man to go hunting, or just as long as a man can make money off of an animal's skin, he'll do it, without giving the animal a second thought. The truth is, animals do have feelings, and should be taken into consideration.

This world was not created for human beings alone, and animals have as much right to be on it as we do. Because we have aggressive tendencies, and because we have separated ourselves from the rest of the world and developed our own little communities known as cities and suburbs, we have classified animals as beneath ourselves and as being "renewable resources" and as not being able to feel pain. Man is not so godlike and almighty that he is in a situation to judge animals. Animals are not any "lesser beings," than we are.

In fact, they are the same in a number of ways. They think, they move around, they eat, they sleep, they breathe, they feel pain, and they talk in a language we can't understand. And if people feel that they are in such a position that they can judge animals and use them so, then I think we are the lesser beings.

Terrible things are happening to animals now. There are many good men and women in the Government and things are being done to change what's happening to animals. But the things that are being done are few and far between and millions of animals are still suffering or being murdered for no good reason. And if animals keep being killed at this rate by the time our generation gets to the Government there will be nothing left to save.

We would like to see the cruel things that are happening to animals stopped. There are programs for energy and defense and poverty, and now we feel it's time there was a program for the animals. Here are our suggestions.

(1). Immediately passing the Alaskan conservation bill that would turn about ¼ of Alaska into national parks, forests, and refuges.

(2). Stopping hunting and trapping on *all* the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges.

(3). Stopping *all* the poisoning of wolves, coyotes, and other predators on national land and keeping it stopped.

(4). Making a law to make the wolf our national mammal so that these beautiful intelligent creatures don't have to die out.

(5). Stopping federal grants for people to conduct unnecessarily cruel and unusual experiments on animals in laboratories in the name of science.

(6). Having the Endangered Species Act protect *all* animals, even where a multimillion dollar dam is concerned.

(7). Enforcing the Marine Mammal Protection Act which says that *no* dolphins can be killed in tuna nets while catching tuna.

(8). Putting pressure on the Japanese and Soviet governments to stop killing the whales which are one of the most intelligent and one of the highest forms of life on earth.

(9). Stopping our government from deciding to allow people to resume killing the California Grey Whale.

(10). Stopping the Eskimos from killing the Bowhead Whales, because no "culture" justifies killing a form of life at least as highly developed as our own.

(11). Stopping the importation of all ivory to help Kenya and other countries in a fight to save the last of the world's elephants.

(12). Putting more pressure on the government of Canada to force them to stop allowing the harp seal hunt to go on.

Here are our ideas for what we feel is a better kind of world. Us kids have been accused by our opponents as not knowing anything and therefore not being able to have an opinion. But the words I wrote here are my own, and the thoughts that helped put them on paper are also my own. And if the kids are going to inherit this world then I feel that we should have opinions about the things that are happening in our world. We feel these issues are among the most important in the world and we won't stop fighting until the things we have talked about here come to be.

LIZA DIPRIMA AGELL.

President, Animal Saving Association and the children in the world who care about the animals and who would like to see the horrible torture and brutal murder stopped.●

## CAMBODIAN INTERVIEWS

## HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD two more interviews with Cambodian refugees conducted last month:

INTERVIEW WITH CAMBODIAN REFUGEE IN BURIRAM, THAILAND, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN EMBASSY OFFICER IN JUNE 1978

ACCOUNT OF SOURCE A*

Source A, 41, from Battambang Province, worked in the Wildlife and Forestry Department of the former government. After April, 1975, he was ordered by the Khmer Rouge to move to another village to become a farmer. After building a bamboo hut in the forest and beginning to clear land in the jungle, he was moved to another village, where he stayed until he fled to Thailand. He worked in the rice fields in the rainy season and helped to dig dams and irrigation ditches during the dry season. He escaped to Thailand May 19, 1978. His account follows:

CONDITIONS OF LIFE IN DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA

"During 1975, rice rations were adequate. Each person received two tins of rice (500 grams) per day. Starting in 1976, the 156 members of my collective ate together. In 1976–78, the people received only rice porridge in inadequate amounts. There was no fish or vegetables to eat. Banana leaves and morning glories were mixed in the porridge. Everyone in the village was sickly. Diarrhea, malaria, and beriberi were very common. There was no modern medicine. The Khmer Rouge made their own of roots and leaves. After eating the Khmer Rouge medicine, some people got better, but others died. The medicine was not very effective. In general, life was getting increasingly difficult."

SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION AND DISCIPLINE

"There were 10,301 people assigned to my collective. Six villages were administered by an Administrator (*kha mar pibal*) from Angka (the Organization or Communist Party). Each village was headed by a chief, also from Angka. Occasionally, I saw a few Khmer Rouge soldiers, but not many. The village chiefs, and the group chiefs under them, received their orders from the Administrator. The village chiefs, in turn, passed orders to group chiefs who told us, the people, each day what work was to be done.

"Regarding discipline, for minor errors, such as being late for work thirty minutes, you were warned and given an oral reprimand. You might be reprimanded one or two times. The third time you committed the error, you were executed. If you were a former Government of the Khmer Republic (GKR) soldier or official, you would not be warned; you were executed even for the first minor error. If you committed a serious mistake, such as talking favorably of the former Government or criticizing the new Government, you were executed immediately. For other serious mistakes, such as stealing a banana or other food, you would be executed immediately.

"Rules were given orally in the Political seminars held every tenth day. They were not too clear, however. The village chief would merely say, 'work hard. Do not do anything wrong,' without specifying what was 'wrong.'

"Sometimes the village chief or group chief would reprimand you: advise you privately of your mistake. Other times, you would be reprimanded in the political seminars.

"In each village there were spies for the Administrator, called (chhlop). The spies arrested persons guilty of mistakes and took them to the Administrator. Only the Administrator could order execution. If you commit an offense, there is no recourse. "You are not allowed to defend yourself. You are simply executed."

EXECUTIONS

"I saw in my village in 1976 the execution of a former GKR soldier. The soldier had said, 'Let the others work before me; I will work after.' The soldier was executed immediately before my eyes. The Khmer Rouge knew that the man was a soldier under the former regime. This was the only execution I saw personally, but I heard of many both in my village and in the adjoining villages. You don't dare ask about such a thing, since everyone is afraid he will be executed if he is curious. People are not familiar with what is going on.

"I heard often that former soldiers and officials of the old government were executed. Each year the same story would circulate, as the Khmer Rouge discovered more former soldiers and officials. I heard that they did not catch them all at first.

"I heard the same thing on May 15 this year. I had a friend who worked in the Administrator's office. My friend told me that my name was on the list to be executed. I fled to Thailand, arriving four days later."

HUMAN, CIVIL, AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

"We, the villagers, were not allowed to make any suggestions about anything such as decisions affecting our lives, hours of work, what to grow or what to eat. Because of fear, no one ever dared to make any suggestion about living or working conditions.

"There are no human rights at all in Cambodia . . . You cannot talk, listen to the radio, cannot communicate from one house to another, one village to another. You are not allowed to move from one village to another, or even from one house to another. I have not seen a radio since April, 1975."

*(The name of the individual refugee who provided this account has been excised to protect the identity of family members or friends still in Cambodia.)

INTERVIEW WITH CAMBODIAN REFUGEES IN BURIRAM, THAILAND, CONDUCTED BY AMERICAN EMBASSY OFFICER IN JUNE 1978

ACCOUNT OF SREP SARANG*

Srep Sarang, 30, came from Kouk Chrey village, Sasak Sdam, Siem Reap Province. He arrived alone in Thailand May 17, 1978. His account follows:

CONDITIONS OF LIVING IN DEMOCRATIC KAMPUCHEA

"During the harvest, we had little rice, but we usually had gruel. We got the equivalent of two U.S. Army canteens of gruel a day. Beginning in 1978, we got one day off after ten days of work. Before that we worked every day. During the day off, we were allowed to go and look for food. Sometimes we could find a frog or a crab. I look fat now, but after starving so long, you swell when you finally get some food.

"In Kouk Chrey there are 100 families, or about 400 people; most were women. In late 1975, there was a period of starvation. Lots of men died of hunger. Women seem to be able to survive better."

*(Refugee agreed to use of his name in a public document.)

EXECUTIONS

"In 1975, I was told by the Khmer Rouge to dig graves. I was told that the graves were for the educated people, the wives of soldiers and teachers. I also dug eight holes where eighteen former soldiers were buried. These graves were in Trapeang Khim. Later it was discovered that I had been a local militia chief. After that, I was no longer used by the Khmer Rouge to dig holes.

"In 1976–77 the guilty would be executed alone. After late 1977 and in 1978 the guilty and his family also were executed, even for a minor offense. For example, if you were executed for being late to work, your family would be executed too. This may have been because of the leader. In 1975, the head of the northern sector in Siem Reap, Sot, was not too strict. Sot was found to be a traitor and was replaced in late 1977 by Se, who was more strict. Se followed the policy of killing wives and children of former soldiers and teachers. Se said that wives were the vestiges of the old society and are still corrupt.

"I saw lots of executions because I drove bullock carts from Poul District to my village Koul Chrey. After the past harvest, lots of people, but mainly women, were killed in Pouk District. There were also seventeen families who were taken to Trei Nhor and killed. A fellow who used to work for the Khmer Rouge, but who has become disaffected, told me about this. Four of the families had men. The rest were widows with kids, even pregnant ones. They were taken to Trai Nhor so the villagers would not know what happened to them.

"In February, 1978 100 families in Samrong Yea, Siem Reap, rose up and killed 2 Khmer Rouge. When this was known, the Khmer Rouge sent thirty soldiers to Samrong Yea in Pouk District and the other surrounding villages in Pouk District to kill the villagers. The people fled, but the Khmer Rouge hunted them down and killed most of the 3,000–4,000 who lived in nine villages. The people only had knives but the Khmer Rouge had AK–47 rifles. The people rose up because they could not get enough to eat and had no freedom.

"I was taken to be killed by the Khmer Rouge in December, 1977. There was a serious food shortage and hunger right before the harvest. A father and his son killed a water buffalo for food for themselves and the other villagers. I did not kill the buffalo but asked for some meat. The Khmer Rouge found out and took the father, son and me to jail. There were fifteen others there waiting to be executed. After fifteen days in jail, seven Khmer Rouge took the eighteen of us to a place four kilometers away called Kanhchoan Svey. All eighteen of us were tied together. Three Khmer Rouge dug a hole for our corpses. While they were digging the hole, I united myself and fled. I was very skinny since we got only one bowl of gruel a day in the prison. I hid in the rice fields. Finally, I crawled to the hut of my father. He was a sugar palm worker and received an extra ration of rice because the work was so hard. I then made my way to a place near Tonle Say where relatives lived. Everyone wanted to help me since everyone hates the Khmer Rouge, but no one knew what to do. I hid out for many weeks and finally escaped to Thailand.

"Before I made it to Thailand, I ran into a neighbor who told me that my wife, Kum Ku, 19, son Sarong Sarun, 5, and sister-in-law Kum Mey, 11, had been killed by the Khmer Rouge."

"HUMAN, CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

"There are no human rights in Cambodia. The central government policy is to have genuine communism in Cambodia. The Khmer Rouge keep telling the people, 'This is communism.' Religion is no longer allowed. There was a wat near our village. The Buddha images in it were all smashed, and the place

was demolished. They took the reinforcing bars from the building to construct dams. You don't even have the right to keep your children. They are taken away from their parents at age six to work. What people want is the same life that they had before."●

## TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN FRIEND

### HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, last week saw the passing of Mr. Benjamin Friend, a distinguished San Franciscan. Known to his many friends as Benny, he was a leader in the Jewish community and a person beloved by all who came into contact with him.

I am sure all Members will join with me and my colleague PHILLIP BURTON in offering our sympathy to Benny Friend's family.

SAN FRANCISCO MERCHANT BENJAMIN FRIEND

Benjamin Friend, a leader of San Francisco's Jewish community and pioneer Market street merchant who helped found Howard's Clothing Co., died yesterday at the age of 84.

At the time of his death, the patriarch of the three-generation family business was still active as chairman of Howard's executive committee.

A native of Russia, Mr. Friend came to San Francisco from New York in 1913. At first, until he could find work at his trade as a capmaker, he sold newspapers on the city's Barbary Coast and later was a conductor for the Market street railway.

The first family business was the United Cap Works established in 1920 at Eddy and Fillmore streets.

The specialty of the tiny firm—made by his wife, Mollie—was the white cloth cap favored by the city's longshoremen. Through Mr. Friend's merchandising efforts, the company's caps became popular throughout Northern California.

With capital derived from the cap works, he and his son, Eugene L. Friend, started Howard's in 1937 at Fifth and Market streets as a store specializing in fashionable men's wear.

Over the years, from the zoot suits of the '40s to the disco outfits of the present, the store mirrored the fashion habits of the San Francisco male.

In 1968, due to BART construction at Fifth street, the clothing store moved to its present expanded quarters at 969 Market street.

"He was a man who was devoted to the interests of his customers, his family, the city and to the Jewish community in particular," a family friend said yesterday.

As a leader of the city's Jewish community, he served as president of Temple Beth Israel in 1963 and was active with the Jewish Welfare Federation.

He is survived by his wife Mollie, his son, Eugene, president of the city's Recreation and Park commission, two grandsons, Robert and Donald, and a great-granddaughter.●

## NAACP BAKKE SYMPOSIUM

### HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Carlton Goodlett, president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, gave the following address at the NAACP Bakke Symposium in Detroit.

I commend its contents to the Members of the House.

BAKKE: A FAILURE OF BLACK PROFESSIONALS AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

(By Carlton B. Goodlett, Ph.D., M.D.)

Black leaders throughout America have been called to the NAACP Bakke Symposium. However, this forum apparently is dominated by Black lawyers who seem more concerned with a microscopic search for the blessings which Blacks allegedly find in the U.S. Supreme Court Bakke decision.

These Black members of the bar do evil greater than their knowing, because either they do not know the truth or they refuse to speak the truth on the latest Supreme Court's refusal again in the 115th post-Lincoln Emancipation year to unequivocally declare that in the USA there is only one kind of citizen, one kind of equality, and that Blacks are equal, period, under the law.

The time has come when the majority of Black physicians, dentists and lawyers residing in Northern California should be publicly condemned for their failure to deal a death blow to Bakke in the early days of the Bakke litigation. On two occasions, California Black physicians and Black lawyers refused to expend $1,600 for a Friend of the Court brief during the six months of delay in which the retired California Superior Court judge delayed his decision in the Bakke vs. University of California Medical School, Davis, California. Only three of sixteen Black doctors, dentists or lawyers could be found who would contribute $100 to defend minority youth's right to professional training in the early days of the Bakke case. In a moment of spirited conversation, members of the Charles Houston Law Club refused to financially support a Friend of the Court brief prepared by two radical female white lawyers: one, former President of the National Lawyers Guild, and the other, Western Regional Director, National Lawyers Guild. At the insistence of Black lawyers, Chief Counsel, NAACP, Nathaniel Jones came to California and spent three hours in discussion of the Bakke case and the evil results which would occur should Bakke go unchallenged. The Chief NAACP Counsel promised to do his duty in filing an amicus brief supporting the U.C. Medical School against Bakke; yet those conferees never heard from or saw any activity on the part of the NAACP Chief Counsel.

However, after the 6 to 1 California Supreme Court decision declared that the University of California Medical School, Davis, California, was guilty of "reverse discrimination" and ordered the admission of Bakke to medical school, alarm spread throughout America.

A few hardy souls, led by Attorney Nathaniel Colley, NAACP National Board Member and Regional Counsel, and Verna Canson, Executive Secretary, Region 1, NAACP, demanded that the University Regents appeal the California Supreme Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. The NAACP General Counsel, the Director of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and other former friends in the civil rights struggle adamantly opposed the Board of Regents' appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court; they argued that Bakke was the wrong case to be taken to the U.S. Supreme Court. After intensive struggle by Colley, Canson and several others, the U.C. Regents yielded and appealed the Bakke decision to the nation's highest tribunal.

THE STRUGGLE WITH THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION

Lo and behold, on the second weekend of September, 1977, the game plan of the Carter administration in the Bakke case became evident. President Carter and U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell were low-keying the U.S. Department of Justice's participation, deferring to Solicitor-General McCree and Drew Days, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, the preparation of the brief. The initial U.S. Department of Justice brief pointedly rejected the argument that race was a viable criteria in the assignment of admissions to the medical schools.

An awesome amount of national Black pressure was brought to bear upon McCree and Days which reached even to the White House, before Carter and Bell relented and ordered McCree and Days to rewrite the U.S. Justice Department brief.

This tale of professional California Blacks, through selfishness and parsimony in the first instance, refusing to contribute financially to the constitutional question of equal rights for Blacks, accompanied by the foot-dragging of the National League staffs of the NAACP and the reluctance of the Black U.S. Solicitor General and his assistant to lead the struggle for full Black citizenship rights, seems like a fairytale or a bad dream; but these facts stated above are true.

U.S. SUPREME COURT: THE BAKKE DECISION

Finally, the Supreme Court of the U.S. in its 5 to 4 decision straddled the issue, giving a semblance of victory to Bakke and his reactionary supporters on one hand, while throwing a bone to placate Blacks by a 5 to 4 decision deciding that race is a viable factor in the selection of students in medical schools.

THE BAKKE DECISION—BETRAYAL OF BLACKS BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT:

The Bakke decision was wrong. The State Supreme Court was wrong in its absurd pronouncement that the 1964 Civil Rights statute upholds the right of whites to continue trampling on minorities. And the U.S. Supreme Court was likewise wrong in its equally absurd allowance that Allan Bakke was the victim of "reverse discrimination."

During Reconstruction, laws were passed to enable former slaves to reap some of the benefits that American society had to offer its citizens; but whites soon grew tired of the notion of sharing their wealth and privileges with black people. Fortunately for them, the courts became easy allies, upholding Jim Crow laws and validating concepts like "separate but equal," just as the current Supreme Court has validated "reverse discrimination." Even with the Warren Court's historic unanimous school desegregation decision in '54, great mischief was done by the phrase "with all deliberate speed." The stark truth of the matter is that in a racist society, all of its institutional forms—legislative, executive and judicial—are honed to serve the racism of that society. The hard reality is that the Supreme Court has never unequivocally ruled in any constitutional question involving the rights of black people an affirmative *Yes*, indicating that blacks are henceforth to be judged as equal. With this truth, the survival of blacks depends upon the hard reality of injustice, and not the myth of "justice."

Hopelessly divided decisions, such as the Bakke one, can never satisfy those in need of protection and help from the courts, because they do absolutely nothing to help vanquish the three-headed scourge that afflicts the very vitality of American society: racism, sexism and classism. It is to these evils that the "eight old men in black who think white" need to address their attention, not the question whether one white man might not like the way an affirmative action program works.

THE BAKKE CASE—A CONDEMNATION OF THE SYSTEM

The Bakke Case says that blacks are denying loyal, competent, educated white males their god-given right to be educated at public expense in the professions. However,

many factors were mitigated against Bakke's entry into a medical school, the foremost being the unwritten law of his age. Actually, 40,000 aspirants applied and 26,000 were rejected across the nation. The U.S. Supreme Court was asked to determine how this coveted pie of only 13 or 14 thousand admitted applicants could legally be divided among the competing groups: Blacks, Chicanos, women, handicapped, too old, too young, or even, like Bakke, white Protestant male; but the court did not address the underlying question: not just "Who get in?" but "Why isn't there room for more?"

The inability of all the contestants in the Bakke case to understand the basic indictment against a socio-economic system will deter the coalescence and unity so necessary for structured social change in the nation. The many inequities which exist in housing, education, employment and health care result from the parsimony of the government as well as the rampages of the military-industrial complex upon the people for all the profits that the traffic can bear. Now, even the Black masses clearly perceive that racial minorities have a stake in the development of a political ideology of abundance. The victims of economic racism, whose families for generations have been denied gainful employment, are saying: "There must be something better than this, and we're ready for it!"

These victims of racism and poverty can never surmount, alone, these handicaps imposed by a system which denies enriched opportunities to its people, not only in the field of medicine but also in jobs, education, and adequate health and welfare, to serve the needs of every citizen. Even Cuba, with its many demanding problems, finds it possible to educate proportionately more of its citizens in the medical sciences and healing arts than the USA, the world's richest and most powerful nation.

Support for affirmative action must be coupled with the understanding that the DeFunises and the Bakkes as well as every other person excluded from law school or medical school because of the restricted number of admissions, or because the level of unemployment is kept artificially high, are part of a problem which is not just a racial one, but an old economic shell-game, in which ethnic and racial groups, Black workers and white workers as well as women are played off against each other. The progressive forces must understand this no-win game; strategies must be developed which unite, not divide, the masses with their common needs, who are ruthlessly exploited by multi-national corporations and profiteers extracting their profits from the nation's reservoir of human, physical and moral resources, and having only one god: profits!

SUGGESTED ACTION:

The education of the children of five million or more Californians in the professions is severely threatened. The affirmative action program at UC-Davis was a result of a ten-year struggle against racism and sexism in the university system, as regards student body composition, faculty appointments and administrative officers. Clearly, California's racial minorities have been denied "equal protection under the law," which is a violation of both the U.S. Federal and the State of California constitutions. The racial minorities cannot continue to climb the Bakke mountain. Therefore, we recommend that Black leaders in California, in cooperation with leadership organizations, should enter both Federal and State Courts with legal action against the State Controller, Ken Corey, restraining him from dispensing any public funds to the Universtiy of California system or the State University system because of the lack of a higher educational policy guaranteeing the graduate and professional education and training of the children of five million Californians, who are more numerous than the population of 27 or 28 of the sister states. This action in the State and Federal Courts would place upon the University of California Board of Regents and the State University system Board of Trustees a court mandated timetable for the redress of this unconstitutional condition, and the courts themselves might become the first agents to monitor the performance of higher education and professional authorities of the University of California and the State University System.

SUMMARY

We have come to Detroit to say to both White and Black America, in a clarion voice, that the leaders of 1.8 million Black Californians the second largest Black population in any of the fifty States, will assume leadership in defining the evil intent of Proposition 13, the true significance of the Bakke Decision, and the formulation of the correct procedure to be followed in the struggle to mitigate the evil circumstances and aftermath if these infamous acts, both political and judicial, of White Californians. We will not under any circumstances permit others to speak for us, about us, or consider California's racist behavior without us.

The Bakke Decision must be a milestone which signals the final awakening of the people. This NAACP Bakke Symposium can become a historic event, if we have the strength and understanding to define the true intent of White California and White America to continually use its political and judicial institutions to thwart the just demands and the determined drive of Black Americans to be accepted as first-class citizens and to announce to the world that Black America, led by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, will pay any price and make any sacrifice, to destroy institutional and individual racism in the USA. If the opponents of this justifiable demand want to take this serious problem out of the area of firm, objective discussion and into the arena of confrontation, let it be so. At long last, it has dawned upon Black America, via Kerner Report enlightenment, that our struggle is not one against abberrant sociological and moral behavior, but that Blacks live in a society suffering from the social pathology of racism. Blacks accept the tragic reality that conversation will be as successful in eradicating institutional and individual racism in America as a neurosurgeon is successful in combatting brain cancer with aspirins. Racism is a dangerous disease which is leading to the destruction of the nation and all of its peoples. Moreover, if conversation of the appeal to reason would have given Black Americans full citizenship, we would have achieved our goal eons ago.

There are far too many educated Blacks and professionals who think that the Black upper class can make it, alone, in racist White America. Reality belies this myth. Blacks have and belong to each other. For those Black professionals—medical and legal—who have betrayed the Black masses in the struggle against Bakke, we leave their acts of penance and redemption to the good judgment of this Bakke Symposium.●

## QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

## HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is customary in my office, as in the offices of many Members, to periodically seek the opinions of my constituents through a legislative questionnaire.

Earlier this year, I mailed such a questionnaire to each household in the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. A total of about 7,400 responses were returned to my office, and now have been tabulated.

I am pleased to share this tabulation with my colleagues in order to add the expressed opinions of a great many North Carolinians to public opinion data which they already have accumulated.

The results of the questionnaire survey follow:

A. CONCERNING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

How should the Federal dollar be spent? The Federal budget is outlined below according to the budget categories currently in use. Please indicate whether you think Congress should allocate more, less, or the same amount for each category:

HOW SHOULD THE FEDERAL DOLLAR BE SPENT? THE 1978 FEDERAL BUDGET IS OUTLINED BELOW ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET CATEGORIES CURRENTLY IN USE. PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU THINK CONGRESS SHOULD ALLOCATE MORE, LESS OR THE SAME AMOUNT FOR EACH CATEGORY

[In percent]

| | 1978 budget (billions) | More | Less | Same | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. CONCERNING THE FEDERAL BUDGET | | | | | |
| 1. National defense | $107.6 | 32 | 26 | 32 | 10 |
| 2. International affairs | 6.7 | 5 | 55 | 27 | 14 |
| 3. Science, space and technology | 4.7 | 29 | 25 | 34 | 12 |
| 4. Natural resources, environment and energy | 19.9 | 45 | 18 | 25 | 11 |
| 5. Agriculture | 9.1 | 35 | 21 | 33 | 11 |
| 6. Commerce and transportation | 19.8 | 14 | 40 | 34 | 13 |
| 7. Community and regional development | 9.6 | 14 | 46 | 27 | 13 |
| 8. Education, training, employment and social services | $27.4 | 21 | 46 | 22 | 11 |
| 9. Health | 44.2 | 22 | 31 | 31 | 12 |
| 10. Income security (including social security) | 147.6 | 18 | 40 | 31 | 12 |
| 11. Veterans benefits | 18.9 | 16 | 29 | 43 | 11 |
| 12. Law enforcement | 4.0 | 41 | 13 | 35 | 12 |
| 13. General Government | 4.1 | 2 | 62 | 24 | 12 |
| 14. Revenue sharing | 9.8 | 15 | 40 | 30 | 14 |
| 15. Interest on the national debt | 43.8 | 19 | 35 | 31 | 16 |

HOW SHOULD THE FEDERAL DOLLAR BE SPENT? THE 1978 FEDERAL BUDGET IS OUTLINED BELOW ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET CATEGORIES CURRENTLY IN USE, PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU THINK CONGRESS SHOULD ALLOCATE MORE, LESS OR THE SAME AMOUNT FOR EACH CATEGORY—Continued

[In percent]

| | Yes | No | No response |
|---|---|---|---|
| **B. CONCERNING ENERGY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES** | | | |
| 1 Should Congress support the President's energy policy? | 49 | 34 | 18 |
| 2 Should Congress deregulate, and thereby increase, the price of natural gas and oil to insure sufficient supplies of energy in the future? | 43 | 48 | 10 |
| 3 If a new tax on crude oil is established, should the taxes be rebated to low and middle income consumers rather than given to oil and gas producers as an incentive to increase production? | 49 | 38 | 13 |
| 4 Does the Government pay too much attention to environmental concerns like air and water pollution, and protecting wilderness areas? | 31 | 64 | 5 |
| 5 Should Congress substantially increase Federal spending on solar energy research and development? | 69 | 25 | 6 |
| 6 Should construction of the proposed Perkins nuclear powerplant on the Yadkin River be approved? | 53 | 36 | 12 |
| **C. CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR** | | | |
| 1. Should Federal spending on public service jobs be increased to help reduce unemployment? | 26 | 68 | 6 |
| 2. Should Congress have increased the Federal minimum wage? | 38 | 57 | 5 |
| 3. Should public employees have the right of collective bargaining? | 32 | 61 | 7 |
| 4. Should public employees have the right to strike? | 19 | 76 | 6 |
| 5. Should affirmative action programs, which establish hiring and other quotas for minorities, be continued? | 21 | 71 | 7 |
| 6. Should Congress have approved the labor law reform act which makes it easier for employees to organize unions? | 24 | 69 | 7 |
| **D. CONCERNING SOCIAL PROGRAMS** | | | |
| 1. Should social security taxes have been increased to keep the social security program financially sound? | 45 | 48 | 7 |
| 2. The Supreme Court has ruled that abortions cannot be denied to women who chose them and can afford them. Should abortions be paid for by the medicaid program for welfare recipients? | 24 | 70 | 6 |
| 3. Should Congress approve a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion? | 40 | 55 | 5 |
| 4. Should Congress replace the food stamp and other welfare programs with cash payments to welfare families and financial incentives for welfare recipients who find employment? | 40 | 47 | 13 |
| 5. Should Congress establish a comprehensive national health insurance program administered by the Federal Government? | 25 | 68 | 8 |
| 6. Should Congress establish a comprehensive national health insurance program administered by private insurance companies? | 29 | 60 | 12 |
| **E. CONCERNING FOREIGN AFFAIRS** | | | |
| 1. Should the Senate approve the new Panama Canal treaty? | 31 | 60 | 9 |
| 2. Should the United States continue to negotiate with the Soviet Union to reduce the number of nuclear weapons each country has? | 78 | 16 | 6 |
| 3. Should the United States go ahead with production of the B-1 bomber at a cost of more than $100,000,000 per airplane? | 30 | 59 | 11 |
| 4. Should the United States give up to 1 percent of its gross national product to the poorest nations in the world? | 24 | 66 | 10 |
| 5. Should the United States break diplomatic relations with Taiwan in order to establish full diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of China? | 12 | 75 | 13 |
| 6. Should American troops be removed from South Korea? | 38 | 51 | 11 |
| **F. CONCERNING OTHER ISSUES** | | | |
| 1. Should Congress make every effort to reduce inflation, even if it means higher unemployment? | 64 | 25 | 11 |
| 2. Should our tax system be simplified by considerably limiting deductions? | 43 | 44 | 12 |
| 3. Should Congress establish a new Federal agency to protect the interests of consumers? | 35 | 58 | 7 |
| 4. Should the Congress approve a constitutional amendment against busing? | 70 | 24 | 6 |
| 5. Should capital punishment be reinstated for some crimes? | 79 | 15 | 6 |
| 6. Should Congress extend the deadline for the States to ratify the equal rights amendment to the Constitution? | 24 | 70 | 9 |
| 7. Should the ERA be ratified? | 28 | 64 | 8 |
| 8. Should congressional elections be federally financed like the 1976 presidential election? | 32 | 60 | 8 |
| 9. Should the Postal Service be returned to congressional control and subsidized to the extent necessary to insure adequate and timely service? | 45 | 43 | 12 |
| 10. Should Congress pass the Humphrey-Hawkins bill? | 23 | 52 | 25 |

## NEED FOR IMPROVED NUTRITION EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently published a story which illustrates the great need for improved nutrition education in our public schools. The Congress has wisely moved to increase this effort through creation of a $26 million nutrition education last year.

As a member of the committee which acts on authorizing legislation for school and summer feeding programs, I have seen the extent to which such laudable programs have been captured by industry. Often, I have feared, the programs have more to do with the purchase of excess commodities than with assuring that our children get nutritious and healthy meals. This problem is exacerbated when the foods fed our schoolchildren are in the form of junk and garbage foods. Even though sometimes filled with vitamins and nutrients, these foods resemble regular products which are not fortified. Encouraging the consumption of heavily sweetened foods through the school programs therefore is contrary to one of the fundamental goals of the program, good nutrition.

During our hearings, we all recognized that nutrition education must be a major part of any program. The Post article indicates, however, how this field, too, has been largely captured by the food industry which cannot hope to offer the impartial and factual mode of presentation we would all hope for. The program which will be generated through the funding contained in the summer feeding bill will hopefully be far more independent, and therefore more along the lines envisioned when the program was created.

I would like to share the Post article with my colleagues.

WHAT DID YOU LEARN IN SCHOOL TODAY?

(By Marian Burros)

Angel food cake with ice cream. Balls of cream cheese softened with cream or fruit juice, rolled in chopped nuts and served with fruit.

Is it appropriate to recommend these to school children as low-calorie desserts?

The executive director of the Center for Science in the Public Interest, a nutrition activist, was telling a congressional committee last week that he doesn't think so even though the National Dairy Council offers them as such. Dr. Michael Jacobson said he believes the reason they are included in one of the Dairy Council's many publications used in the schools is simply because they contain dairy products.

He was using the National Dairy Council as an example of his claim that much of the nutrition education offered in classrooms comes from biased sources. "Many school systems have basically turned over the job of nutrition education to the Dairy Council. Teachers take its workshops, use its materials and echo its messages." Jacobson said the "industry-subsidized" organization has "contributed to nutritional ignorance, nutritional misinformation, and nutrition-related diseases."

The council's emphasis on dairy products, Jacobson said, "has something to do with the fact the Dairy Council's multimillion-dollar project is funded in large part by the dairy industry."

The Dairy Council is a trade association whose products were generally assumed to be good for everyone. That is, until recently, when many health experts began to recommend a decrease in the consumption of fat. Despite their acknowledged nutritional value, many dairy products are high in fat. But Jacobson might have chosen from dozens of other sources with more obvious direct commercial interests to make his point.

Material from Kraft's consumer relations department tells students that additives put into food are "beneficial" and "essential", and specifically that: "Safe human tolerances can be established for some substances that have induced cancer in experimental animals which have been submitted to questionable tests."

Many additives are used in Kraft products.

A Sugar Association brochure used in home economics classes says: "The Association has not found concentrated opposition to sugar in responsible medical circles, but it has detected concern among many individual doctors and dentists unfamiliar with the facts. This, unfortunately, seems to influence the thinking and actions of national and local politicians."

Isolated examples of companies or trade associations pushing their products and their points of view to the nation's student population? Not at all. These are just a smattering from the material, most of it free for the asking, available to school teachers all over the country. Much of it can be seen every year at the annual convention of the American Home Economics Association attended by many home economics teachers.

This year's exhibit in New Orleans had 240 booths. All but a very few of them were distributing information from people who have something to sell—whether sewing machines, microwave ovens, carpet sweepers, baby products, soft drinks, sugar-coated cereals, jams, jellies, marmalades, fish and cheese.

Only four government agencies had displays: the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the National Bureau of Standards and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute.

According to Sheila Harty, who has made a study of corporate advertising in schools, most teachers are delighted to have this material and are not critical of it. The slick, highly professional films, bright workbooks and recipe guides with four-color illustrations and photos are not available from other sources.

One Florida high school teacher told Harty, an education media specialist for Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law: "Materials disseminated by private industry couldn't be perceived as anything else but a sales pitch. But who cares? The federal government couldn't do as well."

The material is divided into two categories: that which is specifically geared to teaching and that which is informational and used both in classrooms and as promotional material to fill requests from the public. Some of the advertising is fairly subtle: the company's name is mentioned only occasionally. But the majority are like a recipe booklet from Dr. Pepper.

"Cooking with Dr. Pepper" offers a history of soft drinks, information on kitchen technology, nutrition information on the soft drink and about 40 recipes, all of which use Dr. Pepper as an ingredient. There is one for corn bread (1 package of cornbread mix and Dr. Pepper), another for Sugar Free Gazpacho Salad for which sugar-free Dr. Pepper is recommended.

In Campbell Soup Company's "Nutrition" pamphlet, under the headings of the well-known four food groups, the company lists its products. The nutrition information tables contain only the items the company sells—from canned soups and beans to frozen TV dinners.

Betty Crocker offers a filmstrip extolling the virtues of convenience foods—its convenience foods. Each recipe suggestion calls for a General Mills product.

Sometimes a company is quite direct in counterattacking suggestions that its products might not be the most nutritious in the world. At the convention, Hershey's offered home ec teachers: the story of chocolate and cocoa, including how Hershey's came into being; 48 of Hershey's favorite recipes; answers to some questions about Hershey Foods Corp., and a 28 minute film, "The Great American Chocolate Factory." In addition the company's literature includes a statement to consumers.

In essence it says that the company "shall stand firmly in our position that Hershey's products are mixture of ingredients which inherently have nutritional value," despite charges to the contrary that they and other confectionery products are "'empty calorie' or so called 'junk' foods."

The brochure includes excerpts from a speech made by the company's director of research. Questioning the FTC's proposal to regulate children's advertising, Dr. Barry Zoumas says: . . . is an apple consumed between meals more or less carcinogenic than a candy bar? Since apples contain a greater percentage of their calories from sugar than most candy bars, this is an important question to have answered before one bans the advertising of candy on television and attempts to encourage the consumption of apples."

The catalogue of educational publications and audio-visual aids from the National Livestock and Meat Board includes a pamphlet explaining "beef's role in feeding a hungry world": "With millions of lives at stake, decisions must be based on facts, not slogans. Anti-beef critics have seized on the world food situation to strengthen their arguments—often using misleading, unfactual statements. This folder sets the record straight. . . ."

The Cereal Institute has "facts and perspectives" to correct "confusing and mislead" impressions about the nutritional value of sugar-coated cereals.

Filmstrips on microwave cooking cover safety questions: "Myths concerning microwave ovens are scientifically dispelled."

The National Soft Drink Association puts in a pitch for education rather than "punitive or restrictive container laws," (bans on nonreturnable bottles and cans) to control litter.

Critics of this kind of nutrition education material are asking the government to provide the material instead. Some attempts are being made. The Department of Agriculture has just made $26 million available to the states to develop classroom materials, instruct teachers in nutrition principles and educate both students and school food-service workers about the relationship between diet and health.

The critics, for the most part nutrition activists inside and out of government, have a curious ally in their belief that business should not be in the business of educating the nation's children. What the president of the Association of National Advertisers, Peter Allport, has to say about the role of television advertising as a vehicle for educating children applies to education in the schools as well. In a letter to the editor of Advertising Age, Allport wrote:

". . . Education (as well as other things 'of the spirit') does not fall within society's mandate to business or, indeed, within its competence. Accordingly, I can think of few things which would be more inevitable than a rightful public outcry against an intrusion by business into areas such as education where it has neither competence nor a publicly legitimized role."●

---

## THE RECLAMATION LAW CONTROVERSY: BEHIND THE SMOKE

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent months a great debate has developed over the issue of the 1902 Reclamation Act. Some very expensive and slick advertising has been bought in national magazines and major newspapers which creates the impression that enforcement of the law will cause a catastrophic disruption of American agriculture. As I pointed out in my testimony before the Water and Power Subcommittee last week, enforcement of the law will affect only farmers in reclamation districts. Such farms constitute just two-tenths of 1 percent of all U.S. farms, and just 1 percent of all farmland. Moreover, the 1.3 million acres of reclamation land which is excess constitutes just a fraction of the total acreage, most of which is entirely in compliance with the law today.

Why then the major outburst? I would suggest that it has been generated not by a wide group of individuals, but by a select group of special interests who have been profiteering from lax enforcement of the law, and lavish taxpayer subsidies, for many years. While these special interests point to the jobs created and the taxes they have paid over the years, it is important to note the enormous personal profits—hundreds of millions of dollars—which they have enjoyed, all at the taxpayer expense, because it is the taxpayer and the utility ratepayer who pick up the tab for the subsidized water and the forgiven interest.

Let us look for a moment at just one of these districts. The Westlands Water District, which is part of the San Luis Unit in the Central Valley of California, is the largest, and probably one of the richest reclamation districts in the world. It is composed of 600,000 acres of land, converted by federally subsidized water into one of the most productive agricultural areas in the world. Without the Federal subsidy, it would have remained grazing land, for the most part. Every year, Westlands uses over 1 million acre feet of subsidized water, paying a rate established in the mid-1950's. The contract contains no inflation escalator clause, and runs until 2008. Every year water is delivered under that contract, taxpayers and utility ratepayers are making up the difference. This year, the subsidy totals $7 million.

Let me indicate the size of the subsidy enjoyed by this one reclamation district, noting in advance that it is not by any means representative of all districts. But neither are all other districts or landowners decrying enforcement of the law, or making the ludicrous demands upon the public treasury, which are a matter of habit to Westlands. I think it would be especially illuminating to compare the size of the subsidy to this one district, with its few hundred landowners, to the fiscal condition of New York City. Hopefully, the comparison will help my colleagues from nonreclamation States appreciate the magnitude of the benefits which have been bestowed for years on these special interests.

The Bureau of Reclamation has estimated that the subsidy to Westlands equals $1,600 per acre. Given Westlands' 600,000 acres, that totals $960,000,000 in subsidy. Although Westlands has a "population" of 9,000 people, few of these actually own land. There are actually only about 200 farm operations. But assume that all 9,000 profit from the subsidy. That means a per capita subsidy of $107,000.

Now, by comparison, New York City has 7,600,000 people. According to Westlands' formula, New York City deserves a subsidy of over $800 billion. And, I would point out, New York City also generates great wealth, and its residents pay a lot in taxes. Naturally, no one is suggesting that we began laying out enormous amounts of money for these kinds of subsidies to cities, or even to farmers in other regions of the country. Nor are all farmers in the West enjoying such benefits. But these figures should cause us to wonder a bit about all the furor which has exploded over the Reclamation Act, because the loudest cries are coming from a very select, and very prosperous farm elite. The rest of us should study the record carefully, and hang onto our wallets.●

AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY

## HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post addresses a subject which, in my judgment, should be of great concern to all Americans. I refer to the alarming decline in the growth of productivity in this Nation in the past few years.

Productivity, the output per hour of the American worker, grew at amazing rates during the years following the Second World War, and the United States took a commanding lead in world markets. The growth in productivity allowed Americans to improve their standard of living across the board, and this improvement continued over a period of so many years that we have come to expect it. The difficulty lies in the fact that we are not making the gains in productivity that are a prerequisite to the further upgrading of our standard of living.

Improving our Nation's productivity will not be as simple as it has been in the past. It will require hard work, creative thinking, and positive attitudes. All levels of the work force must be willing to put in a full day's work for a full day's pay while at the same time developing ways in which jobs can be done better and more efficiently. The challenge can be met, with awareness and true commitment to the improvement of our own standard of living, and indirectly, that of the rest of the world.

I direct the attention of my colleagues to the article, reprinted here.

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1978]

AMERICAN PRODUCTIVITY

Throughout most of the years since World War II, productivity in the American economy has risen briskly. As it went up, it carried with it people's earnings and standards of living. But the rise began to slacken about a decade ago, and for the past year and a half there has been hardly any rise at all. Of all the changes overtaking the American economy, the behavior of productivity is one of the most peculiar—and one of the most disquieting.

The immediate consequence of no productivity gains is that inflation will become harder than ever to control. But if the present pattern continues, it will also ignite uncomfortable political questions about dividing the pie in a country that has come to expect, and to count on, steady increases in both public and private wealth. Nobody really knows why productivity has stopped rising. All explanations are, to one degree or another, speculative. But the evidence suggests that it is no minor passing blip on the chart. The causes seem to lie deep in the changing structure of the national economy.

Productivity is simply the average output per hour of labor. The Labor Department computes it every three months, and it has just published the figures for the spring quarter of this year. They show that productivity was rising at the minuscule rate of 0.1 percent a year, after having fallen during the winter. Through the 1950s and most of the 1960s, it was going up at an impressive pace of nearly 3 percent a year. In the years after 1968, the trend dropped to half that rate. Since late 1976, it has been almost flat.

That departure is consistent with two other surprises. Inflation has been running considerably higher in recent months than most people expected, and unemployment has been considerably lower. Output over the past year has been raised by putting more people on payrolls, not by improving each person's capacity to produce.

It's a striking departure, and one explanation may well lie in the rather low rates at which business has been investing new capital. That, in turn, may be the result of low profits. Another possibility is the cost of the new environmental and safety rules, requiring industry to invest heavily in equipment to control air and water pollution.

Whatever the influences controlling productivity, they vary enormously from one country to another. In international competition, the United States is currently not doing well. The following brief table compares the increases in productivity in manufacturing, for the decade 1967–77, among some of the major industrial powers:

United States, 27 percent; France, 72; West Germany, 70; Italy, 62; Japan, 107; Canada, 43; Great Britain, 27.

There is a tendency in this country to regard Britain as the world's great example of industrial decline. But you will note that the rate of productivity gain in British factories over the past 10 years has been the same as in American factories.

Since no one is quite sure why the American rate has fallen, no one is in a position to offer a sure remedy. But these latest productivity figures may well strengthen the impulse in Congress to cut taxes on capital gains, in an effort to increase investment. Beyond that, it's also necessary to consider the possibility that some of this change may lie beyond the reach of government policy. A good many Americans' ideas about work, incomes and economic growth began to change around 1968. These new attitudes may now be showing up in the statistics on the nation's economic performance.●

NEVER TOO LATE

## HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, my district has become a symbol of what is gone wrong in urban America, and, fortunately, it has begun to become the laboratory in which we will discover some of the ways to make our urban policy work again. Unfortunately, the perception of my community—and it is a community—has been colored by all the bad news—the documentaries about arson, the photographs of rubble-strewn streets, the stories about crime and addiction. But I want to talk about another South Bronx, the South Bronx that has the capability of producing people who are lawyers, scientists, and ministers, and yes, Members of Congress like myself. That South Bronx exists, and one of my priorities here in the Congress is to get that image of my community across to Americans.

Recently, an article appeared in Nuestro, a new English-language magazine that covers the American Hispanic community. It was an article about the 12 outstanding Hispanic graduates of 1978, and among those graduates was Luis Maceira, a native and resident of the South Bronx, who, after receiving a degree as a premed psychology major this spring, will enter medical school this fall—at the age of 35. Luis wants to stay in the South Bronx to help. I applaud his determination, his vision, and his talents. It is people like Luis Maceira who will revitalize the South Bronx for future generations.

LUIS MACEIRA: NEVER TOO LATE

Looking back today, he remembers Morris High School in New York's South Bronx barrio as "not the best school around." So Luis R. Maceira dropped out at age 17 and joined the Air Force. For four years, he was a "grease monkey" fixing Air Force machinery in Viet Nam and elsewhere. Along the way he decided to finish his education and worked first for his high school general equivalency diploma, then for a degree at City College of New York. This month Maceira gets his diploma as a pre-med psychology major; next he goes to med school at State University of New York at Stony Brook. When he graduates, he will be a G.P.—35 years old. Luis is unfazed by his delayed start; he does not believe it is ever too late for change. The native of Santurce, Puerto Rico, has already forsaken bachelorhood for marriage and fatherhood. Nor do the well-publicized difficulties of med school daunt him. By now, Maceira knows that he can stick to his studies. His greater motivation is the people of the South Bronx. "People here always get the bad end of the stick. But as a doctor, I can help people directly. It may sound corny, but I got into this to help my people. I have lived in the South Bronx all my life. I want to practice here as a family doctor. I want to give something back to this place."●

SUPPORT FOR CETA

## HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong support for H.R. 12452, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). This bill provides job training and employment opportunities for the economically disadvantaged, the unemployed, and the underemployed. This bill also implicitly provides a measure of the heart and wisdom of America. It is not news to anyone that America has a chronic employment problem—millions of people who want to work cannot find jobs. The policymakers of the United States have two options—to try and actively do something about it or not. I would hope that only the most callous would not want to make the attempt. Failure to try means not only that we do not care about the welfare of our citizens but also means that the rolls of those on welfare will swell. It is in the enlightened self-interest of America to try—and try hard. When administered properly and run efficiently, CETA represents such an effort. The individual dignity innate in each and every human being demands that those who want to work can.

I have recently received telegrams from Richard S. Caliguiri, mayor of Pittsburgh, and from Allegheny County Commissioners Jim Flaherty, Thomas J. Foerster and Robert N. Peirce, in full

support of the CETA bill. I strongly support their statements and urge others to consider their arguments.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request unanimous consent to have these telegrams printed in the RECORD.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
*July 21, 1978.*

Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

It is my understanding that the CETA reauthorization bill is scheduled to reach the House the week of July 24. The CETA program has been extremely successful in the City of Pittsburgh. Since its inception it has provided employment and training services for over 34,000 individuals. The unemployment rate in the city, according to the latest available figure, is 6.4 percent—the lowest it has been for several years. However, the unemployment rate for minorities and women is above the 6.4 percent mark and is estimated to be even higher for minority youth. Although the economy of the city has shown signs of improvement in the past few months, there remains thousands of economically disadvantaged individuals waiting to obtain training and/or a public service job in the city's public service and training applicant files. I believe that funding for such programs should be cut. In addition, I do not believe that the current CETA legislation concerning PSE wages and supplementation should be altered. If a person is to be placed in a public service job that person should receive a wage commensurate with the wages received by other employees doing the same job. More importantly, it seems terribly unfair that if a PSE participant has the same skills as a non-PSE employee that the CETA participant should only be paid the minimum wage. The intent of CETA is not merely to provide jobs but also to provide a decent standard of living for the economically disadvantaged. The City of Pittsburgh is about to enter into a new phase of economic growth. It is my hope that this growth is not suddenly hindered by a reduction in the CETA program which would add considerably to our jobless rate. I look forward to a CETA re-enactment which will enhance the success which the program has enjoyed.

RICHARD S. CALIGUIRI,
*Mayor of Pittsburgh.*

---

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
*July 27, 1978.*

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
*House of Representatives, Rayburn Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Allegheny County strongly opposes efforts currently underway to add amendments to CETA reenactment. H.R. 12452, as it is presently reported by the Education and Labor Committee, is already a reform bill with controls against fraud and abuse, strict eligibility requirements, limitations on length of time an individual may hold a P.S.E. job, wage limitation, etc. Please vote against all amendments concerning public service employment that would effect any of the following: 1. lower P.S.E. wage ceiling, 2. restrict P.S.E. to minimum wage, 3. eliminate age indexing by area or consumer price index 4. reduce the number of jobs authorized in title VI, 5 eliminate P.S.E. in title II, 6. eliminate title VI, 7. change the title II allocation formula or any other amendments that would impede the intent of the original legislation.

JIM FLAHERTY,
*Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners.*
THOMAS J. FORESTER,
ROBERT N. PIERCE,
*Commissioners.*●

## TRIBUTE TO GEORGE HUBERT BATES

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, with sadness, I bring to your attention the passing of a very special friend of mine, George Hubert Bates of Jefferson City, Mo., dedicated his life to serving people of our State. He held State offices for 28 years, being State treasurer from 1953 to 1957 and commissioner of finance from 1957 until he retired in 1961.

Mr. Bates was active throughout his life. He was chief clerk at the Lexington Selective Service Board in World War I. He served as president of the Lexington Chamber of Commerce and the Lexington Country Club. He belonged to the Lexington Elks Club, the Woodmen of the World, the Masons, and the Scottish Rite bodies. He was a member of the Lexington Methodist Episcopal Church and served as superintendent of its Sunday school.

He was a warm and good friend. We became acquainted when I was a boy, as he and my father were close friends.

Besides his accomplishments, Mr. Bates was a man you could turn to for advice. He lived a long and admirable life and I am honored to have known such a dedicated man.●

---

## MEDICAL RESEARCH ON HUMAN SUBJECTS

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today legislation to establish the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The proposed Commission would succeed the present National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research which goes out of existence on October 31, 1978.

The studies of the National Commission have been of great value to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and to Congress in developing policies which would take into account the ethnical aspects of research involving human subjects and guarantee that the rights of such individuals be fully protected. The Commission's reports concerning the conduct of research on prisoners and children, on psychosurgery, on informed consent, and a variety of other difficult topics dealing with human research subjects were produced by a very able and hard-working group of outstanding individuals, whose efforts deserve our highest praise.

While ethical problems connected with research on human subjects still are very much with us, our society is currently grappling with many very difficult ethical dilemmas in the practice of medicine and in the conduct of biomedical and behavioral research which go far beyond the protection of the rights of the research subject. It is time that we began to deal with these problems directly and as expertly as possible. Our experience with the National Commission has demonstrated that the concept of a working study commission is a valid one, and has provided a model which may now be applied to the study of these areas at a time when Congress and the administration is having to make crucial policy decisions.

A glance at virtually any newspaper or television news program in recent weeks would indicate that both medicine and science have reached such a high degree of sophistication that we must now give serious thought to the ethical aspects of techniques and procedures which were believed to be impossible only a few years ago. Last week, it was the achievement in England of the fertilization of a human egg cell outside the human body and its subsequent transportation into the womb of the egg's donor. As you know, this resulted in the birth of a normal baby. While I regard this as an achievement which will be of great benefit to many couples presently unable to have children, there are, nevertheless, both ethical and legal questions raised by the use of the technique, particularly if it proceeds past the experimental stage to routine practice.

In hearings held by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment over the past few months, many other equally important issues were brought to the subcommittee's attention. For example, we have seen the development of X-ray technology to the point where it has become such a commonplace, routine diagnostic aid, that it's use is rarely questioned by either physicians or the public. Yet we were told in our hearings that the common practice of the routine X-ray screening of apparently healthy individuals is needlessly exposing the public to the risks of radiation and is adding substantially to the cost of health care while providing little or no benefit. This is but one of many examples where a technique led to a standard procedure with no prior or ongoing evaluation of whether the practice was efficacious or if it posed risks to the patient.

The once widely practiced tonsillectomy, the use of high oxygen levels for premature infants and the treatment of acne with X-rays all serve as past reminders of immediately applying a technique to routine practice before it was shown to provide a net benefit to the patient. More recently, we have had the swine flu issue. And, we are now trying to assess whether or not coronary bypass operations are really a good thing. Thus the current lack of a mechanism to establish standards of efficacy in procedures performed on humans poses a serious ethical problem.

Another perplexing area which the subcommittee looked into was the increasingly costly end stage renal dialysis

program, which is projected to cost taxpayers upward of $1 billion per year in the near future. While prolonging the lives of kidney patients, a majority of those on dialysis are still very sick people and cannot lead normal lives. Dialysis cannot cure the disease. Yet only a very small fraction of this sum was spent on research to better understand the causes of kidney disease and to find a more satisfactory treatment. Is this the most effective way for us to allocate our resources for health care and for biomedical research? Is it the most ethical? Should we opt in favor of research which will provide the greatest long-term benefit, or is it more important to provide the greatest relief possible to those who are suffering now? Can a proper balance be found?

There are many other issues which must receive serious attention soon. Are the patients rights in clinical trials fully protected? Is it appropriate for American drug companies to conduct clinical trials outside the United States where standards for the protection of the subject are far less stringent than under FDA rules? We have in recent years based much of our health policy on the proposition that health care is a right, not a privilege. Yet the quality and availability of health care differs widely depending on one's income and where in the country one happens to live. Can we develop a sound program of national health insurance without first examining the ethical problems in distribution of health services? Should the maintenance of life, per se, at any cost, override all other considerations in making medical decisions? Does one have a right to die? If so, under what conditions? And what of informed consent in agreeing to a particular medical procedure? Do patients or next of kin, at a time of great anxiety, really carefully read the forms they are signing? Does "informed consent" mean that one gives up the right to legal remedies in the event that person is unnecessarily harmed by a procedure?

With a little reflection, I am sure we could all add many more topics to this list. However, as a beginning, I have included in the charges to the proposed Commission the following eight subject areas. Additional mandates may be added by the President:

First. The allocation of Federal resources for biomedical and behavioral research and for health care delivery;

Second. The requirements for informed consent to participation in research projects and to otherwise undergo medical procedures;

Third. The establishment of a uniform definition of death;

Fourth. Counseling and testing for genetic diseases;

Fifth. The differences in the availability of health services as determined by the income or residence of the persons receiving the services;

Sixth. The requirements and guidelines applicable to clinical trials;

Seventh. The establishment of standards of efficacy applicable to medical procedures performed on humans; and

Eighth. Human in vitro fertilization.

I call upon my colleagues to support the proposed legislation and work for its speedy passage.●

## THE HUMAN VALUE OF THE HOSPICE PROGRAM

### HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure to attend a meeting of Marin County Hospice members where I was informed about the tremendous job being done in treating the terminally ill.

I would like to share the remarks of Jim White, a hospice survivor, that clearly indicates the human value of the hospice program.

WHAT HOSPICE MEANT TO US

(Remarks by James D. White, retired Associated Press correspondent and editor, to a luncheon at Hospice of Marin in San Rafael, Calif., for Rep. John Burton, his staff and other guests, July 7, 1978.)

When Jenifer, my wife for 44 years, died of bone cancer last October, she had been under Hospice care for about six months. She was 65, I was nearly 70, and we had no children or other family members nearby. Help from Hospice therefore had special meaning for us, and at the receiving end we concluded—in many discussions that continued as long as she lived—that we could discern three outstanding qualities in what the Hospice people did and how they went about it.

The first was Hospice's candor and conscience in filling the cancer information gap. We knew no more than anyone else about cancer: this despite Jenifer's 10 years as a surgical secretary during which she got no closer to cancer than operative notes—and we all know that in most cases an operation is only the opening skirmish with cancer; and as for my 40 years as a newsman, well, among the scores of stories I have written or edited dealing with cancer I can think of none that contained any substantive information about what actually happens with cancer. As for doctors, we had found them usually—and understandably—reluctant to go into detail about the progression of cancer.

Where it could, Hospice answered our questions, with tact and patience. Where it didn't have the answers, it went after them and reported back. Hospice people told us what equipment we'd need, what skilled and unskilled help was available, and where to get all these. In other words, they told us what to expect, what could be done about it, and how to do it.

The second factor that we found extremely valuable was Hospice's accessibility. We felt that the importance of the 24-hour call-in service cannot be overestimated. Yes, our doctor had told us to call him at any hour, day or night, and he meant it. But general practitioners tend to overwork themselves—ours certainly did—and are distracted by other patients and other kinds of patients, and one hesitates to add to their burden. It therefore was invaluable to us to be able to call Hospice at any hour in the 24-hour clock and get a sympathetic and helpful answer from specialists in our kind of case.

The third element that we thought was extremely important was Hospice's insistence upon fitting the care to the patient, instead of stuffing the patient into the relentless routine of some institution designed for other purposes. We were deeply impressed by the care and the tact with which this approach was carried out. Typically, Hospice asked us early in the game if we had any particular religious or philosophical beliefs. No, we said, we're agnostics, holding nothing more complicated than the simple Taoist concept of the cosmos as a balance, and that within that balance there are no effects without causes. The question never came up again, and we appreciated very deeply the wisdom of Hospice's universalist approach and its willingness to work within any reasonable framework of beliefs.

Jenifer first heard of Hospice from a nurse on the midnight-to-dawn shift at Marin General Hospital where she was undergoing radiation therapy in April, 1977. At our request, Hospice entered her case, and when radiation was finished it was Hospice's help and guidance that enabled us to be at home together for a whole month. In addition to the advice, information and special equipment provided by Hospice nurses such as a sheepkin and an eggcrate mattress, I should mention the lessons given me by the home health aide in bathing, bedmaking and other details which enabled me to take care of Jenifer.

During that month she was able to go through the whole house with me, in her wheelchair, deciding all the things that had to be decided after 44 years of life together. This made it possible for an innately tidy person to feel that her affairs were in some sort of order, and it made it possible for me to know what her wishes were and to carry them out later without having to guess about them.

When she no longer could sit up, Hospice and our doctor helped us arrange for a private room in a rest home where I could be with her 24 hours a day. There, we had three months together.

As she grew progressively weaker and more helpless, I was able to help her more, with her feeding, her medication, her bathing, massage and taking care of her colostomy. In this environment of quiet and privacy, she became much freer of pain, more cheerful and alert, and was fully aware of everything, including her own condition.

To Jenifer, Hospice meant that it was possible for her to end her life with the same sense of self-possession with which she had lived her 65 years. Together, we faced the end in peace and dignity which would have been impossible without Hospice.

For me, it meant that Hospice had helped her to suffer much less, and had made it possible for me to feel that I had been able to do as much for her as anyone could.

Because Hospice really works, I can stand here and talk to you about what it did and still does. I mean, now, the bereavement program, in which it is wonderfully helpful to be able to meet and talk again with those wonderful people who helped us both, who know what happened to us both. I have received much help from others who are ahead of me in the survivor experience, who understand without being told what the problems are. And I find it deeply satisfying to be able to understand and, at times, help those who are just entering the survivor sequence and are struggling up through the overwhelming sense of loss and disorientation I know something about.

Finally, I find what volunteer work I've done for Hospice immensely therapeutic, providing a sense of being part of something that is as uniquely useful as it is desperately needed.●

## PROBLEMS WITH 5.5 PERCENT CAP ON FEDERAL PAY RAISE

### HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, sections 860 and 861 of H.R. 13635, the defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1979, as reported by the House Appropriations Committee, would place a 5.5-percent ceiling on all Federal blue collar

employee pay raises which take effect during fiscal year 1979 (October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979). I can appreciate the House Appropriations Committee following the President's recommendation that Federal white collar pay raises be kept at the 5.5-percent level. However, there are some problems with this appropriations "cap" which I wanted to bring to my colleagues' attention.

Because Federal blue collar raises are not implemented simultaneously, but, rather, are given to the various local wage areas at different times during the year, an appropriations ceiling will not treat all Federal blue collar employees equally. For instance, those who receive their raises in January will have their wages affected for approximately 9 months, while workers who receive their raises in June will have their wages capped only for 4 months. It is hard to imagine that any organization in the private sector would pursue such an inequitable policy, and I do not believe we in the Congress should either. There is no system at present to allow either the President or the Congress to fairly apply a ceiling on blue collar raises, particularly in an appropriations bill. Besides, the President's remarks of April 11, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, when he announced that he wanted Federal pay increases kept at 5.5 percent, were specifically directed to white collar (general schedule) employees, with no mention of blue collars:

> Last year, Federal white collar salaries rose by more than 7 percent. I intend to propose a limit of about 5½ percent this year, thereby setting an example for labor and industry to moderate price and wage increases.

Thus, while it appears that the House Appropriations Committee was following President Carter's wishes by reporting sections 860 and 861, this is not the case.

Additionally, my colleagues should be aware that the continuing distortion of pay comparability for Federal employees enforces the arguments for collective bargaining. If the President and/or the Congress persist in depressing Federal salaries and wages, the efforts to have Federal pay set at the bargaining table would be strengthened. We should not overlook this fact.

Finally, I know there has been much concern lately over the growing power of the Appropriations Committees at the expense of the authorizing committees, and I believe sections 860 and 861 are further evidence that these concerns are not groundless. Public Law 92-392 refined and codified a complex procedure for establishing pay comparability in the blue collar wage area. It was developed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and it is this law which should be amended to allow for the equitable application of a pay "cap" for Government blue collar personnel. Therefore, sections 860 and 861 do not attempt to usurp the authority of an existing legislative program, but are an "end run" around the members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who have jurisdiction over Federal pay.

So, as you can see, although sections 860 and 861 are well intentioned, they are not sound pieces of legislation. Thus, I urge you to strike these provisions from H.R. 13635.●

## THE NATURAL GAS BILL

### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following Washington Post article on the natural gas bill. As this article points out, the current agreement is very different from the bill passed by the House last August.

The Energy Information Administration report cited in the article states that the compromise agreement will cost $32 billion more than the House bill. This would result in consumers paying from $28.5 billion to $50 billion more for gas through 1985. Yet, the EIA projects supplies to increase only by 0.2 trillion cubic feet over the House bill—last year's production alone was nearly 20 trillion cubic feet. The inflationary effect of paying $32 billion more for virtually the same amount of gas is disconcerting to say the least.

Finally, both the article and the EIA study indicate that the twin goals of conserving gas supplies for high priority users and protecting residential users from sharp price increases will not be met. Rather, the compromise is seen as providing less gas at higher prices to these users than would have occurred under the House bill.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1978]

AFTER SQUEEZING THROUGH HILL PIPELINE, GAS BILL NOW SKEWED TOWARD INDUSTRY

(By William Greider)

When President Carter first proposed his national energy plan, one principle was clear: The nation's dwindling pool of natural gas would be saved for the homeowners of America. Industry would be coaxed or driven, by taxes, prices and regulatory rules, to shift to other less-precious fuels.

Now, 15 months later, that priority has been reversed.

Carter's compromise natural gas bill, scheduled this week or next for an up-or-down climax vote in the Senate, is skewed in the other direction—big industry is supposed to get more natural gas in the future, a lot more, while homeowners and businesses are expected to get along on less.

The reason for this is simple, according to C. William Fischer, deputy administrator of the Department of Energy's quasi-independent analytical section. The final prices set for homeowners are much higher in the compromise measure than they were in the original plan—high enough to drive residential and commercial users away from gas, not toward it.

The NEP originally envisioned an increase in residential-commercial consumption of natural gas of 8 percent by 1985. The compromise bill, according to an evaluation by Fischer's Energy Information Administration, will produce a decrease of about 4 percent. Total industrial consumption, on the other hand, was expected to hold even or decline slightly by 1985, as companies switched to coal and other fuels. Now the administration bill claims that total industrial use will grow by 10 to 14 percent in the next six years.

"There are rational reasons for that," said Fischer, "the main one being the price differentials. . . . The compromise has a price for residential of $3.31 [per thousand cubic feet] by 1985. That's a significantly higher price, 57 cents higher than the national energy plan. That would tend to drive down consumption in the residential sector."

In terms of future consumption, said a staff professional on the House Commerce Committee, "industrial users are just coming out the big winners."

This is one of the fundamental mutations that have crept into the president's program during its arduous journey through Congress, a trip which has left all sides exhausted and politically jangled by so many bargains made and unmade, so many angry speeches and private deals, so many fortunes won or lost in the fine print of this legislation.

No one seems very eager for the Senate showdown ahead. Another filibuster is expected from the pro-consumer liberals who are opposed to deregulation and higher gas prices, in any form. They may be joined this time by a few pro-oil conservatives who are disgusted with the compromise's extremely complex formula for phased deregulation over seven to 10 years. They think the oil industry should kill this bill and try again next year for immediate deregulation of gas prices.

The administration hopes to break the filibuster on the third or fourth try, depending upon a middle spectrum of Democrats and Republicans, senators who are either loyal to the Carter program or loyal to the oil industry, who started out this fight on opposite sides.

The political imperative that unites them now is to pass something, to settle the matter once and for all, even if the victory is riddled with impurities. Passage of the gas bill would give the president a much-needed political victory and, for industry, it promises what gas producers have been fighting 24 years to accomplish—an end to federal control over interstate natural gas prices.

What would this bill do for America? Or to America? as the critics would say. All answers and explanations must be hedged by this note of caution: virtually all aspects of this measure—the economic impact, the impact on energy production, the fine print and the larger purposes—are the subject of intense dispute at this moment, extremely technical arguments that are not likely to be resolved by the final political rhetoric coming up in the Senate and the House.

In simplest terms, the measure will authorize a substantial transfer of income within American society—at least $28.5 billion over the next six years—from all the consumers of natural gas to all the companies that produce it. Some critics claim that the transfer will be much larger, closer to $50 billion, but at the very least the gas industry should derive an increase of 17 percent in its expected revenue.

The White House inflation watchers, who are concerned about the inflationary effects of government regulation for safety and the environment, have not shown much interest in the inflationary potential of deregulation. An inquiry at the Council on Wage and Price Stability produced this response: "We have not done anything with natural gas. It's a very complex, complicated thing. With our limited staff, there wasn't any way we could get into it."

The Department of Energy claims that the $28.5 billion is a good investment for the nation with these benefits: Increased gas production would be stimulated by the higher prices. The nightmare of regional gas shortages in hard winters would be eliminated. The prices would also shift industrial use of gas from wasteful boiler burning to more essential purposes like manufacturing processes. The bill also proposes gradual melding of the two gas markets which now cause so many headaches to energy planners, users and producers—the interstate national market whose prices are controlled by federal government and the unregulated intrastate

market of Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma, where smaller independent producers can sell gas for a much higher price now, as long as their fuel doesn't cross state lines. The dual market is blamed for many problems—large and small companies hold their gas for the higher-priced southwest market, if they can, while northern customers come up short.

Top aides to Energy Secretary James R. Schlesinger did a bit of backing and filling on the question of who will get this new gas production stimulated by the bill. Jim Bishop, Schlesinger's press secretary, first responded by pointing out that the national energy plan mandated a natural gas policy favoring homeowners.

"That's the heart of the Carter policy," Bishop explained. "Gas is going to be reserved for the homeowner."

After more discussion, Bishop referred the question to DOE experts, including Leslie J. Goldman, deputy assistant secretary, who likewise expressed disbelief that any DOE documents were claiming increased industrial consumption as a consequence of the natural gas bill.

Later, Goldman examined the figures and responded with a clarification: Yes, industrial uses would increase—by as much as 2 trillion cubic feet by 1985—and residential use would be held even.

Goldman argued that these consequences would still be consistent with the President's plan. Total industrial consumption will go up, he said, but the wasteful uses will go down—particularly the use of natural gas for electricity generation and oil refineries. He claims that no oil refineries will be burning natural gas for heat by 1985. Furthermore, he insists that the residential users won't be hurt because insulation and other conservation measures will save so much gas that many more homes will burn the same amount of natural gas by 1985.

It should be noted that some private industry analysts think the administration's projections on future consumption are strange, to put it nicely. They point out that homeowners have fewer options than industry about choosing a fuel to burn. A large factory can easily switch from gas to oil, as many have done in recent years, while residential use of natural gas has continued to increase.

Once a home is hooked up for gas, the owner is not likely to switch, even if stuck with a sharp price increase. Total industrial consumption has declined slowly since the early 1970s when energy prices shot up—a trend that might be accelerated not reversed, by future price increases.

Homeowners have always paid much higher rates for natural gas than industrial or commercial customers. The original plan favoring homeowners was to shrink that difference drastically but, as various amendments and industrial exemptions were bargained into the pricing formula, that goal evaporated. The final version does reduce the gap, but by only a few cents, from an average of 85 cents to 72 cents.

The irony of all this back and forth is that the substantial increase targeted for industry may be an embarrassment to energy planners—but has also become one of the major political selling points for their bill. Administration lobbyists, according to one DOE memo, should remind business and labor and senators of this point:

"Industrial use of gas could increase by more than 2 trillion cubic feet; there would be no curtailment of firm demand. The gas supply in the heavily industrialized midwest would increase by nearly 50 percent."

The unions are an important battleground in this political struggle—union members are homeowners who oppose higher heating bills but they are also workers who need industrial growth for jobs. The administration argument is that, on balance, the compromise bill hurts homeowners less than the alternative of total deregulation and it will also stimulate economic growth. Unions, as a matter of principle, oppose deregulation, but the question is how hard they will fight against Carter's version of it.

"The consumer folks," said one administration official, "are trying to get the unions to look at this in terms of higher prices. We're trying to get them to look at it in terms of jobs."

On a regional basis, the administration is selling broad economic benefits to most sections of the country, quite apart from the national impact of higher prices for everyone. The sales pitch goes like this:

The midwestern industrial cities—the great centers of steel, glass, autos—are being promised a reliable supply for healthy industrial growth.

Midwestern agriculture, which depends heavily on natural gas for chemical fertilizer and corn-drying and other processes, will pay more for gas—but agriculture production has been exempted from the higher-priced pool that affects most industrial users. This same argument will appeal to other farm regions, like the South, where textiles and food-processing plants are also exempted from the higher industrial prices.

In the East, the increase in natural gas is supposed to displace more expensive fuels—liquefied natural gas and synthetic gas—that are used there in small amounts, thus moderating the average costs for everyone. If you are paying $3.60 or so for LNG, then natural gas at $2.13 looks pretty good.

For New England, which doesn't burn much gas in any case, the argument heard on Capitol Hill is any gas-pricing measure that raises the cost of manufacturing for the rest of the nation is bound to help the depressed industrial base of New England.

For the West, there is an additional argument: passage of the natural gas bill would pave the way for pipeline projects to bring vast new quantities of gas by the late 1980s from both Alaska and Mexico.

The Carter administration suspended negotiations with the Mexican government on an import project for its newly discovered gas until after passage of this bill. Mexico wants a guaranteed price of $2.60, well above the current market, and the bargaining is expected to resume if Congress raises the U.S. price closer to that target.

The Alaskan gas pipeline is waiting on the higher prices too. A higher price base would make it easier to arrange financing for the mammoth project. In the meantime, states like Alaska have arranged an exemption of their own—ensuring that state-enacted severance taxes on natural gas will be excluded from the federal pricing scale.

Everyone in Congress understands that the major regional beneficiary would be the southwest, though the benefits won't be spread evenly there by any means. The oil-producing states are where most of America's natural gas lies and that's where most of the $28.5 billion would go. The administration reminds everyone that the prices and the cash transfer would have been much worse under the total deregulation bill passed by the Senate last year.

The pro-consumer opponents of this compromise would argue that all this money doesn't have to change hands in order to accomplish the various economic benefits promised by the Carter administration. Their solution, in the extreme, would be simply to extend federal price control to all that intrastate gas production in Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma and then, by federal regulation, allocate the sale of that gas to the customers who will need it most.

If there is any doubt that the oil industry came out of this legislative struggle with good results, listen to Sen. J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.) addressing a meeting of Texas independent gas producers in Houston last month, trying to persuade them to support the compromise:

"I tell you this—compared to the president's program, compared to the House bill, compared to what we feared and, frankly, even compared to what we had hoped, this is a magnificent bill, believe it or not."

Many of the smaller independents do not believe it. They have smaller wells that sell gas in the unregulated intrastate market—so this bill puts them under the thumb of Uncle Sam for the first time. Their gas production would become subject to a nightmarish system of price categories—17 different flavors of natural gas or 23, depending on who does the counting. This "reregulation," as DOE officials now call it, is supposed to expire by 1985, but the oil men are skeptical—they fear that a future president or a future Congress will change their minds and they'll be stuck permanently under federal regulation.

In any case, the largest benefits will flow to the larger companies that control the major reservoirs, either onshore or in offshore waters. This is natural gas that would inevitably be sold to interstate customers in the North, whether price controls continue or not.

When Carter announced his energy plan, the regulated interstate price for new gas was an average of $1.42, up from 52 cents in 1976. The president first proposed $1.75. The argument moved upward to $1.93. The compromise bill envisions a final price by 1985 in the neighborhood of $2.60 per thousand cubic feet.

Even allowing for the distortion of inflation built into those figures, they demonstrate crudely the way this argument has gone—in favor of the producers. Major companies that have purchased expensive offshore leases, as one petroleum analyst puts it, "were sitting on a lot of 50-cent gas that's now going to sell for $1.80 or $2."

The administration is "cautiously confident" that this package of interests will sell the natural gas legislation, when the votes are counted. Working in its favor now is plain fatigue: everyone is sick of fighting over this horribly complex subject.

"What we hear on the Hill," said one energy aide, is: "Let's get it through. Let's get it out of here."●

## TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. "JACK" JACQUES

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I note the passing of John W. "Jack" Jacques, of Slater, Mo. Mr. Jacques, president of the State Bank of Slater for 30 years, was an esteemed member of the banking profession for 52 years. He was a member of the Slater Airport Board and the Zoning and Adjustment Board. From 1921 until 1964, he served as treasurer of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Mr. Jacques was a member of the Slater First Baptist Church, a Scoutmaster, and a Mason.

I join all who mourn the passing of this good man.●

## ILLEGAL ALIENS

### HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, today as we debate our Nation's foreign aid program, I think it important that we take note of a related problem—that of the

increasing tide of illegal aliens coming into this country.

The following article from the New York Times is based on a new book, "The Illegals," by a distinguished Texan, Grace Halsell. She is a talented and responsible writer who has been my very good friend for many years. I would commend the article to my colleagues for the insight it provides into the growing problem of illegal aliens.

For two years I have been living with people on both sides of the Mexican border investigating the illegal immigrants who are entering this country.

Our border with Mexico is a line on a map that, in reality, is difficult to discern. On either side of that 2,000 mile border that runs from Brownsville, Tex., to just south of San Diego, Calif., there is the same expanse of brilliant sky, the same soil producing the same fruits and vegetables, and people who feel equally at home in Mexico or in the Southwest.

The borderlands comprising four American states and six Mexican states, are not two distinct countries so much as a binational, bicultural regional entity, a zone of interlocking economic, social and cultural interests.

Cruz Sedillo, 87 years old, can trace his family history in the Southwest for 12 generations, to the 1500's. A native of New Mexico, he observed, "Hispanos have always lived in the Southwest. We're second only to the Indians. And, like the Indians, we are an indigenous people."

The Spaniards were here more than two decades before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. El Paso, Tex., has been Spanish and Mexican far longer than it has been part of the United States.

All of what is now the Southwest once belonged to Mexico. In 1846, with the discovery of gold in California, President James K. Polk ordered United States troops to march into Mexico. By taking California, and the land between, he extended the United States to the Pacific.

Henry David Thoreau went to jail rather than pay taxes to support this war. Abraham Lincoln, then a freshman Congressman, accused President Polk of ordering United States troops "into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement, purposely to bring on a war." Ulysses S. Grant, a young second lieutenant in the Mexican war, called it a "political war," one of the "most unjust" ever waged.

By winning the war, the United States not only annexed half of Mexico, but acquired all the Mexican citizens who were living in the Southwest.

Mexicans still observe the anniversaries of their defeats at Chapultepec and Molino del Rey as national days of fasting and prayer. And as recently as 1943, Mexican schools were using maps designating the land we acquired as "territory temporarily in the hands of the United States."

This history is important in understanding why so many Mexicans come over the border illegally. I interviewed scores of Mexican nationals in American jails who had crossed without documents.

And, on several occasions, to better understand their experiences, I swam the Rio Grande, crawled through the sewers of Tijuana and was guided at night through the infamous Smugglers Canyon" near San Diego.

Undocumented workers do not feel they commit a crime in traveling north from Mexico. They call it going to *el norte*. As far as the Southwest is concerned, we are the legals, the Anglos the illegals," one Mexican said.

Hispanos are the nation's youngest and fastest growing group and soon they will outnumber blacks as the largest minority. The largest number has come here from Mexico and they are scattered throughout this country—in New York and Chicago as well as the Southwest.

Today, every fifth Texan is of Mexican origin. In some of that state's southern counties, their proportion is as high as 98 percent. Los Angeles has 1.5 million Mexican-Americans and, after Mexico City, is the second largest "Mexican" city. Before 1985, it is predicted, Mexicans-Americans will comprise a majority of California's population.

Already Hispanos swing many important elections. Some have argued that they delivered Texas—and Presidential victory—to Jimmy Carter. Others say they will determine the future for Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. of California.

Mexican immigrants often retain their traditions and language. Many come from small villages, they retain customs and hold deep personal and religious convictions. The newcomers constantly renew the Mexican heritage of Mexican-Americans. And in doing so they are aided, as no earlier immigrant group was, by civil-rights legislation.

The United States defeated Mexico and took the Southwest," a Mexican-American, Roberto Salazar, told me. Now I think the conquerors are being conquered. Anglo culture is being influenced more than it wants to be, or is aware of."

Mexicans as well as Anglos are moving into to fastest growing part of the United States, and who will control the land there is still in doubt. Mexican-Americans may regain, through the ballot box, the control they lost through war.●

---

## FDA'S PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON ANTIBIOTICS

## HON. CHARLES ROSE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a report, "Antibiotics in Animal Feeds: Risk vs. Benefit," outlining the scientific and economic concerns of the Food and Drug Administration's proposed restrictions on the use of antibiotics in animal feeds.

Part V shall present the first part of a U.S. Department of Agriculture briefing paper on the FDA's proposed antibiotics use restrictions:

SCIENCE—DEFENDING 25 YEARS OF BENEFITS

THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF FDA'S CASE

In 1970, the Food & Drug Administration established a task force to study whether antibiotics used subtherapeutically in animal feeds should be restricted. The move followed a report from a committee in England that recommended restricting the use of antibiotics in animal feed. England subsequently required the use of many antibiotics in animal feed be limited to prescription by a licensed veterinarian. The FDA task force was headed by Dr. Van Houweling. His special assistant was Gerald B. Guest, who is now acting deputy associate director of the Bureau of Veterinary Medicine.

In an interview, Dr. Guest explained the way resistance is developed in bacteria exposed to antibiotics and how that resistance can be passed from one bacterium to another He said that until 1960 scientists assumed that resistance developed due to chance genetic mutations of bacteria exposed to antibiotics. However, scientists found in 1960 that genetic material carrying the resistance can be passed directly from one bacterium to another. The resistance can be passed from a non-pathogenic strain of bacteria to one that does produce disease.

"If there are a few resistant bacteria in an animal's gut and you put the antibiotic in, you select for the resistant organisms by clearing out the sensitive ones. A population will develop that is 90 to 95 percent drug resistant. When the animal defecates, bacteria that get into the environment are drug resistant. We know they stay that way for long periods of time.

"They contaminate the environment of farm families. We know from studies that farm families, if they have animals receiving antibiotics, carry more germ resistance than families that live in cities. That's because they get the bacteria on their hands. The other factor may be that they're handling antibiotic dusts and residues from mixing operations."

Dr. Guest said scientists know there is a common pool of various kinds of bacteria that can be passed back and forth between animals and human beings.

The 1972 report of the FDA Task Force on the Use of Antibiotics in Animal Feeds summarized the scientific findings that FDA used as the basis for restricting the use of such antibiotics:

"1. The use of antibiotics, especially subtherapeutic amounts, favors the selection and development of single and multiple antibiotic resistant and R-factor-bearing bacteria. (R-factor is the genetic material carrying the resistance.)

"2. Animals which have received either subtherapeutic and/or therapeutic amounts of antibiotic in feed may serve as a reservoir of antibiotic-resistant pathogens and nonpathogens. These reservoirs of pathogens can produce infections.

"3. The prevalence of multi-resistant R-factor-bearing pathogenic bacteria in animals has increased and has been related to the use of antibiotics.

"4. Organisms resistant to antibacterial agents have been found on meat and meat products.

"5. There has been an increase in the prevalence of antibiotic resistant bacteria in man."

The concern of FDA, and the reason for Commissioner Kennedy' decision is that resistant pathogens could cause disease outbreaks in humans for which there would be no antibiotic treatment. A number of human diseases resist antibiotic treatment now, according to the testimony of Dr. Richard P. Novick, Chief, Department of Plasmid Biology, The Public Health Research Institute of the City of New York, Inc. These include *E. coli* diarrhea, pneumonia, salmonellosis and gonorrhea, Dr. Novick told the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Agriculture Research and General Legislation.

The source of this resistance, whether hospitals or animal feed, is not known.

THE SCIENTIFIC REBUTTAL

"Apart from the technicalities of the feared transfer of antibiotic resistance from long recognized resistant strains and species of enteric microflora (intestinal bacteria) to other species which could conceivably cross over into humans and, at least theoretically, elicit an uncontrollable epidemic in man, the fact rather solidly remains that after 25 years of feeding a multiplicity of various antibotics, coccidiostats, anthelmintics, sulfonamides, nitrofurans, etc. to over 100 billion head of livestock in the U.S. alone, and perhaps another 50 billion abroad, it has never happened yet," declared Dr. Robert H. White-Stevens, chairman, Bureau of Conservation and Environmental Science, Rutgers University, at the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee hearings. "This does not mean it will never happen, but only that the odds that it will are somewhere around one in 100 billion or more."

Dr. Jukes, the University of California medical physics professor, testified: "The question of resistance-transfer is fascinating.

Careful laboratory studies show that this takes place more readily in the test tube than it does in the digestive tract."

Dr. Jukes cited an experiment on antibiotic resistance that compared a community in Iowa where antibiotics were used in animal feed with an urban population in Connecticut. "There was no difference in the pattern of antibiotic resistance between the two populations, with a few exceptions," Dr. Jukes said. "The tetracycline resistance, however, showed no geographical pattern. If anything, it was somewhat lower in Iowa."

A position paper issued by Pfizer, Inc., entitled "In Defense of Animal Feed Antibiotics," disputes the main scientific points advanced by FDA as the basis for restricting the use of antibiotics in animal feed.

Pfizer said that even though intestinal bacteria in humans and animals are the same strains, it was found in one industry study "that fecal specimens from human subjects in daily contact with calves showed no significant differences in the marked R-factor, marked E coli (a bacterium) or changes in resistant coliforms when comparisons were made with respect to whether or not the calves received tetracyclines."

Both Pfizer and Dr. Jukes reported on experiments where attempts have been made to colonize human intestines using massive doses of *E. Coli* of animal origin. "In general, *E. Coli* of animal origin have been shown to be poor colonizers of the human intestinal tract, even when exceptionally large doses of bacteria were ingested," Pfizer concluded.

Generally, the position of those supporting the use of subtherapeutic levels of antibiotics in animal feeds is that the link between use of antibiotics in animals and the development of resistant bacteria in humans has never been established. They contend that the resistance in humans probably is due to the use and misuse of antibiotics to treat human diseases.

Even FDA's Dr. Van Houweling says the link between animals and humans is very difficult to establish. At the OTA's first public meeting, Dr. Van Houweling said, "To identify bacteria in animals and then have them show up in a person several weeks or a month later technologically has not been achieved. We have to use circumstantial evidence and say, "Yes, we put the associations together and have come to this conclusion."

THE EFFICACY OF ANTIBIOTICS

The fact that using antibiotics in animal feeds promotes growth and improves feed conversion has been well established for a quarter of a century.

Dr. Byerly presented a paper on "Efficacy of Drugs Used as Feed Additives" at the OTA meeting. He said, "Antibiotics used as growth promotant levels in the feed may save two million metric tons of feed a year. In the absence of equally effective alternates, this accounts for 400,000 metric tons of red and poultry meat—about 100,000 metric tons of beef and veal, 250,000 metric tons of pork, 45,000 metric tons of chicken, and 5,000 metric tons of turkey."

Dr. White-Stevens was a pioneer in the use of antibiotics in animal feed. He testified that growth promotion is due to the antibiotics' effect on bacteria and other organisms in the farm animal. These organisms "compete intestinally for its food, secrete undesirable toxins, or infect and pathologically ravage its tissues."

In addition to promoting growth, antibiotics are used subtherapeutically in feed to control animal diseases. White-Stevens said these diseases included "shipping fever and foot rot in steers; scours and liver abcesses in calves; transmissable gastro enteritis, scours and rhinotracheitis . . .; coccidiosis, aerosacculitis, synovitis and 'rot gut' in chicks; and blackhead, sinusitis, and blue comb in turkeys, plus a score of other diseases that plague the husbandman."

ECONOMICS—WHO PAYS THE PIPER

THE ECONOMICS BENEFITS

The core of the case for continued use of antibiotics in animal feed lies in the demonstrated economic benefits vs. theoretical and unproven risks.

FDA readily concedes that subtherapeutic use of antibiotics benefits both producers and American consumers. Examining the economic consequences of restricting the subtherapeutic use of tetracyclines in feedlot cattle and swine, the FDA concluded that American consumers would pay $1.9 billion more for meat each year if tetracyclines were not used. American Cyanamid Co., a drug producer, said "this translates into an increase of 7 cents a pound for beef, and 15 cents a pound for pork. And this does not even take into account any death losses resulting from increased disease among animals on the farm."

FDA did not make a similar analysis of the impact of its proposed restrictions on poultry prices. However, in another analysis based on 1970 figures, FDA calculated that the use of antibiotics in animal feed provided a $33 million benefit for broiler producers and $13.9 million for turkey producers.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimated that the use of antibiotics in feed was worth $100 million to drug producers; $1 billion to the poultry and meat industry, and $2.1 billion to consumers. Scientists at the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station estimated that two million additional crop acres would be required to produce the added 103 million bushels of corn and 23 million bushels of soybeans that would be needed to maintain beef and pork production, if the use of antibiotics in feed was stopped.

All of these estimates are based only on the changes in the efficiency of feed conversion. They do not take into account the greater losses from disease and from higher mortality among animals and birds that did not get antibiotics in their feed. This would be difficult to estimate. But diseases could spread rapidly among high concentrations of chickens in modern poultry operations, or among cattle in feedlots.

THE "DOMINO PRINCIPLE"

The economic facts notwithstanding, FDA is going ahead with its restrictions on penicillin and tetracyclines.

Commissioner Kennedy told the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee that "when we are confronted with what we view as a serious public health risk, we are not allowed to consider the economic side of the issue. We simply have to make that risk evaluation."

Fred Holt of the Animal Health Institute contends that if the commissioner cannot weigh the economic benefits, then no drug intended for food producing animals is safe from being banned. He said in an interview, "If we can't consider the value to the grower, if any risk, no matter how small, allows FDA to remove a product from the market, then we're not just looking at these specific products (penicillin and tetracyclines). If this philosophy is employed, it will have a domino effect and we could end up with virtually no feed additives available to agriculture."

Dr. Kennedy said in his announcement restricting the use of penicillin and tetracyclines, "These actions should be viewed as a first step toward FDA's ultimate goal of eliminating, to the extent possible, the nontherapeutic use in animals of any drugs needed to treat disease in man. In our view, the benefit of using these drugs routinely as over-the-counter products to help animals grow faster, or in prophylactic (disease prevention) programs does not outweigh the potential risks posed to people."

RIGHT FOR WRONG REASONS?

Dr. Kennedy's apparently hasty declaration of FDA's policy intentions did not catch everyone flatfooted. The drug ban position paper which he adopted had been in the making for several years. With this attitude developing within FDA, some drug manufacturers introduced "animal use only" antibiotics to the American market. (In fact, even before regulatory action, one manufacturer introduced a non-therapeutic feed antibiotic solely for growth promotion and feed efficiency).

Universally, they agree with the Animal Health Institute that there is probably no *scientific* problem with regard to the cross-resistance factor in human and animal bacteria. But they feel a case can be made for the use of alternatives as a means of at least circumventing what may become a *regulatory* problem.

Supporting their animal-use only argument, they say, is increasing evidence that some of the more popular antibiotics require higher and higher usage levels to produce the same effectiveness they did when first introduced. (Bacitracin, for example, is cited as one drug which was fed at 10 grams a ton 10 years ago, but which most mixers use today at a minimum of 25 grams.)

If animal-use manufacturers are raising an issue, in order to circumvent a marketing problem, they at least pose this question: Aside from human risk, which they consider absolutely minimal in current drugs, what will increased resistance of animal bacteria face, given continued exposure to certain antibiotics?

It isn't the human Dr. Kennedy should be trying to protect, long-range, they are saying in effect, but the animal world! They are consistent, however, in criticizing Dr. Kennedy's tack. They don't want the FDA camel to get his nose under the tent, either, because they think FDA's human risk assumption is entirely wrong. This sets the stage, then, for examining industry's unanimous posture on the proposed drug ban.

THE POSITION OF INDUSTRY

The meat producing, animal feed, and animal health industries have taken strong positions that the use of antibiotics for growth promotion and disease control is not only desirable but absolutely essential.

Oakley Ray, president of the American Feed Manufacturer's Association, said the withdrawal of antibiotics used in animal feed would mean "we would have to go back to the kind of agriculture I grew up with, where there were 300 birds on one farm."

Lee Boyd, vice president of the same association, noted that the Soviet Union and other European countries were adopting the "factory model" for producing poultry. He said this method will be threatened in the United States if FDA withdraws its approval of our using antibiotics to control disease. This would mean that U.S. producers would be going backward. Boyd said this would put the United States at a disadvantage in world markets.

All the representatives of the meat, feed and drug industries stress that they want nothing in meat that will endanger human health. Ed Covell, chairman of the National Broiler Council, said, "It is our position that such substances must be withdrawn when they have proven harmful, but not on the basis of unproven theories."

THE OUTLOOK

The battle lines are just beginning to form. The poultry and meat producing industries have a number of solid allies in the congressional committees on agriculture. But hearings being held by other committees may or may not be less friendly. The issue will not be resolved by the agriculture committees alone, or even by Congress alone. Unless Dr.

Kennedy backs down, which few people expect, the penicillin and tetracycline regulations will be challenged in court. This is a cumbersome, time-consuming process.

In Congress, the subcommittees dealing with health, the environment, and consumer affairs are beginning to be heard from. Because of jurisdictional questions, these committees can have much more impact on the antibiotic issue than the more friendly agriculture committees.

In hearings before the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, FDA was criticized sharply for moving too slowly to restrict the use of penicillin and tetracycline in animal feeds. Some committee members felt the antibiotics represented a sufficient health hazard to require immediate action. The parent Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over FDA legislation and therefore more influence than the Agriculture Committees.

In general, knowledgeable observers expressed some confidence that the FDA actions would not withstand the scrutiny of the courts. Most believe that the evidence weighs heavily in favor of continued use of subtherapeutic levels of antibiotics in animal feed.

EFFECT ON THE PRODUCER

"It is impossible to produce today's abundant supply of high-quality, reasonably-priced eggs, without the use of various pharmaceuticals that science has provided," declared James Fleming, vice president for governmental relations, United Egg Producers. In the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee hearings, he said: "In 1950, the average commercial hen produced only 174 eggs. In 1976, the average was 235 eggs. Feed conversion improved from 5.4 pounds of feed per dozen eggs in 1950 to 4.1 pounds per dozen eggs in 1976.

"What do these figures mean in dollars and cents?

"Today, if a farmer owns 10,000 commercial hens (today's average is about 30,000), he would use 127.3 tons less feed per year than he would have needed in 1950. At today's feed prices ($160 per ton) he would save $20,368 a year on feed alone . . . it is impossible to estimate the savings resulting from mass production technique."

John Shaheen, director of the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council, testified at the same hearings. He said, "Without an antibiotic feed program, producers would lose to mortality, morbidity and condemnations up to 10.5 percent more broilers, 10 percent more turkeys, and 12 percent more laying hens. To offset (these) losses, producers would be forced to raise more birds . . . which in turn would significantly increase feed grain consumption and energy requirements."

An FDA study using 1970 figures estimated that the use of antibiotics in animal feeds provided a one-cent economic advantage per broiler due to reduced feed and labor costs. This would amount to $1,000 for a broiler producer who sold 100,000 birds. The same study showed that using antibiotics yielded a 12 cent economic advantage for each turkey raised.

The economics of antibiotics have not been analyzed in terms of the producers' return on investment, the impact of capacity when higher costs trigger reduced demand, or changes in demand for specific meat products because the FDA action will have an unequal impact on different species.

It is clear that use of antibiotics and other drugs has contributed to the concentration of the poultry and meat industries.

The Pfizer position paper estimated that "73% of all meat and poultry in the U.S. is produced in this type of intensive operation." A number of observers fear that the ultimate result of FDA's curent position on the use of drugs in animal feeds will be to make intensive animal husbandry impossible. Without the pharmaceutical tools to control diseases in confined populations of animals, producers would have to revert to dispersion of animals in smaller and more scattered flocks and herds.

ANOTHER KIND OF RISK

The Pfizer position paper speculated that, in addition to economic considerations, the FDA proposal also raises new questions about human health hazards coming from disease-producing bacteria from livestock. "Ironically the proposed ban on certain feed antibiotics could create a more serious human health problem than it is intended to prevent," said the paper. Pfizer said the following scenario was not impossible:

"Morbidity of livestock increases precipitously—and a host of sick animals abound.

"These are hurried off to slaughter.

"Meat comes to market contaminated with high concentrations of bacterial pathogens.

"Dysentery reappears, and epidemics of salmonellosis and other dysenteries become more frequent.

"Regulatory bodies are condemned for permitting unsanitary food to reach the consumer.

"Policy reversal is attempted, confusion is compounded and science policy mechanisms are only further discredited."

Pfizer did not address the economic impact of such a scenario. It seems likely that consumers would buy much less meat after a contamination episode.

COPING WITH THE ISSUE

Producers' response to FDA's proposed ban on penicillin and tetracyclines falls into two categories: what to do at the production level, and what to do politically.

The FDA says there are substitutes that can replace penicillin and the tetracyclines. Some it lists: flavormycin, virginiamycin, bacitracin (zinc and methylene disalicyclate), erythromycin, bambermycins, carbadox, oleandomycin, tylosin, sulfaquinoxaline, hygromycin (B), sulfadimethoxine-ormetoprim, arsanilic acid, roxarsone, carborsone, sodium arsanilate, linomycin and monesin.

FDA also maintains that animal diseases can still be treated therapeutically and that producers can still use penicillin and tetracyclines if they have a veterinarian's prescription. Animal scientists and producers counter that there are too few veterinarians in the United States to treat all sick animals. J.R. Legates, Dean, School of Agriculture and Life Sciences, North Carolina State University, says that North Carolina would be particularly hard hit since there are no veterinarians in 18 out of its 100 counties.

FDA also recommends that disease be controlled through improved sanitation, quarantines, and isolation of sick birds and animals. Animal producers generally respond that these methods are difficult, expensive, and often ineffective.

WITH ONE VOICE

Chairman Rose in his interview with Watt Publishing Company urged "everyone in industry and agribusiness to be aware of these proposals, their possible impact, and to get the facts to their representatives in the House and Senate."

They should make sure, he said, that "all segments of the poultry and meat industries join in a coordinated effort to speak to this problem with one voice so the issue does not get decided in a vacuum or without all having a chance to be heard."

Senators and Congressmen are just as confused as laymen about the safety, or lack of it, of drugs used in humans and animal health, Representative Rose asserts. He suggested a well-funded, well-planned educational approach, not an adversary position. "Say what you believe, and say it convincingly," he suggests, "using your trade associations to provide organized leadership."●

## BALANCE(S) OF POWER—BOOK II C(i), NATIONAL RESOURCES

### HON. JOHN B. BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing series of articles on the strategic balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union, we turn next to the important factor of natural resources. Although our Nation is blessed with a significant wealth of resources, we are by no means as self-sufficient in raw materials as the Soviet Union.

The Soviet advantage is particularly striking in energy resources and the use of those resources as this article by C. Sharp Cook, entitled "Their Energy—Our Crisis," demonstrates. As we strive to formulate an energy policy designed to meet national needs without damaging our strategic position, we need to be reminded of Soviet strengths in this regard.

The following article first appeared in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, August 1976. The article follows:

THEIR ENERGY—OUR CRISIS

(By C. Sharp Cook)

Nikita Khrushchev's famous prophecy, "We will bury you," should be considered seriously by citizens of the United States, especially those of the younger generation who are now in high school and college. At the moment, the U.S. and Soviet postures relative to military and civilian strengths appear comparable. However, a look at future supplies of natural resources, especially energy resources, may well provide cause for alarm.

The statement by Khrushchev was not intended as a military threat but as a boast, to indicate the strength of the Soviet Union in overall productive capability. A better understanding of his meaning can be attained by quoting another statement: "We will survive you, we will be alive and stronger at your demise than we are now." Of course, if one side became overwhelmingly stronger militarily, no deterrent would exist to prevent it from overrunning the other with its armies.

At the moment, with the U.S.S.R. having problems in the production of enough wheat to feed its people, any concern about the competitive position of the Soviet Union might seem a bit ludicrous. However, closer examination of the extent of natural resources in the two countries quickly and clearly indicates the need for concern. Over the past century, the United States has rapidly depleted its originally abundant supplies of oil and natural gas and has wasted many of these supplies. While the per capita use of energy in this country is about six times the world average, the per capita use of energy in the U.S.S.R. is only about two and a half times the world average, a clear indication of the relative rate at which we are using our resources. U.S. domestic resources of oil and natural gas, if current exploitation rates continue, are sufficient to supply a significant fraction of our needs for slightly more than another quarter of a century.

On the other hand, the Soviets have found vast amounts of both these energy resources in Siberia. Furthermore, this abundance covers the whole spectrum of energy resources. Siberia, once thought to be a vast wasteland, has turned out to be a vast storehouse of almost any conceivable natural resource. For example, continuing explotation has re-

vealed that the area probably holds more than half the coal reserves of the world, far outstripping those of the United States, even though most Americans consider the U.S. supplies of coal as abundant.

Although the Soviets are somewhat secretive about their supplies of oil and natural gas, enough information is available to reveal that they have tremendous quantities of both these commodities. One set of estimates, based on Soviet publications, indicates that the U.S.S.R. has 45% of the world's remaining natural gas and 37% of its oil-bearing areas. Since much of eastern and central Siberia has not yet been thoroughly explored, much more oil and natural gas will probably be found. In the period between 1956 and 1970, the natural gas reserves of western Siberia increased tenfold. Reserves are those resources that are known to exist and can be extracted economically. Whereas the oil-pumping rate in the United States has been declining since 1970, the pumping rate in the U.S.S.R. has been increasing. During both 1974 and 1975, the Soviet pumping rate exceeded that of the United States. The 1975 average was 9.79 million barrels a day for the U.S.S.R. and 8.36 million barrels a day for this nation.

Another source of energy is water power. Again, the supply in the Soviet Union is tremendous. The U.S.S.R has five huge river systems and a considerable part of the Amur system, which they share with the People's Republic of China. In the European part of the U.S.S.R., the Dnieper River has already been fully developed to take advantage of its hydroelectric power Development of the Volga River system is rapidly being completed. However, in Siberia the Ob, the Lena, and the Yenisey River systems are only partially developed and still have many good dam sites to be exploited. Full development of the hydroelectric potential of these five huge river systems could provide the complete electrical needs, including all residential, commercial, and industrial needs for between 70 and 100 million people. The Soviets may possess as much as 12% of the world's potential hydroelectric power. By comparison, the only area of the United States that can depend on hydroelectric power to supply essentially all its electrical energy needs is the Pacific Northwest One of the initial purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority was to take advantage of the hydroelectric potential of the Tennessee River system. However, that resource has long been surpassed, and now hydroelectric plants supply only a fraction of the electrical output of the TVA system.

The Soviets' nuclear power program is also going strong. They have a prototype breeder reactor in operation, at Shevchenko, on the northeast coast of the Caspian Sea. While environmental lobbyists actively oppose the construction of any nuclear reactors for power purposes in this country, no such wrangling exists in the Soviet Union regarding programs for the development of a fast breeder reactor. Few, if any, questions are raised about the safety on the environmental impact of the project, certainly none comparable to the ballot initiatives that have found their way to the voters in several of our states. As a result a continuing sustained effort is leading to a set of nuclear reactors that use nuclear fuel in the most efficient manner possible. Some technical problems have been encountered, but successful tests of breeder reactors in other countries, especially France, indicate that the Soviets will ultimately reach their goal.

In the U.S.S.R., fast breeder reactor development has followed an orderly progression in size and sophistication. A small breeder at Obninsk, went into operation in 1958 with an electrical output of 5 megawatts. A larger experimental reactor started operating in 1970 at Melekass. The prototype electric power plant breeder reactor at Shevchenko began operations in 1973 with a rated capacity output of 350 megawatts. However, this plant has thus far operated only up to 30% of full power. A larger 600 megawatt demonstration power plant is scheduled for completion in 1977 at Belogarsk, and a commercial power station using a breeder reactor, with a rated output of 1500 megawatts, is now being designed. This commercial power station is expected to be operating by 1985.

One of the world's largest research programs on nuclear fusion has been in existence in the U.S.S.R. for many years and has made many major contributions. The program includes research both on magnetically confined plasmas and on laser fusion. While nuclear fusion is still in the research stage and no guarantee exists that a practical source of energy will ever be developed, only those who work on such a program have any chance of success in developing a practical source of energy. Comparisons of research programs are difficult, but all indications are that the Soviet effort in nuclear-fusion research is as large, and maybe larger, than the American effort.

The Soviets have not been inactive in other areas of energy research. For example they have one of the two existing tidal electric generating stations in the world. Admittedly, this plant near Murmansk is only experimental, but it is one more tidal-energy plant than the United States possesses. Furthermore, estimates indicate that the long coastline of the Soviet Union has the potential for supplying relatively large quantities of tidal energy, probably about 20 percent of the world's total capability. The Soviets also have a leading, if not the leading, research program in the use of magnetohydrodynamics as a more efficient means of producing electrical energy from the burning of fossil fuels.

Even though the United States has the largest geothermal electric generating station in the world, at the Geysers just north of San Francisco, the electrical output of this station is still less than any new electric generating station powered with either fossil or nuclear fuel. The Soviets also have a number of geothermal projects, including a small electricity generating station at Pauzketsk at the southern end of the Kamchatka Peninsula and a number of experiments in the area of the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea.

When one compares the energy resources of this country and the U.S.S.R., it seems obvious that future generations of Americans are going to encounter problems unless proper precautions and planning take place. U.S. military services obtain an extremely large portion of their energy from fossil fuel, primarily oil. As domestic oil supplies disappear, other energy resources must be found to power the military or else a tremendous deterioration of our military posture will take place.

Even food production, an area in which we currently far outstrip the Soviets, is vitally dependent on energy resources to continue at its present rate. To maintain the present capability of the food industry, including production, distribution and preparation, the United States uses about nine calories of energy for each single calorie of food that reaches an American dining room table. Most of these nine calories come from fossil fuels, and most of these fuels are oil and natural gas, the ones of most concern. During 1974, a total of 2.5 percent of our natural gas supply went into making nitrogen fertilizer for use on the farms of America.

The time has long passed for a careful and thorough analysis of the energy situation in the United States, especially with respect to our future capability to compete in the world arena with the Soviet Union. A full and honest evaluation of the potential effects of the huge Soviet energy supplies is needed. If past experiences are any indication, nothing will be done until a crisis has been reached, and in this case it will unfortunately then be too late. The situation with regard to energy resources was analyzed in considerable detail by the Truman Commission in 1952. This commission also made a series of recommendations to the federal government as to how to avoid disaster. Unfortunately, the report of the findings has essentially been ignored by subsequent administrations of the federal government.

During the next few decades, it will be interesting to observe how and when the American people and their elected leaders come to the realization that they have some rather serious problems. These are problems that have been discussed in the past but about which very little has been done, largely because most people are more concerned about the present than the future. How these problems are solved, if they are, will also be interesting to observe. One conclusion is certain. We have at most three or four more decades in which we can live in the sort of ignorant bliss we have enjoyed for the past quarter of a century.●

---

## BALANCE(S) OF POWER BOOK III B(i) NATO NORTHERN FLANK

## HON. JOHN B. BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, although the confrontation of opposing forces in the center sector of NATO and the Warsaw Pact poses the most apparent threat to peace in Western Europe, we must be aware also that military activities in the areas known as the flanks of NATO may be regional developments with the potential to do equal damage to the military balance in Europe.

Today's selection, "The Nordic Balance," examines the awesome Soviet presence on the Northern flank, and particularly the buildup of Soviet bases in its Kola Peninsula region. The author, Col. Arthur F. Dewey, suggests that "there are indeed limits to tampering with the Nordic Balance, beyond which the U.S.S.R. ventures only at the risk of upsetting the wider international balance of power," concluding that those risks must now appear worth taking to the Soviets. Accordingly, this analysis demands our attention.

This writing first appeared in Strategic Review, Fall 1976. The first part of Col. Dewey's article follows:

THE NORDIC BALANCE

(By Col. Arthur E. Dewey, USA)

IN BRIEF

Perhaps least noticed in the recent development of Soviet naval power is the region which contains most of that power—the Northern Cap and the Baltic Sea. The Murmansk area contains the world's largest naval and submarine base and one of the world's mightiest concentrations of military power. This area supports more ships than are supported by all ports of the United States combined. The most important consequence of this military build-up is the perception it fosters that Norway has now fallen behind the legitimate defense lines of the Soviet Union. A second development suggests the opposite hypothesis: that new technology of the weapon systems based on the Kola Penin-

sula now frees the Soviet Navy from its vulnerable egress gauntlets and thus sharply reduces the strategic importance of Norway. These seemingly contradictory hypotheses converge in the conclusion that the concept of Norwegian neutrality, soundly discredited in World War II, may again become a thinkable proposition. The heart of the problem we are now witnessing with respect to the Nordic Balance is the asymmetrical application of the rules of balance by the USSR and NATO. Although the military part of NATO has voiced a realistic appreciation of the situation for some time, the shifting of the Nordic Balance is basically a political issue and needs to be assessed in NATO's political circles. An initiail step would appear to be an appraisal by the United States national security apparatus of the northern flank in its entirety. Hopefully, from such an appraisal would come a commitment from the United States to consult with its NATO partners and seek a set of guidelines designed to restore and regulate the balance in the North and to communicate those guidelines to the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Progress must also be made in the crucial area of bilateral U.S.-Norwegian issues before one can hope for any broader adjusting mechanisms of the Nordic Balance to have a lasting effect.

The most insistent and pervasive voices in Western strategic circles today carry the message that the impulses, and the capabilities, of Soviet expansionism are rapidly coming to alignment. The growth of the Soviet Navy has been fundamental to the capability side of this equation. This growth has been rapid; the kinds of equipment and doctrine developed have been carefully structured to support an expansionist global strategy; and the locations for this formidable build-up of power have been calculated to minimize the handicaps of geography for the Soviet Union, while exploiting the geopolitical vulnerabilities of her adversaries.

Western strategists have singled out for special attention the increased Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean—its impact on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's southern flank, and on war and peace in the Middle East; they have watched the gradual build-up of Soviet presence and littoral anchorages in the Indian Ocean region; and in the post-Vietnam era, they are watching. In particular, Soviet challenges to U.S. naval presence in the Pacific. Perhaps least noticed in the recent developments of Soviet naval power is the region which contains most of that power. Well over one-half of the USSR's newly developed naval capability is tucked away in one of the "safest" and least worried about corners of the earth—the Northern Cap and the Baltic Sea. Most of this sea power in the north, contained in the Northern Fleet, is positioned in one of the world's remotest and most inhospitable spots—the largely icebound Kola Peninsula.

It is the intent of this article to explore the Soviet Union's reasons for stationing so much of its military strength in that place, and to examine the potential influence of this strength in the so-called "Nordic Balance" (particularly with respect to Norway because of the special location of this NATO member) and on the general security posture of NATO.

To be sure, alert observers in U.S./NATO military circles, and especially Norwegian strategic thinkers, have in the past called attention to this problem and what it may mean for the Nordic countries and for the West. It seems important to highlight the situation at this time for two principal reasons. First, although the large build-up of naval power opposite NATO's northern flank has been a reality for nearly five years, the politico-military impact of the situation has developed so glacially that one could say that only within the last year has it been possible to shift from speculation over its meaning to identification of specific trends. Secondly, where trends adverse to Western security interests are identified, there may still be time to reverse, or attempt to reverse, some of them.

THE OVERALL BUILD-UP PATTERN

Several points, or segments, stand out on the long curve, which stretches from root impulses of the Soviets to project influence beyond their homeland to the achievement of a capability to do so, which we are watching today. Frustration and stagnation of the Cold War seem to have dramatized the Soviet Union's requirement to leap out of its shell of encirclement and rectify the military imbalance which so clearly constrained its ability to influence events far from its shores. A key point on this curve is certainly the humiliation the Soviet Union suffered as a result of the October 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The extent to which this event translated into subsequent Kremlin decisions is alluded to in the remarks of a senior Soviet diplomat to John J. McCloy as the confrontation was drawing to a close. He said, "This will never happen to us again."

Efforts to insure it would not happen again brought about a complex orchestration of military programs, not least of which was the program to redress the strategic nuclear imbalance which figured prominently in the Cuban missile confrontation. In addition, the imbalance in general purpose air and sea forces, strategically deployable, was a sobering lesson for the Soviets. The case is convincing that Cuba was the proximate cause for a rethinking of the role of military force in support of foreign policy objectives. The Soviet Navy, especially in its widening pattern of maneuvers and deployments, became the most visible instrument in undertaking an enlarged political/diplomatic function on the part of general purpose forces.

In addition to signaling a change in naval employment doctrine, the post-1962 actions of Kremlin policy-makers also represented a ratification of the design of Navy Commander-in-Chief Sergei Gorshkov. This design, parts of which trace their beginning to Admiral Gorshkov's appointment as Navy Chief in 1955, called for: global naval intelligence gathering (largely through fishing trawlers); construction of what was to become the world's largest submarine fleet; arrangements for the global infrastructure of facilities, or access to facilities needed by a great naval power; development of sea control capability, utilizing attack submarines, but especially missile-firing surface ships; and ability to project power ashore with helicopter carriers and eventually aircraft carriers.

In a Navy Day speech in July 1966, Admiral Gorshkov was able to declare: "An end has been put to the complete domination of the seas by the imperial powers." In another Navy Day speech four years later, when the major portion of the build-up had been completed, Gorshkov stated: "Soviet navy ships are constantly on the ocean, including the stamping ground of the NATO strike fleets." In a public statement in September 1970 he said: "In the past our ships and naval units have operated principally near our coasts. Now we intend to prepare for broad offensive operations against the sea and group troops of the imperialists in any part of the world's oceans and adjacent territory."

Much of the military force confronting the "NATO strike fleets" is contained in the largest of the Soviet Union's four fleets, the Northern Fleet with its headquarters at Murmansk and operational elements based nearby along the relatively short, ice-free portion of the Kola Peninsula shoreline. This complex has made the Murmansk area the world's largest naval and submarine base, and one of the world's mightiest concentrations of military power. This area supports more ships than are supported by all ports of the United States combined. Here are based approximately 500 surface vessels, including 60 major combatants. The Northern Fleet commands a total of 175 submarines, including 80 with nuclear power. Most significantly, nearly 70 per cent of the Soviet top priority naval capability—the ballistic missile submarine—is based in the Murmansk vicinity.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOVIET BUILD-UP

A rigorous assessment of what this relatively recent development means for Norway, for NATO, and for United States-Soviet relations is already overdue. The situation takes on an acute importance when one considers its impact on the very cornerstone of security relationships among the Nordic states, and between these states and the Soviet Union—the so-called Nordic Balance. This balance began to take shape as early as the entry of Denmark and Norway into NATO in 1949. Mindful that geography had made their territories an inescapable part of the strategic calculus of the Soviet Union, entry into a rival military alliance was softened by Danish and Norwegian unilateral renunciation of NATO bases on their soil in peacetime. Shortly thereafter, this was followed by a ban on the peacetime shortage of nuclear weapons. Concomitant with the formulation of this position, known as the "base and ban" policy, was the undertaking in the Norwegian Parliament (Storting to compensate for these restrictions on the deployments of allied forces with a corresponding increase in Norwegian conventional strength).

Self-restraint and deterrence, then, became the principal components of the Nordic Balance. Self-restraint has acted, not only to assure the Soviets that their defense sensitivities are taken fully into account in this part of the world: it also reassures the Nordic neutrals—Sweden and Finland—who are well aware of the strategic value of their northern regions to the Soviets should the USSR perceive threats or provocations by, or on behalf of, the other Nordic NATO members. Deterrence, on the other hand, involves first the Norwegian forces deployed in the north, and Norway's perceived will to resist from the outset any Soviet moves against her territory. But to be effective, deterrence depends upon Norway's link with the other forces of NATO, and the clear understanding that these forces will also be employed to resist violations of Norwegian sovereignty.

In theory, these stabilizing mechanisms of self-restraint and deterrence are designed to cope with attempts to alter the security equilibrium. That is, if weight is added on the Soviet side, the balance can be restored by adding more Norwegian forces, or by removing the "base and ban" restriction on other NATO forces. In practice, however, such compensating moves do not appear to be available. To begin with, the force increase envisaged to offset the "base and ban" concession has yet to materialize in Norway. In the fifteen years since the Storting unanimously recognized the need for the offset, there has been no serious attempt to bring it about. Yet the assurance, or self-restraint, stabilizer, which included not only "base and ban," but also bars to allied maneuvers in Finmark (that part of Norway contiguous to the USSR) and allied air or naval activity east of 24° east longitude, appears to be locked in concrete. Both within Norway, and by the USSR, self-restraint as defined by these restrictions is viewed, not as part of an adjusting mechanism, but as a sacrosanct tenet or Norwegian foreign and domestic policy. For example, the Soviet side of the scales can be weighted at will with almost no likelihood of counterweights being added by the countries on the other side in the region (and conversely, Norwegian attempts to strengthen its forces can be challenged by the USSR through invocation of its meaning

of the "balance"). So one needs to view the Nordic Balance, not in terms of its potential as a stabilizer for the region, but in terms of the dangers it holds, as currently practiced, for institutionalizing disequilibrium.

Given these characteristics of the Balance, the massive weight represented by the Kola Peninsula build-up has ominous implications, both for Western security and for Norwegian freedom of action. One of the first spokesmen to describe the seriousness of this new situation in the North was the Norwegian Minister of Defense speaking to the Storting in November 1970: "One of the most powerful groups of bases in the world has now been built up close to Norway's borders with Russia . . . the large scale exercise *Sever* in July 1968 and *Okean* in April 1970 proved that the Soviets are capable of undertaking amphibious operations at great distances from their base, and that an exercise pattern has now been created which, in future, would make it possible for an amphibious force to set out from the Baltic and Kola Peninsula without this necessarily having to be noted as unusual."

Later, Norwegian Prime Minister Trygve Bratteli stated in a July 1971 interview with United Press International: "The Soviet Union has carried out a colossal military build-up on the northern flank of NATO where her military forces are greater than ever before, with the possible exception of the Second World War . . . the fact that such great military strength is deployed so near to our country underlines the seriousness of the international strategic situation."

The Defense Minister's characterization of the Kola Peninsula augmentation is noteworthy in the context of Norway's consistent policy of self-restraint in the face of security moves by its giant Soviet neighbor. The strength of Mr. Bratteli's retort suggests that there are indeed limits to tampering with the Nordic Balance, beyond which the USSR ventures only at the risk of upsetting the wider international balance of power. In the calculus which led to their approaching, and even exceeding, these bounds, Kremlin strategists must have taken into account the geographical and political aspects of the Nordic environment, along with the superpower relationship, and concluded that the risks were indeed, worth taking.

From the geographical standpoint, Moscow's military planners surely recognized that they were positioning the preponderance of their naval power in one of the world's most inhospitable environments. For example, while the Gulf Stream maintains a year-round channel of open water to Murmansk, just east of that city, winter ice shuts off all but a small portion of the Peninsula's coastline to surface shipping for nearly six months of the year. This limitation alone compresses the bulk of the Kola naval complex into the short coastal band between what was formerly Finland's Petsamo Peninsula (now Soviet Pechenga, following annexation after World War II) and the ice line east of Murmansk. Even more vulnerable than the crowded location of the Peninsula bases, however, is the channelization of the fleet when it leaves its bases for the open sea. Egress to attack areas and firing positions leads through three formidable choke points. The first is encountered almost immediately on leaving the concentrated base areas—the gateway guarded by Norway's North Cape on the south and Spitsbergen Island on the north. Through this gap, the ice in winter may force surface shipping into an even narrower channel closer to Norway's northern coast. The second and third gateways also anchor on NATO territory, i.e., Greenland-Jan Maven Island-Lofoten Island, and Greenland-Iceland-United Kingdom. These choke points not only define the Soviet egress gates; they also represent NATO's logical defense and surveillance lines against its principal undersea. and surface. attack threats.

WHY HAS THE USSR DONE IT?

Why then would the USSR install such a crucial strategic asset on a largely icebound peninsula, contiguous to a NATO member, and at the end of sea lanes choked by NATO territory?

Accepting the fact that the Kola basing meets the distance requirements to the Fleet's prime target areas, perhaps the simplest answer is that this location is better than any of the others. Look at the home ports of the other three fleets—the Baltic, the Black Sea and the Pacific—together with the gauntlets each must run in reaching its operational areas. The Baltic Fleet, based in the Leningrad area, offers perhaps the best comparison since it, too, is positioned opposite NATO's northern flank. Its exit through the Kattegat, Skagerrak, and Oresund is clearly more restrictive than that faced by the Northern Fleet. Similarly constrictive gateways guard the Black Sea Fleet at the Bosporus and the Dardanelles, and the Pacific Fleet at the Sova, Tsugaru, and Tsushima Straits.

Beyond the risk of geography, there were the risks of politics. There was, indeed, the Western interpretation of Nordic Balance to consider—an arrangement in which the Nordics themselves and indirectly, the U.S. superpower had a considerable stake. What then could have led political analysts in Moscow to conclude that a large-scale, potentially provocative build-up, which the Kola challenge to NATO's north flank clearly represented, rested within tolerable limits?

Several factors suggest reasons for the USSR acting as it did. With respect to the risk of pressing NATO too hard in the North, the psychology of the region has been conditioned to just the opposite concern, i.e., provoking the USSR. It has also been recognized that NATO's preoccupation is with the central region of Europe. Henry Kissinger addressed this focus on the center, at the expense of the flanks, while he was still a Harvard professor in 1963—approximately two years before the Kola build-up began in earnest. He wrote in a foreword to a paper entitled, "Europe's Northern Cap and the Soviet Union": "Most of NATO thinking has concentrated on the contingency of a massive Soviet attack on the central front.

Very likely, this danger is less real than that of Soviet pressures in peripheral areas where Soviet power can be demonstrated at much smaller risk. The Northern Cap is remote geographically and psychologically from the overriding concerns of Atlantic strategy."

Another key political factor lessening the risks of a Soviet move opposite the northern flank is the relatively greater instability of the southern flank. When NATO had to divert its attention to the edges of the Alliance, it was, of course, to the southern edge that it looked—to Greece and Turkey, and to Portugal.

Perhaps equal in importance to the external political factors in NATO are the internal political trends in Norwary, and the effect of these trends on Norwegian reaction to external strategic changes. First of all, Norway's impressive record as a stalwart NATO partner suggests continuing resistance to outside pressure and influence. Norway became a charter member of the Alliance in 1949. Support since then, as measured in public opinion polls, has been consistently solid, ranging from a low of 56 per cent to a peak of 64 per cent. In a recent sounding, 60 per cent favored continuation of the NATO link, including a surprising 30 per cent of the normally anti-NATO far left political coalition.

Other indicators similarly point to the steadfastness of Norway's NATO commitment. Norwegian military expenditures per capita, for example, have remained consistently high among NATO members. Norway has also taken an aggressive lead in such Alliance modernization/standardization projects as the replacement of the F-104 fighter aircraft with F-16s.

Thus the record seems to argue against any near-term weakening of Norwegian resolve or change in defense policy. Other factors need to be looked at, however, in assessing such prospects over the longer term.●

---

## THE TURKISH ARMS EMBARGO DEBATE, NO. 4 AND NO. 5

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues another exchange of "Dear Colleague" letters I have had with proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey.

In their fourth letter, the proponents of the embargo argue that in the last 4 years Turkey has failed to make a single substantive response to congressional concessions in lifting partially the embargo and allowing limited FMS transactions.

And in their fifth letter, it is argued that the Turkish arms vote will be used as a wedge in the administration's growing effort to exclude Congress from its rightful place in the foreign policy process.

In my reply, I point to the recent detailed and constructive Turkish proposals to which the Greeks have replied. The Turkish proposal and the Greek response give new hope that some progress can be achieved and that the suffering of the Cypriot people will be alleviated if the embargo is ended. It should be said that the vote on the Turkish arms embargo will not adversely affect congressional activism in foreign affairs which will continue, is necessary, and has, on many occasions, helped produce better policies that served the national interest.

The exchange of letters follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., July 1978.*

THE EMBARGO AND TURKISH INTRANSIGENCE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We will soon be called upon to vote again on the Turkish arms embargo. Because this issue first came before Congress nearly four years ago, many important details tend to be forgotten. In addition, many Members have joined the House since this issue was first considered in the wake of Turkey's August, 1974 invasion and occupation of forty percent of Cyprus.

The Administration suggests, in its effort to lift the embargo, that the failure to achieve a Cyprus settlement is due, not to continued Turkish intransigence, but to Congressional inflexibility. If Congress would only ease the pressure on Turkey, we are told, Turkey would respond by taking the substantive actions necessary to promote a Cyprus settlement.

The Administration's argument ignores the clear historical record.

Congress has taken action after action in the past four years to "ease the pressure on

Turkey" in response to similar Administration pleas. Yet Turkey has failed to make a single substantive response to these Congressional concessions. It seems, in fact, that Congressional flexibility on this issue has merely encouraged further Turkish resistance.

We ask you to consider the following facts:

Congressional action—September 1974; Congress delays embargo two months as Kissinger's request to use his influence on Turkey.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—December 1974: Congress delays embargo two more months at Kissinger's request to use his influence on Turkey.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—October 1975; Congress relaxes embargo to allow: (a) $185 million in arms ordered before embargo to be released to Turkey; (b) unlimited commercial arms sales to Turkey; (c) future FMS sales to Turkey.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—1974–1976: Nine meetings with President Ford and/or Secretary Kissinger initiated by embargo supporters to show ways Congress would move immediately if Turkey indicated it wanted to solve Cyprus.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—April 1976: Congress authorized $125 million in FMS to Turkey for FY 1976.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—May 1976: Congress adds $125 million in FMS to Turkey for FY 1977.

Turkish action: No response.

Congressional action—April 1977: Congress increases FMS to Turkey for FY 1978 to $175 million, a forty percent boost.

Turkish action: No response.

When the Administration claims that Congress is responsible for preventing progress on Cyprus, remember the past record of substantive actions taken by Congress.

When will Turkey act?

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., July 1978.*

THE EMBARGO AND CONGRESS ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In our previous letters to you about the Turkish arms question, we have discussed a number of reasons why continued Congressional support for the embargo is necessary:

The embargo is required by law so long as the Turkish occupation of Cyprus, aided by American-supplied weapons, continues.

Effective use of the embargo represents the best chance of settling the Cyprus question and restoring full human rights to the more than 200,000 refugees now living there.

The embargo has never been given a chance to work, and a strong Congressional vote in favor of the embargo at this time would demonstrate conclusively the futility of further Turkish intransigence on Cyprus.

Lifting of the embargo would threaten grievous consequences to the southeastern flank of NATO.

Turkey has utterly failed to respond to previous Congressional concessions with respect to the embargo.

Each of these is, in our view, reason enough to vote for continuing the embargo—together, they make a case which simply cannot be ignored.

But events of recent weeks suggest still another reason to resist Administration pressure on this important issue: The Turkish arms vote will be used as a wedge in the Administration's growing effort to exclude Congress from its rightful place in the foreign policy process.

Certain high-ranking members of the Administration have made no secret of their distaste for a Congressional role in the conduct of American foreign policy. They see it as "interference"; they feel their "hands are tied".

We disagree. We feel that a strong and active Congressional role is required not only by our Constitution, but by the needs of the present day as well.

We reach this conclusion with the experience of recent years firmly in mind. Our long and tragic involvement in Vietnam was in large part a result of Congressional acquiescence in uncontrolled Presidential diplomacy.

And the retreat of the White House behind an ever-widening cloak of secrecy and claims of "national security"—again with Congressional acquiescence—made possible a Watergate, a long train of abuses in which the legitimate organs of government were subverted to serve wrongful ends.

Largely as a consequence of these two events, Congress has begun to reassert its proper role in the conduct of American foreign policy. Congress should resist any effort to neutralize this process.

We need not accuse the Carter Administration of bad intent to recognize that the members of the executive branch are not always correct in their assessments of our national interest.

We know that, even now, the White House is of several minds about how to deal with Congress on foreign policy questions. A decision by Congress to surrender to Administration pressure on the Turkish arms issue will be seen as an abdication of our newly-regained responsibilities, and will enable some members of the executive branch to continue to press their efforts to bypass Congress.

As a clear statement that Congress remains committed to an active but proper role in the foreign policy process, we urge you to reject the Administration's effort to remove the arms embargo against Turkey.

Sincerely,

Dante B. Fascell, John Brademas, Edward J. Derwinski, Charles Rose, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Parren J. Mitchell, Norman Y. Mineta, James J. Blanchard, Mario Biaggi, Robert W. Edgar, Norman E. D'Amours, Paul E. Tsongas, Barbara A. Mikulski, George M. O'Brien, Wyche Fowler, Jr., Martin A. Russo, Donald M. Fraser, Benjamin A. Gilman, John L. Burton, James J. Florio, Charles B. Rangel.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This letter is in response to the fourth and fifth letters sent to you by the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey. Their fourth letter addresses the question of whether there has been no progress toward a Cyprus settlement because of Turkish intransigence or Congressional inflexibility and the fifth letter deals with the role of Congress in foreign policy and the implications of the Turkish vote on that role.

Arguments made by the proponents of keeping the arms embargo against Turkey:

1. In the last four years. . . . Turkey has failed to make a single substantive response to. . . . Congressional concessions.

2. Congressional flexibility on this issue has merely encouraged further Turkish resistance.

3. The Turkish arms vote will be used as a wedge in the Administration's growing effort to exclude Congress from its rightful place in the foreign policy process.

Counter:

1. Turkey has recently made detailed, constructive proposals which give new hope for successful progress.

Secretary General Waldheim has termed recent Turkish proposals as "concrete and substantial". Among other things, the Turks have offered to:

Consider making substantial territorial readjustments in six, specific areas;

Permit up to 35,000 Greek Cypriot refugees to return to an initially UN-protected Varosha as soon as talks resume;

Carry out substantial further reductions in the number of Turkish troops on Cyprus beyond the more than 17,000 troops already withdrawn;

And reopen the International Airport at Nicosia under the United Nations auspices.

These proposals are not all that the Greek Cypriots want and deserve, but they reflect a clear improvement over other, previous Turkish offers and the Turks have said these proposals are initial positions and are negotiable.

It cannot be said, as the proponents of the embargo argue, that Turkey has failed to make a single substantive response in the last four years.

2. It is unreasonable to expect any proud nation to capitulate to U.S. pressure.

Turkey, a proud and firmly independent nation, rejects the idea of yielding to pressure. The Turks find the embargo a painful humiliation and it has stiffened their resistence to making substantial concessions. The embargo has led to anguish in Turkey over its treatment by the United States after what the Turks regard as thirty years of steadfast pro-West support. A successful negotiating environment will be almost impossible to arrange as long as the embargo is in effect.

3. Turkey should not be expected to respond to moves by the U.S. Congress with immediate moves on Cyprus.

The Cyprus conflict involves decades of inter-communal tensions and its resolution will require detailed and complicated negotiations. Turkish moves on the Cyprus issue will come in negotiations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, not directly and immediately because of legislation Congress may or may not take.

The Congressional legislative process cannot determine the moves, concessions and compromises—the substance—which may be part of a Cyprus settlement but Congressional action, in this case the embargo, can affect the timing and the environment in which negotiations may or may not take place. The embargo has had a negative impact on Cyprus negotiations and in creating an environment in which the parties will negotiate.

4. The vote on the Turkish arms embargo will not adversely affect Congressional activism in foreign affairs which will continue, is necessary and has, on many occasions, helped produce better policies that served the national interest.

Congressional activism, which is defensible, is not the issue in the vote. Congress, like all other foreign policy actors, however, should be accountable for its actions in the foreign policy arena. For whatever reasons, the embargo has not worked. For whatever reasons, the partial lifting of the embargo in October, 1975, did not lead to the Turkish responses many of us hoped for. Congress needs to act now to protect U.S. national interests.

As a result of this situation and the embargo, national interests of the United States throughout the Eastern Mediterranean are suffering and we are unable to help promote a Cyprus settlement. This is the present, unacceptable situation we must address, not the rights or wrongs of how we got here.

A new approach is the best hope for improving our relations with Turkey, Greece and Cyprus and creating an environment in which Cyprus peace talks can proceed. I hope you agree and will vote to lift the embargo.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON.●

## INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS ENDORSE H.R. 8729, AIRPORT AND AIRCRAFT NOISE REDUCTION ACT, AND URGE AFFIRMATIVE VOTE

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the million-plus membership of the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers through their international president, William W. Winpisinger, have advised me of their strong support for H.R. 8729, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act.

Although this is an environmental bill as Mr. Winpisinger points out, the IAM is quick to recognize that it also is a jobs bill and that it will play a vital role in maintaining our world leadership in respect to aerospace exports. As he further points out its represents a valuable opportunity for Congress to enact legislation that would help alleviate a wide range of problems that continue to plague our Nation's economic growth, stability, and social aspirations.

The following is what Mr. Winpisinger wrote me:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS & AEROSPACE WORKERS,
*Washington, D.C., July 28, 1978.*

Subject: H.R. 8728, "The Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act."

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 1,000,000 members of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, I wish to express our endorsement and support for H.R. 8729. We firmly believe it represents a valuable opportunity for Congress to enact legislation that would help alleviate a wide range of problems that continue to plague our nation's economic growth, stability, and social aspirations.

First of all, passage of this bill would help rejuvenate our faltering airframe and aircraft engine industrial output which needs to be bolstered if we are to maintain our world leadership in respect to aerospace exports. This would be a positive step to significantly improve our balance of foreign trade.

Secondly, the environmental problems that have accompanied the introduction of jet aircraft to most communities would be substantially reduced, if not eliminated. However, in order to comply with prescribed federal noise standards, the airline industry, which is the keystone of intercity travel, must have a sound financial formula which ensures a positive, but not punitive, equipment transition. The introduction of new technology aircraft and engines would not only result in noise abatement, but would also substantially decrease the use of fuel and other vital energy sources of paramount concern to our nation's future.

Airport operators and responsible local governments must have the incentive and availability of funding to solve their airport-community problems, and this bill offers that initiative.

Finally, and of major importance, this is a jobs creating and public works bill affecting every part of the country and the adoption of this legislation would translate into tens of thousands of badly needed new jobs at a time when our country is struggling to regain its economic vitality. I strongly urge your support and affirmative vote for the passage of HR 8729.

WILLIAM W. WINPISINGER,
*International President.*●

## ONE LAST CHANCE TO SAVE OUR AMERICAN CANAL IN PANAMA

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, once upon a time the Emperor had no clothes, but no one realized this until the proverbial little Dutch boy told us so. It is in this spirit that I would like to address myself to the White House press corps, to the networks, to the editorialists, and to American citizens still sick over the giveaway to Torrijos. And I would like to remind all of us that we have not yet lost our American canal in Panama. I would also suggest to all of us who stand opposed to the Carter-Torrijos treaties not to remain undaunted, but to reject defeat.

The fact remains that there is still one more test the treaties must withstand. This test is in the form of the enabling legislation which this body, the House of Representatives, must pass for the Carter-Torrijos agreements to go into effect. Without passage of this legislation, there will be no more money provided to implement the treaties. With passage of this legislation, the treaties still cannot take effect until March 31 of 1979.

To date, only the Senate has spoken on the matter of the treaties, and it is with a muffled voice that they have done so. Every poll, every survey, and every knowledgable reading of the American people reveals the overwhelming rejection of this grand sellout. But while the upper legislative Chamber has so acted, it is still incumbent upon that legislative body which is closest to the American people to finally decide the outcome for all time. It is up to us, the Congress of the people, to finally render a verdict. The giveaway of the Panama Canal is not the first second-rate idea to eminate from the Carter administration, and God protect us, it will probably not be the last. Yet it lingers before us now, and I pray that enough of us have the energy and resolve to see it dissolve. I hope that all of my colleagues will accept this responsibility, and to recognize that the Panama Canal question is on the ballot. This November, in elections everywhere around our country, the Panama Canal question will be the implicit issue which will decide how many of us will or will not return to the Nation's Capital as representatives of the people.

Already, citizens' organizations and independent groups of Americans have begun to rally around this one last chance to save the canal. One group in particular has been in the vanguard of this struggle, the Council for Inter-American Security (CIS). It is young, it is privately backed, and it is independent of outside political influences. But through the CIS campaign, candidates for Congress are being forced to take a stand on the canal question. Just as the Texas Presidential primary in 1976 became a Panama Canal referendum for candidates Ford and Reagan, the November elections are beginning to turn into a similar form of popular referendum on the future of the canal.

CIS is one of the leading organizations orchestrating a newspaper advertising campaign to bring the message to all of the American people. I commend every responsible effort to focus public attention on what ought to be the decisive issue in the congressional elections to come. No effort should be spared to remind every American that they have the opportunity to vote on the Panama Canal question in November by supporting or rejecting those politicians, those running for Congress, who are empowered with writing the ending to this critical chapter of America's history.●

## VIRGINIA B. PATTERSON: 50 YEARS OF NURSING

### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak of a truly remarkable person. Miss Virginia B. Patterson, today, ends an illustrious and dedicated nursing career which has spanned a half a century. During these 50 years she has given comfort and aid to all who came to her. She has worked relentlessly to care for those who needed her help and for the institutions which provide the medical attention and special needs of their patients.

Miss Patterson's achievements range from being surgical supervisor at Freeman Hospital in Joplin, Mo., to working as school nurse at the Joplin public schools for 11 years, to being director of nursing services at Johnson County Memorial Hospital in Warrensburg. From February of 1975 until today she has worked as director of special services at Johnson County Memorial Hospital in Warrensburg.

For many years Miss Patterson almost singlehandedly was responsible for the entire day-to-day operation of the Johnson County Memorial Hospital, coordinating all the necessary functions of the hospital. Until 3 years ago, Miss Patterson oversaw all three shifts at the hospital, while simultaneously serving on several staff committees and committees within the 10th District Nursing Association.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of nurses. There are even some who have worked as many years as Miss Patterson has dedicated to the nursing profession. But I am confident there are singularly few who can claim to have helped so many people in so many ways as has Miss Patterson. In her 50 years in the medical profession, she has transcended the boundaries of competence and embodied the ideal of human caring. I join all who know Miss Patterson in saluting her and thanking her for making this a better world in which to live.●

## DEPRESSION AND SUICIDE AMONG YOUNG CHILDREN

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently published a study of severe depression and suicide among American children. Like the phenomenon of spousal violence, few doctors or researchers had believed that there was so severe an incidence of suicidal acts among young children until very recently. But the results of the studies referred to in the Times' account indicates a problem of serious magnitude, which, like spousal violence, extends to all social classes.

Five percent of all the troubled children studied at one facility were found to be "severely depressed and self-abusive, or suicidal," an incredible percentage considering the paucity of attention this matter has been given. If this percentage is translated to the national population, the implications are staggering.

I particularly want to draw attention to the correlation which is drawn between this depressing behavior in children, and the incidence of family violence. In one study, 11 of the 13 children studied and found to be severely depressed came from families in which fighting was common. Even if the child is not involved directly in the violence between his parents, the witnessing of such fighting has a depressing effect on the child.

To place this fact in its proper context, we should look back to the figures on domestic abuse which were presented to this House a few months ago, during the considering of my bill, H.R. 12299, the Domestic Violence Assistance Act. During the debate on that legislation, which did not pass, unfortunately, I noted that the incidence of violence within families is far more frequent than generally presumed. Some estimate that violence occurs within half of the Nation's families, and that in 10 percent of the cases there is severe injury committed. As we learned during the hearings on H.R. 12299, family violence tends to spread from spouses to children, and children who are abused or who witness abuse as children tend to abuse their spouses in adulthood.

This article tragically records that we need not wait until those children reach adulthood to see the results of their exposure to, or involvement in, family violence. I hope that my colleagues will read this article, and keep it fully in mind when we next consider legislation to help the victims of domestic abuse:

CHILD SUICIDES—THEY ARE SAD, YOUNG AND WANT TO DIE

(By Lois Timnick)

Now as I was young and easy under the apple boughs
About the lilting house and happy as the grass was green . . .
In the sun that is young once only,
Time let me play and be
Golden in the mercy of his means . . .
—Dylan Thomas, in "Fern Hill."

The 11-year-old had slashed his wrists.

"I want to go to heaven," he sobbed. "I can't stand these stomach aches and being unhappy . . . if I could only die . . . it's hard to live . . . living is horrible. I just want to die because nobody cares if I die, so I just want to die."

Childhood, we are told, is supposed to be a time of joy and carefree innocence, but for this boy and many others it is so sad and painful they want to die. The poet's halcyon days of youth—easy, happy, golden—somehow elude them, and they want out of life even before they are old enough to understand the permanence and irreversibility of death.

For years the experts questioned whether young children could really suffer severe depression and intentionally seek death. Now it seems clear that they do both, and that many "accidents"—like swallowing poison or darting into heavy traffic—are in fact conscious or unconscious suicide attempts.

Consider, for example, these attempted suicides:

A 12-year-old girl hanged her doll by its neck, drugged her little sister, cut both her legs with scissors, slashed her wrists, and overdosed on hypnotic drugs. "I would be better off dead," she explained. "Then no one will ever have to look at my ugly face again."

An 11-year-old boy tried to kill his dog, attempted to suffocate his baby brother with a pillow, and stabbed pins and needles into his stomach. Asked why, he answered: "because mother doesn't have any love in her for me."

An 11-year-old boy, preoccupied with death and the idea of rejoining his dead grandmother, threatened to throw himself in front of a car, beat and disfigured his face, and finally jumped out the window of a two-story building.

A 5-year-old girl, obssessed with knives, burned her 3-year-old sister and tried to choke her with a shoestring, threatened her mother with a knife and fled from the house into heavy traffic.

A 6-year-old boy who wanted to die "because nobody loves me," first cut himself with his father's razor and was later found hanging from a second-story window.

These youngsters were among 34 preteens labeled severely depressed and self-abusive or suicidal when seen at UCLA's Neuropsychiatric Institute (NPI) during a four-year period. They represent only about 5% of the troubled 12-and-under children seen there. But even that number is staggering considering that until recently both parents and professionals ignored the possibility that young children could feel so much pain.

The wish to die can be based on misconception—as in the case of one youngster who thought that by killing himself he could rejoin a loved grandparent who had died and another who wanted to escape from home "to fly like Santa Claus." Of it can be a wanting to be dead just for the moment, since most children don't comprehend the finality of death before about the age of 8.

But the UCLA medical psychologist who studied these suicidal children says his findings "demonstrate that preteen-age children *CAN* experience the pain of life to the point of wanting to die. Aloneness, fear of rejection and threats of violence are as meaningful to a 4-year-old as to an adult," Morris J. Paulson said. "And health providers and caregivers must realize that (some) young children are 'at risk' for suicide."

Paulson was one of three national experts on childhood suicide and depression who spoke at a recent weekend conference at Lake Arrowhead sponsored by the Southern California Society for Child Psychiatry.

Of the nearly 2,000 children and teenagers in the United States who killed themselves in 1976 (the latest year for which figures are available), fewer than 200 were under 14 years old. But many suicides go unreported, and Paulson says so-called accidental injuries and poisonings in school-age children are often "purposeful, self-destructive acts."

For example, fully one-fourth of the admissions to the psychiatric unit at Children's Hospital of Los Angeles-Edgemont Hospital during its first year of operation have involved suicide attempts or a preoccupation with self-destruction, according to Dr. Howard Hansen, head of the division of psychiatry there and a participant in the conference.

The suicidal children at UCLA were mostly boys. Nearly half were failing in school despite normal IQs. Many had no friends. Some complained of physical ailments, while others turned their inner hate and anger onto others.

The economic level of the family—most were low-income WASPs, semiskilled and with high-school educations—did not seem to matter, since Paulson and his colleague Dorothy Stone found similarly suicidal children in an earlier study of more affluent families.

What did matter was the emotional poverty found in nearly all the families of suicidal children (some of whom had close relatives who had also attempted suicide); more than half the parents were separated or divorced; the remainder could hardly be said to be living in harmony.

As Paulson describes it: "For the younger age children, the most frequent immediate event leading to referral (to the NPI clinic for treatment) was perceived or imagined abandonment by a parent figure. For some families, divorce was the ultimate separation of a hostile, feuding, pathological relationship of violence between husband and wife."

In other families, Paulson said, the birth of a new brother or sister—a rival for the parents' love—and the mother's decision to go back to work were interpreted by the child as rejection.

Said one such 6-year-old, feeling emotionally rejected by his mother: "I want to die because nobody loves me."

"For many older children," Paulson continued, "the witnessing of family violence both verbal and physical, precipitated acute panic, fear and concern that they also may be the next victim of violent assault."

Said an 8-year-old girl: "They don't like me, I wish I was dead."

And another: "I would rather die than be spanked. They want me dead."

A battered 10-year-old whose 13-year-old brother had committed suicide earlier was philosophical: "Everyone kills and everyone dies . . . there is no escape."

(These children and their parents were treated with a variety of therapies: behavior modification training, individual or family psychotherapy, hospitalization, and foster home or institutional placement or adoption were sometimes necessary. Only 13 of those 34 treated could be traced three years later, but of those, none had committed suicide.)

Although depression is the leading cause of suicide, there are many more depressed children than completed suicides.

The psychiatrist who heads the only hospital ward in the United States devoted to studying childhood depression, Dr. Joaquim Puig-Antich of Columbia University and the New York State Psychiatric Institute, estimates that at least 1 percent of all children are depressed. This is based, in turn, on estimates that 10 to 15 percent of children in urban areas have some psychiatric disorder and that that disorder is depression between 5 and 10 percent of those cases.

When psychiatrists talk about Depression with a big D, however, they are talking about

much more than just feeling blue. And sometime much less than wanting to die.

No one denies that children feel sad or discouraged at times, says UCLA psychiatrist Dr. Gabrielle Carlson. Or that they may feel depressed at being separated from a loved one or at being trapped in a miserable environment. The controversy among professionals has centered on whether children can suffer adult-like depression: an illness with definite signs and symptoms, a family history of related disorders, certain biochemical levels in the body and a predictable response to antidepressant drugs.

Studies by Carlson, Puig-Antich and others show that they do; whether they will outgrow it or become depressed adults, however, is another—and still unanswered—question that will require long-term follow-up studies, since depression most often first shows up when a person is in his 30s.

Carlson says the only two follow-up studies done so far have reached opposite conclusions.

She herself looked back for early signs of depression or other psychiatric illness in the childhoods of 50 manic-depressive patients at the National Institute of Mental Health; few were found. That type of depression—which has high and low mood swings—doesn't seem to start until adolescence, although Columbia's Puig-Antich believes some depressed children may simply start with the lows and not experience the first high (the manic phase of the illness) until the teens.

What, then, does a depressed child look like? Carlson says, for starters, that most readily admit that they feel sad or "down" if anyone bothers to ask. They may, however, also have a behavior disorder like hyperactivity that draws more attention: "When a kid comes in who's been burning down the house, you don't stop to do a depression inventory," Carlson notes.

Besides an unhappy mood, the depressed child may be irritable and weepy. Other symptoms include: thoughts of death or suicide, tiredness, withdrawal from other people or aggressiveness and getting into fights, loss of interest in things that used to be fun, guilt feelings, poor concentration (and consequently, poor performance in school), insomnia or a lot, and, sometimes, changes in appetite and weight. If a child appears sad and has as many as five of these symptoms for more than a couple of weeks, chances are he is depressed.

The current view of how depression develops in children goes like this: depression runs in families. But children born with a susceptibility to the disorder—a "high genetic load" in scientific parlance—may not become depressed until later in life, if ever—unless they are also subjected to traumatic events—separations, divorces, cruelty, neglect, the death of someone close—during their first five years

"The child has to be hit both ways," Puig-Antich explained.

Swedish researchers have shown that poor early home environment can lower the age of depression's onset from the 30s and 40s to the teens and 20s; Puig-Antich's studies suggest that, given a high enough genetice vulnerability, it can be pushed even lower. He sees childhood depression as the same illness suffered by adults but simply occurring at a different point in development.

In a pilot study of 13 depressed children between 6 and 12 years old (at the Bronx Municipal Hospital Center and the Sound View-Throggs Neck Community Mental Health Center in New York), Puig-Antich and other researchers at Albert Einstein College of Medicine found 11 had suffered major losses or long separations from parents or other important figures.

Eleven came from families where fighting was a way of life.

And information gathered on 83 of these children's relatives turned up severe depression or alcoholism in 51. Similarly, Carlson's study at UCLA of 28 depressed youngsters between 7 and 17 found that one-third of them had close relatives who were alcoholics, half had depressive or manic-depressive relatives, a fifth had sociopaths.

Blood samples from severely depressed children also showed an excessive amount of cortisol, an essential hormone secreted by the adrenal gland whenever the pituitary gland releases a certain hormone. Depression appears to be the only disease in which the cortisol "faucet" fails to shut off in the evening as it does in normal people. As the depression gets better, however, the cortisol level drops.

Measuring such hormone levels gives researchers a sort of window on the brain: the brain chemicals that have been implicated in adult depression—sertonin, norepinephrine, and dopamine—and which are the targets of the antidepressaant drugs, regulate the limbic system, thought to be the seat of the emotions. The limbic system, in turn, regulates the pituitary. So the amounts of hormones in the blood and breakdown products of these brain chemicals in the urine provides clues as to what's going on up in the brain.

The drug that seems to wipe out depression in these children is imipramine (Tofranil). Puig-Antich's pilot study showed that 7 out of 8 children responded to it, and now he has embarked on a $500,000, 3-year study that will, among other things, evaluate its effectiveness.

Imipramine is not used longer than 3 or 4 months, he said, and only to alleviate the depression so that other therapy can be started: "It's a losing ballgame to try to treat with psychotherapy while they are still depressed," he explained.

The study, which began three months ago, should provide many of the answers needed to help unhappy children before they reach the point of wanting to die.●

---

## ARMS EMBARGO SHOULD BE MAINTAINED!

### HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee, I have had the privilege to participate in formulating H.R. 12514, the International Security Assistance Act of 1978. Curiously, the finished product, which the House is debating on the floor today, differs significantly in one crucial area from what the majority of the committee members actually support; namely, the issue of lifting the Turkish arms embargo.

Debate over lifting the embargo had centered around two issues: A just solution to the Cyprus question and the need to maintain a strong southeastern flank of NATO. The question we must, therefore, ask is, will lifting the embargo resolve these issues? I believe it will not.

A just solution to the Cyprus question is already in existence. It can be found in United Nations General Assembly Resolution No. 3212 of November 5, 1974, which calls for the political independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and a government which will provide autonomy for both Greek and Turkish Cypriots to enable them to pursue their own interests without compromising their rights. This kind of settlement could lead to the restoration of peaceful relations between Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, by improving relations between Turkey and Greece, this settlement would enhance their ability to defend the southeastern flank of NATO jointly.

By taking steps to repeal the embargo, Congress is putting itself in the position of undermining the laws which it has passed over the years. The embargo was a response to a clear violation of American laws and bilateral agreements already in effect. Under provisions of both the Foreign Assistance Act and the Foreign Military Sales Act the only response to the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in August of 1974 and the subsequent occupation of Cyprus was to institute an embargo as provided for under the law.

Despite the embargo Congress did make concessions to Turkey. The $185 million in weapons ordered prior to the embargo were delivered while the embargo was in place. In addition, more than $800 million in American arms were provided to Turkey through foreign military sales credits and commercial arms sales during the embargo. However, the Turkish Government has not responded by negotiating in good faith for a just solution to the Cyprus problem.

In light of these concessions and the lack of positive action by the Turkish Government, it is not logical to assume that lifting the embargo will spur the Ankara Government to negotiate in a more open and constructive manner. I hope that you will join me and a majority of the House International Relations Committee in defeating this premature effort to lift the Turkish arms embargo.

At this time I insert the separate views of the majority of the International Relations Committee at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPARATE VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES DANTE B. FASCELL, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., ROBERT N. C. NIX, DONALD M. FRASER, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, LESTER L. WOLFF, GUS YATRON, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, CARDISS COLLINS, HELEN S. MEYNER, GERRY E. STUDDS, ANDY IRELAND, ANTHONY C. BEILENSON, WYCHE FOWLER, JR., JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, J. HERBERT BURKE, BENJAMIN GILMAN, AND TENNYSON GUYER

A majority of the members of this committee oppose the administration's efforts to repeal section 620(x) of the Foreign Assistance Act, which now provides for a limited arms embargo against Turkey.

We have reached this position for a variety of reasons, among which are the following:

As supporters of the rule of law in the conduct of American foreign policy, we recognize that Turkey's second invasion of Cyprus in August 1974, was a clear violation of the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and our bilateral agreements with Turkey respecting the proper use of American-supplied weapons. The continuing occupation by Turkey of 40 percent of Cyprus constitutes a continuing violation of those laws and agreements.

As supporters of NATO, we recognize the great importance of our southeastern European defense flank, and we hesitate to take any action which might threaten the full participation of both Turkey and Greece in that defense effort.

As supporters of human rights, we are not convinced that lifting the embargo constitutes a course likely to lead to a just settlement of the Cyprus tragedy and a resolution of the refugee problem.

As supporters of restraint in U.S. arms sales abroad, we feel that lifting the embargo before Turkey has taken the substantive actions necessary to a settlement on Cyprus would serve as a harmful precedent to future recipients of American weapons.

And, finally, as practical men and women, we recognize that the embargo is, even now, a limited one. Turkey has received $600 million in U.S. arms since the embargo was first imposed. Even if the administration's amendment is defeated, Turkey will still receive an additional $175 million in U.S. arms for fiscal year 1979. Moreover, the provisions of section 620(x) themselves permit President Carter to end the embargo in a moment, if he is willing to certify to the Congress that Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and its bilateral agreements with the United States, and that substantial progress has been made toward an agreement regarding military forces on Cyprus. We believe that these provisions offer an appropriate means of dealing with the Turkish arms question.

For the foregoing reasons, we believe that the administration's effort to end the Turkish arms embargo at this time should be defeated.

Dante B. Fascell, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Robert N. C. Nix, Donald M. Fraser, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Lester L. Wolff, Gus Yatron, Michael Harrington, Cardiss Collins, Helen S. Meyner, Gerry E. Studds, Andy Ireland, Anthony C. Beilenson, Wyche Fowler, Jr., John J. Cavanaugh, Edward J. Derwinski, J. Herbert Burke, Benjamin A. Gilman, and Tennyson Guyer.●

## FAITH BETRAYED

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, terrorism has no limits. This repugnant fact was brought to my attention by a recent article in the Los Angeles Times. It appears that well-intentioned Christian churches, who for years have supported democratic, freedom-preserving African movements, now find that, inadvertently, they are supporting revolutionary terrorism. And the targets of the murder, torture and rape are often members of their Christian faith, fellow servants of God.

The following article offers us this sad revelation:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 7, 1978]

AFRICA MISSIONARIES CAN THANK CHURCHES FOR THEIR TROUBLES

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

If I were one of the dozens of American or European missionaries martyred recently in Rhodesia, these days from heaven I would be saying an extra prayer. It would be for the sanity of many of my church's leaders.

For if we are to look at the heinous murders of missionaries and educators realistically, there is one thing stranger than the fact that the churches themselves bought many of the bullets—the fact that church leaders can't figure out why missionaries are being singled out.

"It is as if the devil has gotten hold of the country," the Catholic bishop of Bulawayo, Henry Karlan, remarked, shaking his head after the most recent massacre last week. He is wrong. The devil isn't half the story.

He has the churches with him.

I have before me a press release from the World Council of Churches from April 16, 1975, headed: "Special Fund Allocates $479,000 to Liberation/Support Groups."

The release reads, "More than one-half of this amount will go to liberation movements of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Namibia and South Africa working for black-majority rule." In addition, aid continued to Mozambique and Angola, two Marxist one-party dictatorships supporting the Rhodesian terrorists.

At the recent synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, its primate, the Most Rev. E. W. Scott, was reported in Vancouver as saying that the church must support African "liberation" movements. Asked whether he thought that the church should provide assistance to Christian-based liberation movements rather than to Marxist-based ones, he said that no one could make such a "distinction."

In 1972, the world council appealed to British churches for support of its "Fund to Combat Racism." The fund's director said that the setting up of the fund was a symbol to the oppressed of "the transfer of power from the powerful to the powerless." Approximately $10,000 was given by the council to ZAPU and ZANU, the two groups widely believed responsible for the recent murders.

Proofs of this strange dialectic of guilt, martyrdom and criminal naivete could be offered indefinitely. But perhaps it is better to ask "Why?" A church does not deliberately kill its own prophets—or does it?

When the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, began giving aid to the African "liberation" movements in the early '60s, there was a good reason for it—a reason of which I approved. It was to end colonialism.

But by now they should know better (perhaps I should say that they should know *something*!). After all, the Catholic Church in Mozambique strongly opposed Portuguese colonialism and supported Frelimo, the "liberation" movement there, only to have Frelimo totally outlaw religion once it came to power.

The money, of course, is also supposed to go only for "humanitarian" purposes, but no one seriously believes that any more.

So where are we today? In a horrendous situation in which Marxist guerrillas based in Zambia and Mozambique systematically wipe out missionaries and church educators (who have made black Rhodesia the most educated black population on the continent) to (1) destabilize and terrorize the country; (2) get rid of the only ideology that opposes them—Western democracy and Christianity, and (3) leave a void that only Marxism can fill.

To just touch on the mountain of evidence: In May, 1977, Free Methodist missionaries were told by a terrorist leader, "If the Jews had not killed Christ, I would have done it"; in April, 1974, Sister Vianny of the Avila mission was lectured by a terrorist about "the Catholic Church representing the evils of capitalism"; surviving missionaries say guerrillas trained in Cuba and East Germany were more brutal and anti-Christian than locally trained ones.

But perhaps a document published by Mozambique's Frelimo in late 1975 was most prophetic: "Progressively, we will replace the religious element by the Marxist element. We will thus transform the false conscience into true conscience, so that Catholics may eventually destroy their own movement . . ."

And what is the reaction of today's Rhodesian church superiors to the carnage of their brothers and sisters in Christ? Over and over these past weeks, they have asked in their traumatized innocence, "Why should they kill us when we have been for them?"

The situation is complex. Most members and many ministers and priests of the world council and the Catholic Church and others certainly do not want their money used to rape nuns before axing them to death. They do not have to. The cerebral, remote decisions are made far away, and seldom analyzed.

But what is unforgivable on the decision-making level is the intellectual and moral incoherence of people who cannot even distinguish between Christian and democratic revolution and Marxist totalitarianism. One could almost say that these church leaders have introduced a new term into the historic Christian vocabulary: auto-martyrdom. One could certainly say that, while they think that they are living their faith by their actions, in actuality they are only killing it.●

## COUNTERSPIES

### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Chicago Tribune ran an editorial commenting favorably on the proposed foreign intelligence electronic surveillance measure now pending before the House.

This measure, which was passed previously in the other body, has now raised serious questions among our Members and is being actively opposed by the Association of Retired Intelligence Officers and many other individuals who are knowledgeable in the area of foreign intelligence.

I am attaching to these remarks copies of two letters to the editor which that editorial evoked.

The letters follow:

COUNTERSPIES

WASHINGTON.—It was with interest that I read your June 26 lead editorial entitled "Restraining the counterspies."

Your reference to pending legislation to control foreign intelligence electronic surveillance relates to a subject pending before the House Judiciary Committee on which I serve as the ranking minority member, and which has already been considered by the House Intelligence Committee on which I also serve.

You indicate support for electronic surveillance legislation to be developed "in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with operations that are essential to the national security." I would question whether legislation should interfere in any respect whatever with operations which are essential to our national security. Certainly, the administration bill which would prevent any and all electronic surveillance unless first authorized by an order of a special court could completely frustrate electronic surveillance activities, notwithstanding the urgency or seriousness of the need for intelligence information which may be available only through such means.

While commenting unfavorably on the measure which I have presented to provide statutory direction for electronic surveillance activities by the executive branch of government, you justify the involvement of a special court in such operations by stating that "enough evidence of past abuse has come to light since Watergate to justify

nudging the pendulum back toward the protection of individual privacy."

I should point out that there is no evidence which has been produced in the Senate or House Intelligence Committee hearings indicating any abuses "since Watergate." Indeed, the justification which Sen. Kennedy [D., Mass.] and the American Civil Liberties Union give for this legislation is that domestic wiretaps, wrongfully excused on the ground of national security, were carried out against Joseph Kraft, Martin Luther King Jr., and Morton Halperin, but these were at least four years ago, and there is no evidence that any abuses have occurred during recent years while Atty. Gen. Bell and former Atty. Gen. Levi have been operating under strict presidential guidelines.

You conclude your editorial by stating that in your opinion as well as the Justice Department's "the intelligence agencies should be able to live with" the legislation providing across-the-board warrants for all foreign intelligence electronic surveillance.

I should advise you that at least one of the intelligence agencies remonstrated by convincing the House Intelligence Committee that, indeed, it could not live with such restraints and "special court involvement." While the other intelligence agencies have failed to speak up in opposition to the Carter administration's plan, the private expressions which have come to me are almost entirely to the contrary.

In my opinion, to transfer authority and accountability for foreign intelligence electronic surveillance from the President and the executive branch to a special court is unthinkable and dangerous to our national security.

ROBERT MCCLORY.

HIGHLAND PARK.—Thanks for the June 26 editorial on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Bill now before the House Judiciary Committee.

Rep. Robert McClory [R., Lake Bluff] is correct in looking closely at the bill despite the Senate's 95 to 1 passage. This nearly unanimous Senate rubber stamp was less a measure of intelligence than naivete about counter-intelligence.

The U.S. intelligence community must keep 1,400 foreign adversary agents on station here and their U.S. contacts and subagents under surveillance. This enormous national security assignment is much more than protecting sensitive information—it includes surveillance of covert operations of neutralization, sabotage, and subversion; dissemination of false information; infiltration for the purpose of deep penetration into commerce, industry, and government for manipulation of domestic and foreign policy, and assassination and terrorism.

The good intentions of the bill to curtail surveillance of U.S. citizens need not extend equally to noncitizens and certainly not to individuals intent upon overthrowing the government.

The U.S. intelligence community can best counter the enemy within without this legislation which adds blinders and ear muffs to the cloak and dagger uniform.

GEORGE HISCOTT IV,
*Member of the Association of Former Intelligence Officers.*●

## MISGUIDED U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, from July 31 through August 2, 1978, the House of Representatives will debate and vote on the foreign assistance appropriation bill (H.R. 12931). During the course of this debate, I expect to hear rhetoric from my colleagues concerning U.S. aid which purportedly, supports so-called socialist and Marxist countries like Mozambique and Angola. I also expect Representative ROBIN BEARD to offer an amendment to prohibit indirect aid to Mozambique and Angola through U.S. contributions to international financial institutions and other international organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the Beard amendments and the rhetoric associated with this amendment represent ill-conceived U.S. policy toward Africa. To begin with, they make the serious mistake of politicizing economic and humanitarian assistance and more significantly they assume that so-called socialist and Marxist nations have embraced communism. It is in regards to this last matter that I have submitted an article by distinguished author and commentator Carl T. Rowan. This article, which appeared in the July 27, 1978, Plain Dealer sheds much needed light on an area of foreign policy, which I am sad to say, many of my colleagues have convoluted.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES STUPID IN AFRICA

(By Carl T. Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Americans ought not underestimate the importance of Nigeria's warning to Russia and Cuba that they should not overstay their welcome in Africa.

It is of great importance that the most populous and powerful black nation in Africa should publicly tell the Soviets that Africa "is not about to throw off one colonial yoke for another." Those were the words of Lt. Gen. Olesegun Obasanjo, Nigeria's head of state, at a summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity, Khartoum, Sudan.

Americans—Congress particularly—are so hung up on words like "socialist" and "Marxist" that we adopt stupid policies inimical to our national interest regarding countries like Mozambique and Angola. A majority of Congress, and a lot of newspaper editors, get their minds thrown out of joint because African leaders do not embrace capitalism or governmental systems that match our two-party cultural indoctrination. So Americans conclude, irrationally, that these African countries have become the allies and pawns of Russia, Cuba, East Germany or the People's Republic of China.

Obasanjo pointed out that Egypt, Sudan and Somalia threw out the Russians rather than see the Soviets become imperial rulers.

I recently was in Mozambique, where President Samora Machel governs "along Marxist lines." What on earth does that mean? It means that his Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO) moved quickly to wipe out a situation where doctors served only whites and a few important Africans. The African masses got little or no health care. So FRELIMO nationalized medical care and abolished private practice. Some 90% of the Portuguese doctors fled, leaving fewer than 50 to serve 9 million people. Still, Mozambique's masses are now getting more and better medical care, more inoculations against infectious diseases, than in 400 years of Portuguese rule.

Does this, and other socialist innovations by Machel, put Mozambique in the pocket of the Kremlin? Far from it. I found Mozambicans already up to their throats in disenchantment with the Soviets. They talk privately about how, last year, they caught the Soviet airline, Aeroflot, engaging in flimflammery of ticket prices, costing economically pressed Mozambique at least $3 million in precious hard currency. (Mozambique forced Aeroflot to close its Maputo office.) They talk about how the Soviets are ripping off Mozambique in a fisheries agreement where the Russians take a catch of about 10,000 tons a year out of Mozambican waters and pay a ridiculously low compensation.

But Congress is so blinded by the word "Marxist" that it will not let the United States offer Mozambique an alternative to exploitation by the Soviets.

Since independence three years ago Mozambique has suffered devastating floods, a severe drought and hundreds of military attacks by Rhodesia. It is losing at least $150 million a year because of the Rhodesian war, and is trying to feed some 50,000 refugees who have fled Rhodesia. Yet Congress has forbidden aid to Mozambique, meaning that the United States cannot provide even food, drugs, clothing or agricultural assistance. This is political insanity.

The rhetoric of American know-nothings puts Mozambique in the same bag with Uganda, Chile and other countries of gross oppression and human rights violations. This is shamefully unfair to Mozambique.

Congress ought to take a better-informed look at Mozambique. It will discover that, like Nigeria's Obasanjo, Mozambicans do not want the yoke of the Soviet Union to replace that of the Portuguese. And we ought not deny Mozambique an alternative.●

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 31, 1978*

● Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 20th observance of Captive Nations Week. This year, as in every year since 1958, we set aside a week during July—the month of our own national independence—to honor those who have struggled to obtain the freedom that Americans enjoy as a right.

This yearly observance reminds us that all people do not enjoy basic liberties and human rights—a grim message brought home to us recently, when the Soviet Union, in blatant and callous disregard for human rights, sentenced Anatoly Shchransky, Alexsandr Ginsburg, and Viktor Pektus to prison terms for their so-called "crimes" of speaking out against government wrongs and attempting to help others leave the Soviet Union.

Even without the reminder of the cruelty of the recent Soviet action, we must recognize the continuing Soviet oppression of the millions of struggling individuals in Eastern Europe. These brave individuals have maintained their courage and perseverance, in the face of continued occupation and control by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we in the United States do not disappoint these brave individuals. It is incumbent upon us to continue to voice our outrage whenever and wherever human rights are violated.

Captive Nations Week must be more than just a once-a-year occasion for speeches and rhetoric. We must continually demonstrate to the Soviet Union

that we will not be silent in the face of systematic violations of international agreements such as the Helsinki Final Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 177—A measure which calls for independence for Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, three Eastern European countries now suffering from Soviet occupation.

I believe this measure is a step in the right direction for a Congress which wants to affirm its commitment to the objectives of freedom and human rights. Let us reaffirm the principles of Captive Nations Week and pledge to support this resolution and any others which will discourage Communist oppression and encourage freedom in all captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, WCAU-TV in Philadelphia recently editorialized on the occasion of Captive Nations Week. I offer for the RECORD the text of that editorial, because I feel it is an intelligent, thoughtful statement about the underlying issues of importance of Captive Nations Week.

The editorial follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Carter has declared July 16 to 23 "Captive Nations Week."

The idea of paying attention to and paying honor to "Captive Peoples" came out of American reaction to Soviet expansion following World War II.

Soviet dictator Josef Stalin rushed his tanks and his troops across Eastern and Central Europe following the collapse of Nazi Germany. He filled a power vacuum. People who thirty years before had heard the gospel of "self-determination of peoples" found themselves swallowed by new conquerors. Marxist totalitarianism was enforced by Red Army soldiers. And most of Europe's Slavic peoples were walled up behind what Churchill named "The Iron Curtain."

America's response was to try to live with it—to strengthen our own defenses—and to hope for change. Some change has come.

The American and Soviet superpowers have remained at the stage of where talk has replaced troops, where negotiation has been preferred over nuclear war. And we say this is good.

But events of this past week—the news of the trials of Jewish dissidents inside Russia—remind us of the connection between the enslavement of the Slavs and the continuing imprisonment of the human conscience.

The concept behind Captive Nations Week must, we feel, be more than a ceremonial sop to American voters of Eastern-European origin. We must continue to speak out for the human conscience and human rights wherever they are imperiled: in Central Africa, in Chile, in Korea, or in Russian courtrooms.

(File tape Russian invasions of the Ukraine.)

Presented by John A. O'Connor—Editorial Director.●

---

## 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, August 1, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 3

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue mark up of proposed legislation designating certain Alaska lands as national parkland.
3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S.J. Res. 134, extending the deadline for ratifying the ERA.
318 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To mark up H.R. 13468, making appropriations for fiscal year 1979 for the District of Columbia Government.
S-126, Capitol

Environment and Public Works
Regional and Community Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 3319, authorizing funds for programs under the Public Works and Economic Development Act for fiscal year 1979.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the quality of patient care in nursing homes.
8302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 3227, to establish a program of therapeutic communities in Federal prisons.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Military Construction and Stockpiles Subcommittee
To hold hearings on military base realignments by the Department of Defense.
212 Russell Building

Finance
To resume mark up of S. 1470, to reform administrative and reimbursement procedures currently employed under the medicare and medicaid programs, and on H.R. 12232 and H.R. 12380, reporting dates for the Unemployment Compensation Commision, and other amendments related to unemployment programs.
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings on organized crime activities in South Florida, with testimony on loansharking, arson, and narcotics trafficking.
1202 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To resume hearings on S. 2525, to improve the intelligence systems of the U.S. by establishing a statutory basis for U.S. intelligence gathering activities.
1318 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging
To hold hearings on vision impairment problems of older Americans, and on aspects of S. 3038, to provide payment for lenses prescribed to improve the eyesight of individuals with severely limited vision.
6226 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.
Conferees
On H.R. 12598, FY 79 authorizations for the Department of State, the International Communication Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-116, Capitol

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

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S.J. Res. 134, extending the deadline for ratifying the ERA.
318 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the Government in the Sunshine Act (Public Law 94-409).
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on several public building prospectuses.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume mark up of S. 2755, the Drug Regulation Reform Act, and S. 3115, to establish a comprehensive disease prevention and health promotion program in the U.S.
4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 7

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the problem of property insurance in urban America.
5302 Dirksen Building

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

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nominations of James D. Phillips, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fourth circuit, and Harry E. Claiborne, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Nevada.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2533, proposed 82 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

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition Subcommittee
To hold hearings on what information is currently available to the public on food labeling and nutrition content.
322 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To mark up second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979.
6202 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2533 proposed Gasohol Motor Fuel Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed initiatives designed to improve Federal water resource programs transmitted by the President in his message of June 7, 1978.
4200 Dirksen Building
Finance
To mark up miscellaneous tariff bills.
2221 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To consider further the nominations of John Warren McGarry, of Massachusetts, and Samuel D. Zagoria, of Maryland, to be members of the FEC.
301 Russell 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

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition Subcommittee
To continue hearings on what information is currently available to the public on food labeling and nutrition content.
322 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue markup of second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979. (Afternoon session expected.)
6202 Dirksen Building
Environmental and Public Works
To hold hearings on several public building prospectuses.
4200 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 11

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To continue markup of second concurrent resolution on the Congressional Budget for FY 1979. (Afternoon session expected.)
6202 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 14

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Developmental 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

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 2329, proposed Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act, and H.R. 8394, proposed Refuge Revenue Sharing Act.
4200 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with Finance Subcommittee on Private Pension Plans and Employee Fringe Benefits on bills relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (S. 3017, 901, 2992, 3193, 1745, 1383, and 250).
4232 Dirksen Office Building

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the FBI Charter as it concerns domestic security.
2228 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.
285 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting on pending calendar business
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with Finance Subcommittee on Private Pension Plans and Employee Fringe Benefits on bills relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (S. 3017, 901, 2992, 3193, 1745, 1383, and 250).
4232 Dirksen Office Building

AUGUST 17

9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with Finance Subcommittee on Private Pension Plans and Employee Fringe Benefits on bills relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (S. 3017, 901, 2992, 3193, 1745, 1383, and 250).
4232 Dirksen Office Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the physical and financial condition of the Erie canal.
4200 Dirksen Building
Foreign Relations
Arms Control, Oceans, and International Environment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2053, the Deep Seabed Mineral Resources Act, now pending in the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee.
4221 Dirksen Building
Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on Federal Spending Practices and Open Government on S. 2515, dealing with occupational alcoholism programs.
3302 Dirksen Building
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

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2645, proposed National Art Bank Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

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

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
To continue hearings on S. 2645, proposed National Art Bank Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 24

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

SEPTEMBER 14

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the FBI Charter and its overall policy.
2228 Dirksen Building