

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE TAX CUT

## HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for August 30, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

## THE TAX CUT

The multibillion dollar tax cut bill now halfway through Congress is remarkable in two respects: it shows an unmistakable new emphasis and it rejects an attractive but unsound tax reduction of massive proportions.

The congressional mood on taxes has changed markedly since the talk of tax reform in the 1976 election campaign. The shift has been away from widespread tax reforms and toward tax breaks for middle-income wage earners. The change in the bill just passed by the House is a reaction to the protest of middle-income taxpayers who have felt the pinch of inflation. It reflects the perception—which most of us share—that middle-income families are overtaxed. The new emphasis is expected to be sharpened by the Senate.

Since Congress has enacted five tax cuts in the past ten years, a reduction in taxes is nothing new. But the provisions of the House-passed bill are significant. They include:

## RELIEF FOR THE MIDDLE- AND UPPER-INCOME TAXPAYER

The major departure from tradition in the bill is a tax cut that would go primarily to persons in the \$15,000 to \$50,000 bracket rather than to those earning less than \$15,000. Tax cuts since the mid-1960s have been slanted in favor of lower-income taxpayers at the expense of those better off.

## BREAKS FOR BUSINESS

Corporate taxes would be trimmed by \$3.8 billion, with reduced corporate tax rates, graduated rates for small businessmen and a liberalization and extension of the investment tax credit.

## HELP FOR INVESTORS

Taxes on profits from the sale of stock and other property would be lowered, with the maximum rate falling from 49 percent to 35 percent.

## AID TO HOMEOWNERS

Homeowners would be freed on a once-in-a-lifetime basis from the capital gains tax on profits up to \$100,000 from the sale of a home.

## INDEXATION

Taxpayers would be insulated from one type of taxation on capital gains—that produced by inflation. Inflationary increases would be automatically counterbalanced by a reduction in the tax at the annual rate of inflation.

The House also defeated a much larger tax cut proposal (Kemp-Roth) that would have slashed income taxes by 30 percent over the next three years. Kemp-Roth would begin with a tax cut of \$30 billion in 1979 and would build to a \$120-billion reduction in 1981. Its proponents argue that the huge tax cut would generate an economic boom of such scale that in a few years the government would recoup all the revenues that were lost, and then some. They believe that the huge tax cut would increase the incentive to work, save and invest, thereby re-

sulting in greater economic growth, lower prices, more jobs and higher government revenues. Supporters of Kemp-Roth claim that the tax cuts could be made without increasing the federal deficit and without any drop in spending.

The House voted down Kemp-Roth, believing it would overheat the economy and lead to catastrophic deficits and runaway inflation. It is almost certain that Kemp-Roth supporters have overestimated the benefits of the proposal and seriously underestimated its inflationary potential. The "free lunch" rationale of Kemp-Roth just does not hold up under scrutiny and has been rejected by economists of all persuasions. Without offsetting reductions in government spending—which Kemp-Roth does not provide—such tax reductions would bring on enormous deficits, estimated to be \$90 billion in 1980. There might be a formidable surge in spending that would lead to either a dangerous acceleration of inflation or a crippling credit crunch. Economists agree that a tax cut would increase total demand and national income and would thus partly compensate for the initial revenue loss. But to make up for the effect of the lower tax rates called for by Kemp-Roth, total income in the country would have to rise by some four or five times the original amount of the cut. The evidence is simply overwhelming that no cut in taxes could generate a rise in spending and income of that size.

Kemp-Roth advocates point to the 1964 Kennedy tax cut as historical proof of their claims. After that tax cut unemployment dropped and the gross national product rose. However, the Kennedy tax cut and the economic activity during that period differ greatly from Kemp-Roth and the current economic situation. First, the Kennedy cut was nowhere near the magnitude of the Kemp-Roth cut. Second, the inflation rate was running at slightly less than 2 percent per year in 1964 and there was no great concern, as there is now, about the inflationary impact of a large tax cut. Third, the federal deficit has grown immensely since 1964, posing a whole set of complex problems. Finally, the claim that the Kennedy measure was solely responsible for the economic recovery and the increase in revenues in the 1960s is plainly false. In 1964 the economy was already on the upswing because of the effects of the Vietnam War.

Nothing I have said about the dangers of a massive tax cut in 1979-1980 applies to a moderate tax cut of \$15 billion to \$20 billion. Since joblessness is still high and the economy is still operating well below its potential—and with payroll tax boosts and inflation adding to the taxpayer's burden—it is desirable to enact a tax cut to neutralize these factors and to supply some stimulus for an economy that would otherwise slow down.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, on August 12, the House of Representatives considered the Dornan amendment to the defense appropriations bill. In the RECORD of that date, I was listed as paired against the amendment (rollcall No. 644).

Due to an error which I have already pointed out to the pairing clerk, I should have been listed as voting for the amendment. I would like the following statement placed in the next available RECORD:

"Mr. Speaker, on August 12, the House considered the Dornan amendment to the defense appropriations bill. That amendment prohibited the use of Department of Defense funds for elective abortions except where the life of the mother was endangered. In the RECORD of that date, I was incorrectly paired against the amendment. I would have voted in favor of the Dornan amendment.

"I believe that it is Government's primary responsibility to protect the lives of its people. I believe that it is inconsistent with that principle to have Government, through the expenditure of public dollars, sanction the taking of life. For these reasons, I oppose the expenditure of public funds for elective abortions except in those cases where the life of the mother is endangered."

## CONGRESSIONAL CONDUCT

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would address a most serious problem that relates to the perception of this body in the public mind.

The resolution would express the sense of the House that any Member of the House who is the chairman of a permanent, select, special or joint committee of the Congress or any subcommittee thereof should refrain from exercising the function of that office when he has been indicted for an offense for which he could be sentenced to 2 or more years imprisonment. The resolution would not affect voting rights in either the committee or the House. That subject is already provided for in clause 10 of House rule XLIII, in the event a conviction follows from such indictment.

The resolution would also provide machinery for temporary restoration of suspended chairmanships if the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on which I serve, determined that such restoration is warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware some constitutional purists will oppose this resolution but I am persuaded that being only a sense of the House expression, it is constitutionally sound.

I am also aware that some will oppose it on the grounds that it offends the innocent-until-proven-guilty doctrine. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Federal criminal justice system in this country is so filled with prior safeguards for the accused that of the indictments which fi-

nally evolve an overwhelming number ends in convictions.

With these odds do we dare to be in fact, as well as appear to be, indifferent to such situations? No one argues with the proposition that committee chairmen have a disproportionate impact on the legislative functions of this body. I know, I have chaired two permanent and one select committees and numerous subcommittees in the House.

The problem is simply one of the balancing of interests. On the one hand shall we have the most important functions of this body managed by men under a cloud, with all the wear and tear on the fabric of public confidence such a situation brings about, or on the other hand shall we express ourselves that we too are concerned about this and feel that it is far better to let others not under any cloud perform these functions until the matter is finally resolved?●

TERAMANA AMERICAN LEGION  
POST OHIO BASEBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, with the close of summer comes the end to many summer activities. I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an event of which we in Ohio and its 18th Congressional District are extremely proud.

As we all know, summertime baseball has long been a tradition in America. But, perhaps the most skillful leagues at the amateur level are the American Legion league teams that play across this land. It is a highly competitive league and one that possesses much talent. I am privileged to announce today that the Ohio State champion for 1978 is the Teramana American Legion Post 33 of Steubenville, Ohio. They have proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are the champions that they have been proclaimed.

Following their State championship title in Athens, Ohio, the team went to the Great Lakes Regional Tournament, where they missed advancing to the American Legion World Series by only two runs of the final game, certainly not a performance to be ashamed of in any way.

Throughout this past and all previous seasons, Post 33 has displayed the meaning of teamwork. All team members and personnel have had a hand in achieving the State championship. Members of the 1978 playing team include: Terry Romey; Jimmy Joe DeFrank; Mark Chetock; Tim Cutri; Larry Whetstone; Bill Mason; John Maltese; Dave Morelli; Vince Lamatrice; Mike Montgomery; Tim Werkin; Paul Simpson; Ron Sismondo, named pitcher of the year; Lance Coulter, named player of the year; Mike Judy and Ken Peterson. Carmen Barbetta is the team statistician and Johnny Binkiewicz is the batboy.

While these young men have provided the talent on the playing field, they have been directed by an outstanding coaching staff. The staff includes: Jake Hollowood; Chuck Watt; Red Coulter and head coach Ang Vaccaro, who has taken teams to the State finals 27 times.

The entire State of Ohio should be proud of this team for carrying the State banner so far and so well. And on behalf of the 18th Congressional District, in particular, I extend my sincerest congratulations on a job well done.●

MARIHUANA

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the liberal cliché about drug use being among a category of "victim-less crimes." Marihuana, particularly, inspires its devotees to the use of this hackneyed cliché because its effects upon the health of the user have, until only very recently, been among the least studied of all dangerous drugs. Beginning with the building bombers on our college campuses during the 1960's and continuing today with the advocates of legalization, both in and out of the Carter White House, marihuana has become the "drug of choice" of chic liberals.

Tragically, their choice may be influencing millions of younger Americans to pursue a form of slow suicide. That appears to be the major conclusion of a new report issued by the Education and Research Institute (ERI) of Washington, D.C. This important new report summarizes all available study evidence regarding the effect of marihuana upon the human body and provides some disturbing conclusions about marihuana usage which should be of concern to every American.

Marihuana usage has reached epidemic proportions, particularly among young people. Reliable authorities estimate that some 53 percent of all Americans between the ages of 18 and 25 have at least tried marihuana. The Federal Drug Abuse Council estimates that 15 million young Americans are now steady marihuana users. The effects of this drug upon these young Americans are only now beginning to be quantified scientifically.

The first study included in the ERI report is that of Gabriel Nahas of Columbia University. Dr. Nahas' study indicates that marihuana's active chemical ingredient, delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), accumulates in the fatty tissue of the body, including the brain, and is not eliminated with normal rapidity. The substance settles in the liver, brain, bone marrow, and adrenal glands. Due to the body's natural tolerance functions, users find it necessary to increase continually their dosages to achieve the desired euphoric levels.

Citing a study done at the University of California by Prof. Hardin Jones, professor of medical physics, Dr. Nahas con-

tends that since THC accumulates in the fatty tissues of the body, the long term effect of the body's natural adjustment to the chemical's presence is more severe than that associated with alcohol.

The effects of marihuana usage on the brain are also documented in the ERI report. Among the effects upon the mental activities of the brain indicated by studies included in the ERI report are impairment of the memory, an inability to think sequentially, and slurring of words and sentence structures.

More disturbing, however, is the evidence included in the ERI report that marihuana usage of no more than 1 to 3 years can lead to pathological forms of thought, followed, in the case of the continued heavy user, by the development of paranoia.

To mask these effects, one study included in the ERI report noted, many regular users, particularly those in classroom situations, resort to phrase memorization and rambling, disjointed speech. This evidence must be especially frightening to parents whose children seem incapable of speaking without resort to that worn-out rhetorical duo, "like \* \* \* you know."

Damage to the brain from marihuana does not appear to end with the mental processes. Actual measurable physical damage is also documented in the ERI report. Five different studies cited in the report indicate conclusions similar to those of Dr. A. M. G. Campbell of the Royal University Hospital in Bristol, England:

You can see under the acute effects of marihuana-smoke changes in many sites (of the brain). The amygdala, septal and hippocampus show the most pronounced changes and these are brain areas where activity has been correlated with various specific emotional states. The septal region is the site for pleasure—stimulating it activates pleasure feelings. When its activity is impaired, as it is in schizophrenia, you have a lack of pleasure and a reduction of awareness toward a sleepy, dreamy state.

All the studies conclude that this type of physical damage is irreversible.

Parents whose youngsters seem to be chronically ill may also find the ERI report disturbing because among the effects of marihuana usage it documents is a marked decrease in the user's ability to combat the germs of diseases. Experiments by Dr. Nahas revealed a 40-percent reduction in the body's ability to manufacture white blood cells which attack foreign germs. This particular segment of the Nahas work dealt with light users, averaging but three or four joints a week. It would seem that even the briefest exposure to marihuana can result in harm to the user.

Finally, the ERI report summarizes studies which indicate that continued use of marihuana can lead to sexual impotence among male users. This effect seems to be the result of the accumulation of THC in the testicles and sexual glands which produce sexual differentiation. Yet another study in this particular area indicated that sperm counts among moderate users—at least four joints per week—dropped 44 percent. The sperm count reduction observed in these studies appeared to be proportionate to mari-

huana amounts consumed. Among heavy users, the counts plummeted to almost zero.

Once the reproductive system has been damaged by marihuana use the incidence of birth defects related to the drug must inevitably increase. According to the Staab-Lynch study cited in the ERI report, kidney deformation, runting, and even death were observed at uncommonly high levels among lightly exposed laboratory mice.

Millions of American youth today use or experiment with marihuana. How many of these youths will be permanently harmed because they believed those adults among us today who preach the gospel of legalization, decriminalization or justification of marihuana as a "victim-less" drug? I believe the American public, and particularly the young people suffering, probably unaware, the damage of this drug, deserve to know the truth. For this reason, I commend this fine study by ERI to the attention of this Congress. ●

### BUFFALO: A SUNNY BUSINESS CLIMATE

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, Buffalo, N.Y., has been the butt of many jokes, largely because of the monumental blizzard of 1977. Added to that unfortunate event was the widespread perception, even among western New Yorkers, of the Buffalo area as one of inevitable economic decline.

This negative and often self-defeating attitude obscured the underlying reality. Buffalo, having undergone a period of economic stagnation similar to that of many old Northern cities, is now experiencing a cultural, educational, and economic renaissance. Mike McKeating who is the financial editor of the Buffalo News has done an excellent job of setting the record straight in an article entitled "In Buffalo the Joke's on Johnny," which was published by the mid-America Outlook in its summer 1978 issue.

The article follows:

IN BUFFALO THE JOKE'S ON JOHNNY

(By Mike McKeating)

If your view of Buffalo has been polarized by Johnny Carson's jokes about the "Blizzard of '77", then consider this cold fact: In an average year, say local air transportation authorities, the Greater Buffalo International Airport is closed fewer hours from snow than LaGuardia, Kennedy or O'Hare.

Johnny Carson doesn't tell you that. And there are some other things Johnny Carson doesn't tell you that might be a surprise if you haven't visited the Queen City of the Great Lakes lately.

Despite a decline in manufacturing jobs, total employment in the Buffalo metropolitan areas has increased by 14,000 in the past decade due to an employment surge in the service and trade sectors.

The Buffalo metropolitan area is a center of higher education with 11 colleges and three universities. One, the State University of New York at Buffalo, is currently building

a new campus in suburban Amherst at a cost of \$500 to \$650 million which is currently the largest university construction project in the world.

Buffalo is a banking center. Although only the 28th largest city in the U.S., it is headquarters for the nation's 13th largest commercial bank, Marine Midland with deposits of over \$10 billion; the eighth largest savings bank, Buffalo Savings Bank with \$2 billion in deposits, and the 16th largest savings bank Erie Savings with \$1.6 billion in deposits.

The Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, conducted by the precocious Michael Tilson Thomas, ranks among the finest and has appeared in major cities across the nation.

The Albright-Knox Art Gallery, home to millions of dollars in art treasure, has a worldwide reputation.

Buffalo remains the largest flour milling center in the world, producing 1.2 million tons of flour a year—or 50 percent more than Kansas City and three times as much as Minneapolis, the nation's other large flour milling centers.

And, finally, those suits with the Johnny Carson label are made in Buffalo at the M. Wile Co., a subsidiary of Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

These are just a few of the facts that comprise the other side of the Buffalo story. But actually, the Buffalo story is more like a prism—with many sides. And like a prism, it reflects light differently, depending on the angle from which you view it.

The Buffalo saga is one of early prominence as an industrial and cultural center, subsequent decline and now a renaissance.

Due to its strategic location as the Eastern terminus of Great Lakes shipping and as the entrance to the Erie Canal, Buffalo quickly became a transportation hub and one of America's earliest industrial centers. By the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it was an important center for the manufacture of steel, other primary metals, machinery, foundry and forge products, and later, autos and aircraft.

Buffalo peaked early, both in population and as an industrial and transportation center. In 1940, Buffalo's population of 575,904 ranked 14th among U.S. cities. By 1960 the population had fallen to 532,759 and the rank to 20th, and in 1970 it had 432,768 people and ranked 28th.

The apparent population decline is misleading, however. The municipal boundaries were fixed in the 19th century, and the city became hemmed in by suburban townships. Under the New York State Constitution, suburban annexation is extremely difficult. Furthermore, in New York there's no such thing as unincorporated land. Every square inch of the state is already incorporated into either a city, township or village.

Therefore, the option of annexing more land, an option followed after World War II by Columbus, Jacksonville, Nashville, Denver, and many other cities, was not open to Buffalo.

The fact is the population of the Buffalo metropolitan area has remained relatively constant—at about 1.5 million—since 1940. There has simply been a large exodus of population from the city itself to its suburbs.

The industrial picture, however, is different. Following World War II, the Buffalo area began to lose industries. There were several reasons.

Buffalo was a city of old industries. Many were proprietary companies, founded in the 19th century by men who were inventors or entrepreneurs. As these companies passed into the hands of the second and third generations, often the heirs either lacked the talent or the desire to run them. Also, estate tax considerations encouraged sale, and one after another of the old-line Buffalo companies were sold to outside companies.

As years went by, these Buffalo plants became obsolete. The new owners lacked

personal commitment to the city and to revitalizing their plant. Eventually, the Buffalo plant became the highest cost plant in a multi-plant operation, and was closed or moved.

With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Buffalo lost its position as the Eastern terminus of the Great Lakes. Ships sailing the Great Lakes could now make a left turn at Pt. Colborne, Ontario, about 30 miles west of Buffalo, and go through the Welland Canal and out the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic.

They no longer needed to stop in Buffalo and transfer their cargos to trains, and this, coupled with the rise of the trucking industry after the war, diminished Buffalo's importance as a railroad center as well.

The net result: Between 1958 and 1974, the Buffalo metropolitan area lost 218 manufacturing plants and 30,974 manufacturing jobs.

The biggest losses have come in the areas of primary metals, which lost 14,000 jobs in the past decade, transportation equipment, which declined 5,000, and chemicals and allied products, which declined by 6,000 jobs.

Probably the biggest single reduction has been suffered by Bethlehem Steel's Lackawanna plant. Although it has some ultra-modern components, in general it is one of the oldest and most obsolete in the Bethlehem system. It peaked at an employment of nearly 20,000 in the boom year of 1967, but has since undergone several downgradings and reductions in capacity, and now employs only 8,500.

That is the Buffalo story viewed through the prism from one angle. But viewed from another angle, simultaneous to the decline in the heavy industry sector, a rebirth was taking place in other areas, including downtown redevelopment, higher education and high-technology industry.

The redevelopment of downtown was initially spurred by the banks in the mid 1960's. The Manufacturer's and Trader's Trust Company, the nation's 79th largest commercial bank, led off by building a new 20-story headquarters building.

Erie Savings Bank followed with a new 26-story headquarters tower and office building atop a block-long shopping mall across the street.

Finally, Marine Midland, the patriarch of Buffalo's banks, built a 40-story world headquarters building atop a U-shaped 3-story plaza.

The Buffalo Evening News, deposed from its 90-year-old building by the Marine Midland complex, built an ultra-modern 5-story building two blocks away.

Then the government sector became active. Erie County built a new 16-story office building to house county offices, and the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority erected a 10-story office building attached to a new bus terminal in the heart of downtown.

Erie County and the City of Buffalo teamed to use county bonds and city funds to build a \$20 million convention center downtown.

San Francisco architect and developer Clement Chen will begin construction soon on a \$17-million, 500-room hotel on Buffalo's waterfront, and has an option to build another hotel on land across the street from the convention center.

The theater district is another example of successful downtown revitalization. Located at the northern end of downtown, it boasts several stately old movie theaters and the Studio Arena Theater, a successful Buffalo professional theater which has hosted world premiers of plays by Edward Albee and others.

The Studio Arena was looking for larger quarters, and a \$940,000 grant from the federal Economic Development Administration made possible the purchase and renovation of the Palace Burlesque across the street. At the same time, a non-profit group received a \$693,000 EDA grant to renovate the Shea's

Buffalo, an historic legitimate theater seating over 3,000.

But the real jewel of downtown redevelopment will be the \$425 million rapid transit system. Federal grants have been approved, and construction will begin this year.

The rapid transit system will be 6.4 miles long initially, and will connect downtown with the State University of New York's Main Street Campus. Plans call for later extensions to the university's new Amherst Campus, and to other northern suburbs. The system will be a subway through the downtown area, then will surface in the theater district and run at grade through most of the rest of the route to the campus.

The State University of New York at Buffalo is a major economic force in the community. Surprising to many, it ranks among the top employers with 7,500 people and an annual payroll of \$78 million.

It was the private University of Buffalo until it joined the State University system in 1964, but is still commonly referred to as UB. It is now spread over two campuses.

The Main Street Campus on the northern edge of the city was founded by former President Millard Fillmore in 1848. It now houses the graduate school and the medical school. The new Amherst Campus consists of ultra-modern college complexes surrounding beautifully landscaped lakes, and houses the undergraduate school and the law school.

In addition to the \$78 million payroll, the university spends \$13 million a year on materials and supplies, and university officials say the 25,000 students spend \$41 million a year in the Buffalo community.

UB also spends \$2.4 million a year on off-campus leases, and brings into the community \$22 million a year in research grants.

While employment has been decreasing in old-line, heavy industries, Buffalo has seen a significant growth in high-technology industries primarily because of the presence of three institutions: UB, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories (now Calspan Corporation), and Bell Aerosystems. Many fast-growing high-technology companies have been formed by engineers and scientists who got their start at these three institutions. Some examples:

Sierra Research Corporation was founded in 1957 by several engineers from Bell Aerosystems and a handful of employees, some of whom loaned their salaries back to the company to help it grow.

Sierra, which makes sophisticated navigational and radar equipment for aircraft and a line of inventory-control computers for industry, now has 550 employees, a payroll of \$7 million and annual sales of \$17 million.

Astronics Corporation, founded in 1970 by an ex-Calspan engineer, makes electroluminescent panels with applications as diverse as aircraft panels, subway tunnels and photo darkrooms. It now has 185 employees and sales of \$7 million.

Comptek Research, another spinoff of Calspan engineers, designs radar systems for the Navy and also makes a line of word-processing computers for law offices. This fast-growing firm now has 250 employees, about 90 of them added in the past year.

Mennen-Greatbatch Electronics was founded in 1962 by Wilson Greatbatch, a Calspan engineer and the inventor of the heart pacemaker, and Herbert Mennen, a Sierra Research officer. It makes sophisticated medical monitoring equipment for hospitals. It has 450 employees and \$14.5 million in annual sales.

These companies and others like them are the vanguard of an industrial renaissance that is underway in Buffalo. And if Buffalo has traded heavy metals industries for high-technology industries it has made a good bargain, for high-technology industries are clean, pollution-free industries with high capitalization, high average salaries and a highly-skilled work force. ●

## RECOMBINANT DNA—RUNAWAY RESEARCH

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in our atomic age of potential destruction of humanity, the subject of genetic manipulation and species change is not to be taken lightly. The prospect of curing the human race of birth defects and environmentally caused diseases is a tempting thought. With our current and increasing technological know-how, the possible eradication of impure social elements brings shades of "Dr. Strangelove" close to home. These are results that could evolve from improperly regulated recombinant DNA research.

H.R. 11192 is designed to extend the containment requirements set by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to all private and public recombinant DNA research institutions. Though this bill appears to be progressive, it is actually a poor alternative to conscientious supervision of this blatantly dangerous field. DNA technology has such enormous potential for ecological disruption that all research, in these initial stages at least, must proceed slowly and carefully under the auspices of public control. Although the bill's primary intent is to efficiently regulate recombinant DNA research, it seriously fails to propose this.

A basic discrepancy is that the bill extends the NIH guidelines for regulation, when this body is also in charge of funding biomedical and DNA research. This inherent inconsistency needs to be resolved and H.R. 11192 does not do it adequately. It gives the Secretary of HEW broad discretion in the regulation process rather than giving more power to the public sector. This is a direct departure from recent congressional efforts to involve the people in our Nation's decision-making.

Another provision in H.R. 11192 which concerns me, is its deviance from recent environmental health legislation. It states that recombinant DNA research cannot be regulated by States or localities unless it is "necessary to protect health or the environment." This restriction is yet another instance of special interests determining the course of scientific research through self-regulation. The people whom these decisions affect do not have a say in what is happening to their lives. This issue is not so complicated that it must elude the public arena.

The biohazard committees set up by H.R. 11192 to protect communities from scientific mistakes, also would not be responsive to public needs. At present, membership on such committees is decided by the research institution itself, and this bill makes no mention of any new makeup, selection processes, or the like. This deficiency is not adequately addressed.

It is essential that recombinant DNA research be subject to public scrutiny. As it stands now, it is not. A proper balance between rapid scientific advance-

ment and thorough consideration of social consequences can and should be attained. H.R. 11192 fails to combine these two issues into a truly responsive piece of legislation. Public input must be given a freer hand in determining the future technological directions this country is taking. Our survival depends on it. ●

## VETERANS' PREFERENCE

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during the next few days the House will be considering H.R. 11280, the Civil Service Reform Act. An important provision in this legislation is the proposal to modify existing veterans' preference laws.

The following editorial from the Washington Post is an excellent statement on behalf of Vietnam and disabled veterans, who need this legislation in order to receive a fair deal in the Federal labor market.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1978]

#### GIVING VIETNAM VETERANS A BREAK

We return today to a familiar complaint of ours: the injustices still being done to veterans who served in the era of the Vietnam War. We have in mind injustice deriving from, among other things, the lack of job opportunities, the stigma of service in a profoundly controversial conflict, the inadequacy of education benefits, the once-overlightly approach to the upgrading of "bad-paper discharges"—and, above all, the shameful incapacity of so many members of Congress to stand up to pressures from powerful, old-line veterans organizations heavily weighted in their membership and their priorities to the veterans of earlier wars. We will spare you today a discussion of what may or may not account for the tendency of so many people, in general—and so many public officials, in particular—to turn away from this unfinished business of the Vietnam War. The point is simply that the tendency is there, and it is nicely illustrated by the trouble the Carter administration is having in Congress with a relatively modest provision in its program for civil-service reform that attempts to narrow and refine the present system for awarding sweeping and repeated government job preference to veterans.

The idea, quite simply, is to concentrate job preference on those who need it the most: the 7 million Vietnam-era veterans with no disability, and the 2.2 million disabled veterans of all wars.

Now, it is true this reform would reduce the job preference available to older, able-bodied veterans of, let us say, World War II or the Korean War. It would also severely limit the preference awarded retired veterans who made the armed services their career. Those are the veterans who make up the bulk of the membership of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the other mainstays of the veterans lobby.

But they are also the veterans who need job preference the least—who have already in many cases used their preference more than once, sometimes to shift from one government job to another. For most of them, the original purpose of job preference—to ease their readjustment to civilian life—has long since been achieved. Some limit on their continued preferential treatment, what is more, would provide more job opportunities

not only for those who served in Vietnam but also for a host of non-veterans—women, for example, and minorities—who are also supposed to be entitled to go to the head of the line.

This is, in short, a civil-service reform long overdue. And yet a modified version of the administration proposal was knocked out of the administration's civil service reform bill by a narrow vote of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. Its chances of revival on the Senate floor are uncertain, at best, which leaves its fate largely up to what happens in the House. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee approved the modified administration proposal, and the administration has accepted a refinement sponsored by Rep. David E. Bonior (D-Mich.) that would give veterans who actually served in the Vietnam theater more time to use their preferences. The Bonior amendment is likely to come up for a vote on the House floor today, and it ought to be approved. Also up for a vote, probably today, is an amendment by Rep. James M. Hanley (D-N.Y.) that would substantially undo all the contemplated improvements in veterans preferences and retain most of the injustices of the present law. We need scarcely add that this latest effort to walk away from the unfinished business of Vietnam should be resoundingly rejected.●

#### THE KOREAN INVESTIGATION

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for September 6, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE KOREAN INVESTIGATION

The public is confused and skeptical about various aspects of the Korean investigation.

For one-and-a-half years the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been investigating alleged South Korean influence-buying on Capitol Hill. From the beginning, the investigation was clouded with doubt that Congress would aggressively and thoroughly investigate charges of wrongdoing by its own members.

Thus far much has been uncovered about the South Korean activities, but much remains to be investigated by the House Committee.

Under the direction of former Watergate prosecutor Leon Jaworski, the Committee's staff gathered mountains of information about the alleged South Korean activities. These facts were presented to the House Committee in October, 1977. The report proved that some sort of influence-buying scheme had existed.

The next phase of the investigation proved to be more difficult, for it involved trying to get sworn testimony from foreign nationals who were not in the United States, and not subject to U.S. law.

After much pressure was put on the South Korean government by the President and Congress to obtain testimony from Mr. Tong-sun Park, supposedly an independent South Korean businessman, Park testified before the Committee. He testified that he gave almost a million dollars to present or former members of Congress as campaign contributions. Although he claimed he had no connection with the South Korean government, the established facts strongly suggest he was an agent of that government.

Several specific actions have resulted from

that phase of the Korean investigation. Four sitting members of Congress have been charged by the Committee with unethical conduct and notified of possible disciplinary action. Evidence relating to possible criminal activity by others has been sent over to the Justice Department. One former Congressman has pleaded guilty to accepting more than \$200,000 from Park. Another former Congressman is under indictment and a third is facing possible charges.

There is evidence that other members of Congress may have taken some money from South Korean agents, but the reliability of the evidence is doubtful. Even if they are guilty of wrongdoing, there is no way of pursuing them without the testimony of Mr. Kim Dong Jo, the former South Korean Ambassador to Washington. There is every reason to believe that Kim Dong Jo had some money to spread around Congress to influence legislation concerning South Korea. Until very recently, the South Korean government had refused all requests for his testimony. Mr. Jaworski left the staff because he felt that this refusal ended any chance to complete the investigation.

Congress made numerous attempts to persuade the Korean government to allow Kim to testify, including a House vote to deny nearly \$56 million of aid to Korea and offers to have House members go to Korea to encourage his testimony. On August 3, the Korean government gave assurance that Kim would supply new, concrete evidence to Congress.

So the investigation has taken on new life. As we begin the final phase of our investigation, several thoughts come to mind.

Although charges have been made that the Congress is determined to keep the scandal from being fully revealed, I have seen no evidence to support that charge. Indeed, my experience is just the opposite. Throughout the investigation, the Committee has had the full support of the Speaker of the House and the leadership of both political parties. Not once has a member of Congress come to me and suggested that the investigation be deferred or delayed.

Most certainly, the Congress must take every reasonable step to avoid the charge of a coverup. It will not be easy to do because of the unfortunate charges that 115 or more Congressmen were involved—statements that really had no basis in fact.

I believe a full public Committee report is a critical ingredient to a credible investigation. All the testimony, depositions and other information gathered by the Committee should be made public, and, if at all possible, done so in advance of the November elections. The Committee should also make recommendations to curtail such activities in the future.

One beneficial result of the Korean investigation has already occurred. Congressmen are more careful now about our involvement in any kind of conduct that would be misconstrued, and we are paying more attention to our own codes of conduct.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence on August 16 and August 17, I missed certain votes. I requested to be paired on each vote missed, but did not receive a live pair on each vote. Therefore, I would like to explain how I would have voted if I had been present.

\* Rollcall No. 707, "yes."  
 \* Rollcall No. 708, "yes."  
 Rollcall No. 709, "yes."  
 \* Rollcall No. 710, "yes."  
 \* Rollcall No. 711, "yes."  
 \* Rollcall No. 712, "yes."  
 \* Rollcall No. 713, "No."  
 \* Rollcall No. 715, "No."  
 Rollcall No. 716, "no."  
 \* Rollcall No. 717, "no."  
 Rollcall No. 718, "yes."  
 Rollcall No. 719, "no."  
 Rollcall No. 720, "no."  
 Rollcall No. 721, "yes."  
 Rollcall No. 722, "no."  
 Rollcall No. 723, "no."●

#### MARRIAGE TAX

### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a problem in our present tax code that has not yet been corrected is the so-called marriage tax, the result that now occurs, where both spouses are working, where they actually pay a higher tax after marriage than they would if they were each filing as a single person. This problem is a particularly difficult one, because as long as we have a progressive tax system, if we try to correct it, it results in injustice to another class of taxpayers. Jane Bryant Quinn has written an excellent article in Newsweek, August 28, 1978, that explains the dilemma. I recommended the article to my colleagues, and it is submitted:

#### THE "MARRIAGE PENALTY"

(By Jane Bryant Quinn)

Missing from the tax-cut bill now moving through Congress is a solution to the "marriage penalty," that anomaly of the tax law that hits most working couples with higher income taxes after marriage than before. President Carter, in the early days of his Administration, promised to address this problem in his tax-reform package. But today, Treasury spokesmen will say only that they think the tax on marriage is unfair, and something should be done.

Exactly *what*, however, they'd rather not imagine. The marriage penalty is a curiosity of the tax code that defies easy reform. Anything that ends it would create new forms of discrimination against other classes of taxpayers.

An equitable tax system, Harvey S. Rosen of Princeton University observes, is generally expected to meet three tests: (1) the tax should be progressive, taxing a person's first dollar of income at a lower rate than the extra dollars he piles on top; (2) your tax burden shouldn't be changed by marital status; (3) other things being equal, families with the same incomes should pay the same tax. Any two of these goals can be achieved at the same time, Rosen says, but not all three. As long as we accept progressivity, we have to choose either point 2 or point 3, but not both.

#### CLASH OF PRINCIPLES

This calls for an example. First take point 2, that marital status shouldn't make any difference to your tax. Under this principle, each person's income would be taxed in-

\* Live pair.

dividually, and at the same rate. A person with a \$20,000 taxable income would owe the same amount, whether married or single. But look at what this does to family income: a \$20,000, single-earner family is in a higher tax bracket than a family where the man makes \$15,000 and the wife \$5,000. The latter, in turn, pays more than the family where each makes \$10,000. That's three different \$20,000 families, each paying a different tax. A clear violation of point 3.

Now let's explore point 3, that all families with the same income should pay the same level of tax. Couples with taxable incomes of \$20,000 owe the same amount, regardless of who earns what; similarly, single-person households with \$20,000 would pay at the same rate as marrieds (although they would normally have fewer exemptions). This contradicts point 2. Working couples would pay less if they stayed single.

Prior to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 there was no marriage penalty. When a working couple married and filed a joint return, their combined tax was generally the same before and after marriage. Point 2 triumphant, but point 3 up the creek. A single person paid up to 41 per cent more than a married person with the same income.

This tremendous inequity was eased by Congress in 1969. The tax advantage of joint filing was reduced, so that the extra tax paid by singles wouldn't rise more than 20 per cent above the married amount. The change in rates created a marriage penalty for working couples—not intentionally, but as an arithmetical by-product of a progressive-tax system.

#### SPREADING THE GRIEF

The present law is actually fairer than the old one, despite the marriage penalty, because it spreads the grief around. In the old days, only singles paid an excess tax. Today, singles still pay at a higher rate than marrieds, but the differential isn't as high. Working couples pay a marriage penalty. Only traditional, single-earner families (or families where one earner makes very little) come out relatively ahead.

C. Lowell Harriss, consultant to the Tax Foundation, says that much of the problem could be solved by widening tax brackets. The same inequities would persist, but fewer people would be affected by them.

Rep. Millicent Fenwick, a New Jersey Republican, would let a married couple file either jointly or singly, whichever gave them the lower tax (England went this route in 1972). But this re-creates the singles penalty in all its former glory. Would it help if the Fenwick proposal were extended to singles, allowing them to file at the lower, married-couple rate? It would not. The upshot would be yet another marriage penalty.

Me, I'd leave the relative tax rates alone but add a deduction for working couples, because their expenses are higher than those of one-earner families. For politicians, it's a no-win situation. Whatever they do, they're going to make somebody sore.●

#### INTERNATIONAL PRO-AM BIKE RACE

### HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Third International Pro-Am Bike Race will be held in Wildwood, N.J., on September 23-24, 1978.

This particular race is recognized as one of the major events in international bike racing. The quality of competitors is outstanding, and many of these men and women racers have traveled all the way from Europe to participate in this event.

Several people have worked exceedingly hard to make this competition a very special one by their leadership, support, and enthusiasm. Catherine Cramer of Ventnor, N.J., the president and organizer of the International Pro-Am Bike Race, along with the mayor of Wildwood, Guy Muziani, and Charles Thomas, the president of the Wildwood Chamber of Commerce, have, by their hard work and diligent support of an idea made this competition an example of the success that results from the private and public sectors working together.

I feel that this exciting sporting event will establish New Jersey as one of the world's cycling capitals. The actual competition will be held on the Wildwood Boardwalk, part of which was built with lumber used for President Carter's inaugural platform and bleachers.

I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this opportunity to attend this unique international sporting event.●

#### LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS AND JAPAN: WHO IS IN WHOSE HIP-POCKET?

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, frequently staff members of the League of Women Voters appear before Congressional committees attesting to their self-assumed right to speak for the consumers of this country.

The League of Women Voters insists, and rightfully, that no one is more concerned about the cost of living than the housewife. I doubt, however, if the staff of the League of Women Voters have very much knowledge of the problems of the average housewife of the Seventh District of Georgia.

I am now thinking of the wives of the textile workers and the machinists whose jobs are each day threatened by imports and others in public service whose livelihoods have been adversely affected by imports.

At these hearings of our congressional committees, the leadership of the League of Women Voters always insists that we must keep our markets open to the very imports of textiles, clothing, and machinist products which are endangering the livelihood of my constituents and eroding my district's industrial and economic base. Fundamentally, I believe in free trade, but most of what is going on in the world today is neither free nor fair trade.

Within the last few days I have been presented with evidence gleaned from the files of the U.S. Justice Department that leads me to believe that the leaders of the League of Women Voters may not be

speaking objectively in behalf of the consumers of America. Instead, it appears they may be speaking in behalf of the interests of Japan, whose largesse they have been enjoying for some time. For so long the League of Women Voters has portrayed itself as an objective non-partisan voter information organization. However, the evidence I am presenting here today appears to belie that theme.

The evidence of which I am speaking are the following entries filed with the Department of Justice pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938:

#### REFERENCE A

Supplemental Statement of the U.S.-Japan Trade Council, an agency of the government of Japan, for the six-month period ending December 31, 1969

(1) Item 15(a) page two: "Occasionally, League of Women Voters, contribution, \$1,000.

Question: Had the League of Women Voters rendered any prior service to the Government of Japan to prompt an agency of that government to contribute \$1,000 and if so, what was that service?

#### REFERENCE B

Registration Statement made by the Japan Trade Promotion Office, an agency of the government of Japan, in compliance with a court order issued by the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia in September, 1976, to truthfully disclose their activities in the United States. The following items under "Statement on Project Expenses for the United States-Japan Trade Council

(1) January 1 to March 31, 1972:

(a) "Women's Project, \$7,500.

Question: Was this "Womens Project an anti-Buy America campaign? Did any of these funds go to the League of Women Voters or any of its members? If so, did they register as agents of the government of Japan?"

(b) "League of Women Voters, \$450.

Question: Was this in payment for services rendered?

(2) April 1 to June 30, 1972: (a) "Goodwill tours, \$2,150.

Question: Who were the recipients of these "goodwill tours?"

(3) April 1 to June 30, 1972: (a) "Goodwill tours, \$17,150.

Question: Who were the recipients of these "good will tours?"

(4) July 1, to September 30, 1972: (a) "Goodwill tours, \$5,000.

Question: Who were the recipients of these "goodwill tours?"

(5) January 1 to March 31, 1973: (a) "Charles von Loewenfeldt—Symposia and goodwill, \$15,000.

Question: Who were the recipients of this "goodwill"?

(b) "State Buy American, \$8,194.60.

Question: For what purpose and how were these funds spent?

(6) January 1 to March 31, 1973: (a) "Symposia and goodwill tours, \$7,625.

Question: Who were the recipients of these goodwill tours?

(b) "State Buy American Activities, \$6,000.

Question: For what purpose and how were these funds spent?

#### REFERENCE C

Supplemental Statement of the U.S. Japan Trade Council, an agency of the Japanese government, for the six-month period ending June 30, 1971, filed in September 1976 in response to a court order issued by the U.S. District Court of the District by the U.S. District Court of the District

(1) "On March 2 the Council wrote the

President of the League of Women Voters in Connecticut congratulating her on the League's testimony in opposition to Buy American legislation in the Connecticut legislature."

*Question:* Did any agency of the Japanese government provide any information that was used by this spokeswoman during the testimony, and did she or the League receive any gifts of payment prior to or after this testimony?

## REFERENCE D

Supplemental Statement of the U.S. Japan Trade Council, an agency of the Japanese Government, for the period ending June 30, 1972, filed in September 1976 in response to a court order issued by the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia

(1) "Similar arrangements were made by Charles von Loewenfeldt for a fact-finding trip to Japan which the League of Women Voters was making under arrangements that the League had made with the government of Japan."

*Question:* What are the names of these members of the League who made this trip to Japan? Have any of these women used their influence in any way to direct the course of legislation in this country or attempt to do so?

## REFERENCE E

U.S. Japan Trade Council Report of January 1-June 30, 1978 filed with the Department of Justice, page 15

(1) Arranged appointments for Rep. Jones and House Ways and Means staffers Loren Cox and John Meager in connection with their trip to Japan.

Arranged appointments for Mr. R. Ryan, Jr., Executive Seminar, State Dept. with Sony, Sanyo and Matsushita's offices in the U.S. Helped plan League of Women Voters trips to Japan with B. Perkins of their International Affairs Dept.

(a) *Question:* Have any of these staffers used their influence in any way to direct the course of tariff or trade legislation or attempted to do so?

## REFERENCE F

Supplemental Statement filed by Charles von Loewenfeldt Inc., an agent for the Japanese government, on January 5, 1978

(1) The item under "Advice to the Consulate"

"a. Registrant, at the request of the Consulate, submitted suggestions of several community leaders to be considered to be invited to visit Japan as guests of the Japanese government."

(a) *Question:* Were any of these "community leaders" members of the League of Women Voters?"

## REFERENCE G

Supplemental Statement filed by the U.S.-Japan Trade Council, an agency of the government of Japan, for the period ending December 31, 1972, filed in September, 1976 in compliance with a court order issued by the U.S. District Court of the District Court of the District of Columbia

(1) Charles von Loewenfeldt, a registered agent of the Government of Japan, gave "Advice to the Japanese Government" on September 15 and the League of Women Voters Project to Combat Protectionism."

(a) *Question:* Was this project in any way financed by the Japanese government or any of its agencies? How much money did the League or its staff receive?

I am so concerned about what this evidence implies that I have today written the U.S. Department of Justice the following letter:

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The enclosed evidence gleaned from your Department's registry of foreign agents leads me to

believe that certain staff members of the League of Women Voters have engaged in lobbying and other activities in behalf of the government of Japan, for which they, or the League, have been receiving payments in cash or in kind. That as such, they are required to file with your Department a statement as to their activities in behalf of the government of Japan.

I am further wondering if the members of the staff of the League of Women Voters who accepted trips to Japan and other gifts from the Japanese government should not declare these trips as income if these trips should be determined to be "shallowly disguised vacations."

I would like to ask that you investigate this matter and obtain from the Japanese officials and others involved a complete explanation of the entries with reference to the questions posed, as contained in my enclosures.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

/s/ LARRY P. McDONALD. ●

## CZECHOSLOVAKIAN EXILES PETITION UNITED NATIONS

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the 10th anniversary of the repressive invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops on August 21, 1968. The spark of freedom and democracy nurtured by the freely elected leaders of that small country was swiftly snuffed out and replaced with the iron hand of authoritarian rule.

Those of Czechoslovakian nationality living outside the homeland are seeking to focus international attention on the plight of the oppressed people of their country. Jan Papanek, formerly Ambassador of Czechoslovakia and Permanent Delegate to the United Nations under the Dubcek government, submitted a Petition '78 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations Kurt Waldheim. Mr. Papanek submitted the petition as president of the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees on behalf of more than 6,000 signators and 17 organizations with memberships totaling more than 250,000.

The appeal to the United Nations asks only that the human rights of the people of Czechoslovakia be guaranteed by its own laws and international obligations freely assumed and that the oppressive puppet government now in control of the country with the assistance of Soviet troops be removed. For the edification of my colleagues, I include the full text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

## PETITION '78

The year 1978 has an extraordinary significance for the nations of Czechoslovakia. It marks several important milestones in its most recent history:

60 years ago—in 1918, Czechoslovakia became an independent country, based upon democratic and humanistic ideas of T. G. Masaryk.

30 years ago—in 1948, three years after the end of World War II and the Nazi occupation, the democratic parliamentary order in the country was again destroyed, its peace-

ful and democratic evolution interrupted to be replaced gradually by Stalinism which sapped the national will, spirit and resources for many years.

10 years ago—in 1968, the armed forces of the Soviet bloc invaded the country to halt the process of regeneration of its national culture, the humanization and democratization of its public life which resulted in a massive violation of fundamental civil and political rights...

Remembering these three anniversaries—we the petitioners.

(1) Demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and restoration of independence, sovereignty and rights of the people of Czechoslovakia to self-determination as according to Articles I, II, III, IV and VII of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

(2) Support the Charter '77 in demanding from the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to implement the civil and political rights as defined in the said Helsinki Accord, as well as, in Law 120/75 Sb., adopted by the Federal Parliament of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on November 11, 1975.

(3) Call upon the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to desist from persecuting the Chartists and other citizens who merely demand that the government observes the Czechoslovak Laws and international agreements on civil and political rights it has signed.

(4) Call upon the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to remove or reform all laws which either violate or limit the enjoyment of civil and political rights as defined in the Helsinki Final Act.

(5) Call upon the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations to hold the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic accountable for periodical reports on the measures undertaken to implement the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in the country.

(6) Call upon all signatory countries of the Helsinki Final Act to hold the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic accountable for the full implementation of the Accord and of all related international agreements which the Helsinki Final Act invokes...

Dated this 1st Day of January, 1978, New York.

The document Petition '78 has been signed originally by the following individuals:

Jan Babinec, Antonin Bartos, Marie Bartos, Jiri Blaha, Josef Bursik, Jana Bursik, Jiri Corn, Ota Coufalik, Marie Coufalik, Antonin Cech, Stepanka Cech, Jan Dohnalek, Anna Dohnalek, Libuse Drobilkova, Anna Faltus, Miroslav Fic, Richard Fries, Milan Frybort, Eva Hladik, Ota Hora, Lida Hora, Karel Kalenda, Eliska Kalenda, Ota Kobylka, Gita Kobylka, Vladimir Krajina, Marie Krajina, Jiri Krupicka, Ada Krupicka, Vladimir Krivanek, Harty Krivanek, Jan Kuncir, Josef Kucera, Zdenka Kucera, Milos Kunta, Miloslav Malecek, Anna Malecek, Jaroslav Maliska, Rozina Nehasil, Frantisek Novy, Zdenek Otruba, Hana Otruba, Jan Papanek, Betka Papanek, Jozka Pejscar, Anna Pejscar, Zdenek Prazak, Evelyn Prazak, Olga Radimsky, Ota Rambousek, Zdenka Rambousek, Antonin Roubik, Viera Roubik, Lumir Salivar, Milan Schiller, Josef Schneider, Emil Sklenar, Zdenek Slavik, Drahomira Slavik, Antonin Strnad, Josef Skvorecky, Zdenka Skvorecky, Eduard Vondracek, Vera Vondracek, Antonin Votruba, Vlasta Votruba, Jaromir Zastera.

Petition '78 has been sponsored and approved by the following organizations:

Alliance of Czechoslovak Democratic Associations in Australia and New Zealand.

Associations of Czechoslovak Legionnaires.

Association of Free Czechoslovaks—Queensland.

Association of Free Czechoslovak Sportsmen.

Ceske Slovo—Newspaper of the Czechoslovak Exiles.

Council of Free Czechoslovakia.  
Czechoslovak Advisory Committee in West Europe.

Czechoslovak Christian Democracy in Exile.

Czechoslovak National Association of Canada.

Czechoslovak National Council of America.

Czechoslovak Orel in Exile.  
Czechoslovak Sokol Abroad.

F.C.I. News Agency Ltd.  
Naarden Committee—Czechoslovakia.

National Council of Women of Free Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovak National Socialist Party in Exile.

The Swedish Socialdemocratic Youth.  
With the membership of over 250,000 all over the world.

We, Ota Ramboisek and Mike M. Kunta of New York City duly declare that we have received 6,438 signatures, from various individuals and organizations sponsoring and approving Petition '78. August 18, 1978.

I, Jose Cabanas of New York City duly declare, that I know the above named individuals, and that I have seen and recounted the signatures received by them sponsoring and approving Petition '78. August 18, 1978.

On this 18th day of August, 1978, before me personally came Jose Cabanas, Ota Ramboisek and Mike M. Kunta to me known to be the individuals described in, who, being by me duly sworn, duly acknowledged they executed the foregoing instrument. August 18, 1978.

ANGEL R. RODRIGUEZ,  
Notary Public, State of New York. ●

## REGENERATION

### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the following article on regeneration appeared first in the Saturday Review and then was reprinted in the Washington Post.

It was called to my attention by a remarkable Washington-based organization, Paraplegia Cure Research, with which I have worked closely since its founding in 1976. Paraplegia Cure Research's sole mission is to liberate paraplegics from their wheelchairs through central nervous regeneration. As this article points out, research in regeneration has exciting possibilities not only for curing sufferers of central nervous system disorders, but also for eventual regrowth of limbs.

Mr. Speaker, research in regeneration and the efforts of Paraplegia Cure Research deserve the fullest support of the Congress and the public. The eventual payoff in terms of alleviating human suffering is tremendous—both in the United States and through the world.

The article follows:

GROWING NEW LIMBS—SCIENCE'S SEARCH FOR A WAY TO RESTORE LOST ARMS AND LEGS

(By Susan Schiefelbein)

Physicians may one day treat patients who have shattered limbs, crippled joints and injured spines in a way that man never be-

fore dared to dream of: regrowing the damaged part—whole, perfect and undiseased.

For centuries, man has watched in wonder as the salamander regenerated its severed limbs, never imagining that complicated human parts could grow back in such a way. The halt and the lame could be made whole, it seemed, only by the healing waters of Bethesda or the touch of a god incarnate. But in recent years, scientists have grown back a frog's leg from elbow to toes and a rat's leg from shoulder to the top half of the elbow, with cartilage and bone, muscle, nerves and veins, all in awesome anatomical precision.

One of the pioneers in the field, Dr. Robert Becker, chief of orthopedic surgery at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Syracuse, N.Y., has already applied the newly found healing mechanism to broken human bones, successfully knitting fractures that previously had failed to heal even after extensive surgical procedures. He and his colleagues have now reached the point where they can confidently predict that a regeneration of human parts can and will be achieved, possibly in the next few decades.

A brave new world? Not a bit. The magic of regeneration has been with us all along, hidden in the wondrous complexity of every organism's bodyworks. These scientists are not performing miracles; they are witnessing them.

Their challenge, then, has been not so much to recreate a limb as to discover how some animals do so naturally. The chronicle of their quest reads like a detective story; for clue by clue, Becker and his colleagues have been unraveling a medical mystery that began with creation.

The tale begins with a few known biological principles about regeneration that were to serve as the departure point for their search. The way regenerative healing works has been observed, if not explained, for hundreds of years; the process still seems so magical that even the most clinical of researchers must shake his head in amazement as he watches the microscopic metamorphosis unfold.

The body of every animal, from the flatworm on up the evolutionary scale, possesses primitive, undifferentiated cells that could best be described as being like raw clay. When a creature which can regenerate loses a limb, these cells migrate to the injury, forming a mass called a blastema. Some of the mature, specialized cells at the site of the injury dedifferentiate, reverting to primitive form, and add further to the blastema. The blastema then specializes, transforming itself into whatever types of cells are needed to replace the missing part—bone cells, cartilage cells and so forth. Somehow, the blastema absorbs information about what to produce along the way, so that at the appropriate moment, it creates an elbow joint or a tibia or a fibula, a left leg or a right one.

#### TWO IMPORTANT CLUES

The first formal paper on regeneration was written by the great Italian physiologist Luigi Spallanzani and appeared in 1768. Spallanzani's experiments uncovered the first two important clues: The younger the animal, the greater its capacity for regeneration; and the lower an animal is on the evolutionary scale, the greater its capacity for regeneration.

This latter finding was especially interesting, for it provided a clue in itself. The lower orders that regenerate are biologically just as complicated as man; their parts are just as difficult to replace. The main difference is—and this was later to become a significant clue—that animals in the lower orders have comparatively more nerves in their extremities.

A third clue was buried in the writings of the late 1700s. Every time a creature is injured, an electrical charge is generated at

the site of the injury. This phenomenon is called the current of injury, and it is proportionate to the severity of the wound.

It was not until some 180 years later that scientists again began to delve into the mystery of regeneration. In 1945, the biologist Meryl Rose (a retired professor of anatomy at Tulane University College of Medicine who is currently affiliated with Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratories) amputated the forelegs of some frogs below the elbows. Thinking he could perhaps promote growth by preventing the injuries from scarring over, he bathed the stumps of the frogs' limbs in a strong salt solution.

The result was startling. About half of each amputated limb regenerated, developing new bone and muscle and the some cases even showing the beginnings of digital growth. Thus Rose became the first to prove that an animal which cannot regenerate naturally can be made to do so artificially.

The next year, a Russian named Vladimirovic Polezhaev amputated frogs' legs in a similar fashion and then irritated the stumps by repeatedly jabbing them with needles. The result? Astonishingly, he regenerated about the same amount of growth that Rose had with the salt solution. It was possible that the salt not only had prevented scarring but, like the needle punctures, had actually exacerbated the injuries and thereby simulated growth. Now there was another clue: Regeneration may somehow be connected to the severity of injury.

In the early 1950s, Marcus Singer, now a professor of anatomy at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, became the next to uncover important evidence. He transferred nerves from a frog's healthy hind legs to the stump of its foreleg; his frog also regenerated about the same amount of growth that Rose's had. Singer's contribution to the collection of clues is an almost mathematical formulation: The nerve tissue required for regeneration must constitute at least 30 percent of the total tissue at the site of the injury.

Then, in 1958, a Russian named A. V. Zhirmunskii discovered that the current of injury is proportionate not just to the severity of the injury but also to the amount of nerve tissue in the area.

Becker's turn at medical detection also came in 1958. He assembled his evidence as a good detective would assemble his suspects: Injury is related to regeneration; nerve tissue is related to regeneration, and both injury and nerve tissue are related to the current of injury. Could the current of injury, Becker reasoned, thus be related to regeneration?

He measured the current of injury in a salamander's regenerating leg and in a frog's scarring stump. Sure enough, his findings seemed to support his hunch. On the day the legs were amputated, both creatures generated the same current of injury—a positive voltage. But there the similarity ended: As the frog's stump scarred over, the current of injury in its leg declined to zero, but the current of injury in the salamander's leg switched from a positive to a negative polarity and only then began to decline, reaching zero when regeneration was complete.

Becker had definitely discovered a connection between the current of injury and regeneration. In a sense, however, his discovery complicated rather than clarified the mystery. The way the current of injury worked in those limbs was simply not concurrent with the way nerves are supposed to produce electricity.

Nerve fibers have traditionally been thought to respond to stimulation in only one way: Sodium penetrates into the nerve cell and potassium leaks out, creating a chemical reaction that generates a charge called an action potential. Whatever the stimulus—a gentle touch or an injury—the



action potential is exactly the same. Moreover, each nerve fiber can create only one of these potentials at a time. Becker compares the system to that of a digital computer, which transmits single impulses in rapid succession.

Herein lay Becker's problem: How could the action potential—a constant—account for the switch from positive to negative polarity that he had seen in the salamander's current of injury? How could the action potential account for the fact that the current of injury lasted many days after the stimulated nerve cells should have either died or repaired themselves and ceased their impulses? How could the action potential, which responds in the same way to every stimulus, account for the fact that creatures feel intensities of pain?

Becker guessed that in addition to its digital-computer impulses, the central nervous system can carry steady currents and potentials—in the way an analog computer can. He further theorized that the body's analog computer system has an input signal—could it be pain?—that triggers an output signal which switches on the healing function.

To verify his theory, Becker measured the electrical potentials of different points on the skin of humans and other animals. He found an electrical field that roughly parallels the nervous system. A disturbance in that field, such as an injury, might stimulate cells to begin repairs.

Becker's theory ran counter even to basic textbook explanations of the nervous system, and medical men let him know it. "That cells are capable of sensing and responding to levels of electrical current is hardly universally accepted," he wrote in one medical journal. But he stuck to his convictions; and today, more than a decade later, doctors are coming to accept his hypothesis. "They no longer march out of my lectures," he says. "The response has changed from complete rejection through amused disbelief to—at present—almost enthusiastic acceptance."

#### BONE REGENERATION

And no wonder. The experiments that Becker based on his unorthodox vision of the nervous system produced remarkable results. First, in 1964, Becker began to examine the spontaneous regeneration of human bones. Given the fact that bone is not well innervated, the theories about electrical stimulation would not apply—unless bone could generate its own electricity. Becker knew that bone accommodates automatically to mechanical stress. When he measured the currents around a stressed bone, he discovered that it generated a positive charge on the stretched side (which dissolved some bone) and a negative charge on the other side (which built up bone and provided the necessary added support). Then Becker administered a negative charge to a mouse's broken leg bone to see if he could artificially stimulate bone growth. He did.

In 1964, Steven Smith, then a student of Meryl Rose and now an associate professor on the department of anatomy at the University of Kentucky, studied Becker's findings and got the idea of implanting a simple electrode right into the muscle tissue of the stump of a frog's leg. He soldered together a piece of platinum wire, which has a positive charge, and a piece of silver wire, which has a negative charge, and embedded the metal into the animal tissue—with the negative end at the stump—thus improvising a crude battery. It worked. He regenerated about as much growth as the Rose, Polezhaev and Singer experiments had the decade before.

Breakthrough followed breakthrough. Becker examined his healing frog bones under a microscope and saw that the blastema around the regenerating bone was coming from a blood clot that had formed there. (A frog's red blood cells are prime candidates for blastema, for, unlike the red blood cells

of mammals, they have nuclei and thus can easily divide and dedifferentiate.)

His next step? He had a student expose frog blood to various levels of electrical current in order to find out exactly how much of a charge is needed to turn blood cells into blastema. Days passed, then months. The student administered smaller and smaller currents to the blood (high ones either did nothing or began to cook the cells), but he saw no evidence of change. Finally, the week before the student was supposed to quit and return to his classes, he found that blood cells revert to blastema at a few billionths of an ampere.

In 1973, armed with the knowledge of how much current produces a blastema, Becker decided to brave the step from regenerating amphibians to regenerating mammals. He amputated a rat's foreleg below the shoulder and implanted the platinum-silver electrode device at the stump. Again, success—this time, the most exciting ever. The animal regenerated nerves and tissue and even formed the humerus, the upper-arm bone, complete with the rounded end that fits into the elbow joint. Other parts of the elbow joint began to take shape, including cartilage and two bony structures that Becker surmised were the forerunners of the radius and ulna bones of the lower leg. Everything about the new growth was precisely as it had been in the original limb. And all this growth took place in just three days.

But then the growth ended; for the electrode remained in the shoulder tissue, while the end of the stump, where regeneration was taking place, had grown beyond the reach of its vital current.

The rat's growth, though incomplete, was nevertheless significant, particularly in one respect: The fact that the rat, whose red blood cells have no nuclei, could form a blastema—probably from bone marrow—indicated that in all probability humans could do so as well.

About this time in London, two newborn infants lost their fingers, and the fingers regenerated naturally. The explanation, in Becker's view, probably lies with Spallanzani's early finding that the younger the creature, the better its ability to regenerate. But what was most significant about the babies' growth was that it indicated that the human body contains within it the capacity for regeneration.

Later in 1973, Smith devised an electrode that would travel with the regenerating stump. Again he amputated a frog's leg below the elbow: With the new device, the frog's entire leg grew back.

The year 1973 marked a third triumph as well: Becker began using his findings about the body's electricity in experiments on human bone. A patient of his who had fractured his ankle two years earlier suffered from a mild diabetic condition that was interfering with the bone's ability to regenerate. The ankle had failed to mend despite two corrective operations; and the bone on both sides of the break had deteriorated.

Under normal circumstances, Becker would have had to amputate the leg. Instead, he implanted an electrode into the fracture and administered the same current that he found had divided the frog's red blood cells. He waited three months, the time an ankle fracture would normally take to heal, and the fracture regenerated. A sample of the new bone showed it to be normal in every respect.

#### CLUE IN THE NERVES

The next year, during the course of routine experiments, Becker stumbled on another clue that finally shed considerable light on his nervous system theory. With the intention of impeding growth, he and his staff broke the tibia in a rat's leg and then cut the nerve that led to the broken limb, assuming that without a nerve supply the rat's bone would heal poorly, if at all. But the fracture healed well; the only drawback

was that it took twice the normal time. Perhaps the severed end of the nerve needed time to degenerate, they thought. So they cut the nerve six days before breaking the bone. To their astonishment, the bone healed in the normal amount of time, as if the nerve had never been cut at all.

What was going on? They opened up the leg, only to discover that the nerve fiber had not healed. What had healed was the nerve's sheath of Schwann cells—one of a dozen types of cells that make up the "perineural group"—traditionally thought to serve no purpose other than the insulation of the nerve fiber. The perineural cells in the brain were known to carry a steady current—for what reason, no one knew. It now seemed apparent that Schwann cells also carry a steady current. This was proof enough for Becker that the analog computer system he had theorized was indeed contained in the perineural cells—cells that sheathe the entire central nervous system.

The perineural discovery is by no means the end of the tale. Experiments must still be conducted to determine if electrical regeneration is entirely safe. Could applications of electricity to the peripheral nervous system, for example, induce some sort of behavioral disorder? Or damage our cognitive powers? Every human body contains dormant cancer cells. Could an implanted electrode shock them into fatal multiplication?

Nevertheless, much of the mystery has been solved. Only the last chapter—the most exciting one—has yet to be written. It may well describe the modern world as a Shangri-La where damaged human parts are simply cut off and grown back properly. Our future may lie not with the bionic man but with the natural man.

The replacement of arthritic hip joints with Teflon parts, for example, is now a costly and not altogether satisfactory operation. The Teflon wears out. If the device is implanted in a young person, it may have to be replaced some four or five times in the course of his life. And with each hip operation, there is the risk of infection, which can be a deadly prospect. The alternative—growing a natural hip—would be safer and cheaper.

We may some day regenerate a damaged heart. Becker has discovered that salamanders replace some 50 percent of their cardiac muscles by regeneration. And Polezhaev has cut away the scar tissue on the hearts of dogs which had suffered severe heart attacks; all of the hearts regenerated and less than 5 percent of the dogs died. We may even replace parts defective at birth, given that damaged genes do not garble the instructions given to the blastema.

Becker himself is hesitant to herald regeneration as an immediate cure for amputees. The replacement of several parts, he says, is still pretty far off. Why not aim for more immediate uses that would be beneficial to greater numbers of people? Severing the spinal cord does not regenerate. Becker, however, thinks that since salamanders regenerate their spinal cords, man's spinal cord could perhaps be electrically stimulated to do the same thing. It would take only a year to see whether electrical stimulation works without complications in a paraplegic dog or monkey. And if such stimulation works safely in them, it could be safely applied to humans.

#### UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The outstanding disappointment of the entire regeneration tale is that no one is conducting that experiment with paraplegic animals. Why? Money. Becker's own \$100,000 grant from the Veterans Administration just covers staff salaries. Experiments are costly; keeping paraplegic animals in particular is frightfully expensive.

Still, it must not be forgotten that the financial problem—serious though it is—is the only laggard in regeneration's exhilarating face toward the future. It is the promise

of regeneration—not the problems—in which we must focus attention. Hundreds of questions wait to be answered.

Animals that regenerate don't get cancer. If a tumor is implanted in a lizard's body, which does not regenerate, it grows to fatal proportions. But if it is implanted in the tail, which does regenerate, the tumor disappears. If we learn how to turn on regeneration (controlled growth), can we learn to turn off cancer (uncontrolled growth)?

Hormones play an important role in regeneration. A chopped-up adrenal gland when implanted in a frog will generate some growth. Moreover, if the adrenal gland is removed from a lizard, the creature will lose its ability to regenerate its tail. If the hormone prolactin is then injected, the lizard will regain its regenerative potential. It has also been hypothesized that hormones secreted during stress can cause cancer. Prolactin is secreted during stress. Is there a connection? Do carcinogens impose a stress on the body, which then triggers a hormonal release that oversensitizes the body to its own electrical forces, thus sparking wild division of cells?

If a negative charge builds up bone and a positive charge dissolves bone, could positive charges have an effect on malignancies?

If pain is the input signal needed by the brain to trigger healing, does anesthesia—the muffling of the pain signal—impede healing?

When power lines are stretched across the sea, the amplifiers are put in at regular points to boost the current along. The body's electrical system may run the same way, equipped with special spots along the analog nervous system that boost the signals as they are carried to or from the brain. Becker has found that half of the traditional acupuncture points correspond to the spots in the nervous system that seem to be amplifiers of electricity. Could acupuncture simply involve the insertion of a metal needle into one of the amplifiers, short-circuiting the pain signal so that it never reaches the brain?

Does the body's sensitivity to electricity explain why reversals in the earth's magnetic field are related to the extinction of certain animals?

When one electrical field is imposed on another, the currents are altered. When one human being approaches another, do their biological electric systems overlap? Is this a scientific explanation for the "psychic" mystery of ESP?

The characteristics of the analog nervous system are such that it should be influenced by external electrical fields. Becker has already found experimental evidence that would indicate that electrical fields such as those produced by power transmission lines produce stress in animals—with consequent physical effects that are shocking indeed to the layman. What is the relation between this unseen electrical pollution and human stress?

The possibilities seem infinite. Each is like a silver key. Which one will open the door to a new world? ●

#### WHAT IS THE ENERGY PROBLEM?

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, most people complain about energy but very few people understand the cause of the shortage. Just what is the energy problem?

My wife suggested I read an interesting report she received in The Key Reporter which is the news bulletin of Phi Beta Kappa. This paper had a long story on energy by Dr. Charles J. Hitch who is president of Resources for the Future. It was a comprehensive four-page report but I want to quote some of its key sections about the energy problem.

#### ENERGY IN OUR FUTURE

(By Charles J. Hitch)

Public opinion polls consistently reveal that about half of the American people do not know that this country imports any oil from abroad, when in fact our imports constitute close to fifty percent of our current petroleum consumption.

Energy is a problem of national security and foreign policy, stemming from our dependence on foreign sources of oil.

In 1973-74 this combination resulted in an oil embargo, long lines at gas pumps, a four-fold price rise, inflation, recession, and prolonged economic disruption. We are even more vulnerable now for our oil imports are higher and the proportion of total imports that come from the Middle East is also higher.

Oil is a comparatively recent part of human society—its major use really has been confined to this century—but we have structured our whole society around it.

Over the long run, the domestic economic problem centers on making a smooth transition from fossil fuels to renewable or inexhaustible sources.

Energy is a balance of payments problem. Last year this nation's bill for imported oil came to \$45 billion, a sum about fifty percent greater than our entire trade deficit. We are the world's number one agricultural exporter, but it now takes two years' worth of agricultural exports to pay for one year of imported oil. The shaky value of the dollar abroad is directly related to our astronomical oil bill and the transfers of wealth it represents. And the situation will get worse; projections for the mid-1980's are for the \$45 billion tab to double or more.

Our main reliance must be placed on prices and markets. The market is now giving decidedly the wrong signals. They say that energy as a whole is cheaper than it really is, and that certain sources of energy are relatively cheaper than their alternatives, when that isn't true either. The result is that we are subsidizing imported oil, penalizing domestic production, and discouraging both conservation and fuel switching by industrial and final consumers.

Let us take several examples of what I mean by "wrong signals" in the case of natural gas which is kept at artificially low prices in the interstate market by federal regulation: Most gas furnaces are very inefficient, but since wasting gas doesn't waste much money, there is little incentive to improve efficiency.

There is resistance to expensive shipments of gas and liquefied natural gas from Mexico and Alaska but these are overpriced only when compared to controlled prices of domestic natural gas. They are cheap when compared with imported oil. Similarly, so-called unconventional sources of gas, such as the geopressurized brines in the Gulf of Mexico, are neglected because they are much more expensive than controlled-price conventional sources. Finally, it is nearly impossible for solar water and space heating to compete with gas. This is particularly unfortunate because it reverses the priorities: gas, with its cheap, efficient storage, is the perfect backup for solar. Controlled prices have similar effects in the case of oil.

In general, we can say that pricing a unit of energy below the cost of providing another unit is the chief obstacle to substan-

tial conservation and to the development of new, benign sources such as solar. It is ironic that we impose price controls on the one product—energy—which we most want to conserve and to develop new sources for.

Because of price controls, the market is confusing both producers and consumers, and we are compelled to cope with the problem by all sorts of devices which aren't working well, such as exhortation and detailed regulation.

Further, when compared with prices of two decades ago, 1956, gasoline is up only 4 percent, fuel oil up 31 percent, gas service up 5 percent, and electricity down 37 percent.

This reliance on prices and taxes is an historic turnaround, for the nearly instinctive response heretofore has been to create a complete set of regulations, along with a new bureaucracy to try to enforce them. This approach has been as ineffective as it has been ubiquitous. ●

#### SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT IS NOT INFLATIONARY

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we attempt to discover the various causes for our unacceptable rate of inflation, we are bound to reach some wrong conclusions. An excellent example of this is the assertion by some economists that environmental regulations are a major cause of inflation. It is easy to see how a superficial analysis could lead to this conclusion, but it is discouraging to see the acceptance of this assertion by responsible individuals.

Our economic indicators measure money flows. They do not measure non-monetary values. They do not generally measure second-order effects, and seldom have any relationship to the quality of life, in contrast to their ability to measure the dollar costs of goods and services. Despite these well known limitations economic indicators are frequently misused to imply that they measure qualities that they do not.

It hardly needs to be noted that environmental regulations that improve the health of individuals or at least prevent the deterioration of health have economic benefits. The GNP might be adversely affected if health care costs decreased, but the economic benefit to the individual, not to mention the noneconomic benefits, are indisputable. Similarly, laws that improve the quality of air and water have real economic benefits to property values, recreational values, agricultural production, and health. The point of all this is that our economic indicators are not devised to measure the general welfare, which our Constitution calls on us to promote.

Even in conventional terms, environmental regulations do not cause a significant amount of inflation. This fact has been well documented by those who have examined inflation in our society.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert excerpts from a recent speech on this subject by Gus Speth, a member of the President's Council on Environmental

Quality which appeared in the August 18 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The article follows:

SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT IS NOT  
INFLATIONARY  
(By Gus Speth)

Five years ago, when the OPEC nations suddenly hiked the price of crude oil, the U.S. began looking for ways to resolve the energy crisis. As any well-informed observer might have predicted, environmental regulations immediately came in for a close look—and schemes were quickly hatched to speed the development of new energy sources by revising or outflanking laws.

Then, as unemployment inched upward, environmental regulations were attacked again—this time, as a barrier to creating jobs. Critics of environmental regulation did, indeed, have some numbers on their side: according to the Environmental Protection Agency's analyses, the costs of pollution control by 1976 had forced the closing of plants employing about 20,000 people. But the defenders of such regulation came back with another set of numbers that deserved attention: air and water pollution control investments forced by local, state, and federal regulation had also created more than 600,000 jobs—roughly 30 new jobs for every one they had destroyed.

Today environmental, including health and safety, regulations—having weathered, at least temporarily, the energy crisis arguments and the unemployment arguments—are being criticized on a new ground: as contributing substantially to inflation.

How much do our present environmental protection laws cost us?

To date, only one really comprehensive analysis of the inflationary impact of pollution control regulations has been done. It was performed by Chase Econometrics at the behest of the Council on Environmental Quality. Thus there might be a certain suspicion here of the contractor coming up with answers that the client liked. But Chase Econometrics has its own reputation to protect; more to the point, the Chase findings have been published, widely disseminated, and they have never been refuted.

Chase's study indicates that, for the period 1970-1983, federal pollution-control requirements would cause an average annual increase in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) of between 0.3 percent and 0.4 percent with the 1978 figure estimated at 0.5 percent. This is in line with figures from the Council on Wage and Price Stability. COWPS estimates that the inflationary impact of all federal regulatory efforts adds seven-tenths of one percent to the CPI.

The first point to note is that, even by standard economic measures, any conceivable modification of federal environmental and health regulations would produce no significant reduction in the overall CPI. If the inflationary impact of these requirements could be reduced by 20 percent—a substantial relaxation—the CPI's increase would be restrained 0.1 percent: the net effect of even draconian measures could be the difference between a 10 percent and a 10.1 percent increase in the CPI. Further, even if we were to order modifications in our federal environmental and health regulations tomorrow morning, the economic effects would not be noticeable for some years . . . and we do not know what the inflationary pressures will be at that time.

Moreover, we must recognize that the CPI, like the GNP, is a very limited measuring stick. It gauges inflation by measuring the price increases of a typical market basket of goods. Expenditures to improve the environment can and do greatly increase consumer welfare—I have in mind improve-

ments in public health, reduced property damage, increased agricultural and resource yields, and enhanced recreation and enjoyment of leisure time—but these benefits to consumers are poorly reflected in the CPI. Moreover, while it is true that enhancing environmental quality leads to price increases for some goods, it is quite likely that consumers will change their consumption patterns, switching away from the goods whose relative prices have increased. To the extent that such substitution takes place, the CPI will overstate the effect of these price changes since it is computed on the presumption that the "typical" market basket remains the same.

For both these reasons, the CPI is not a satisfactory measure of the inflationary impacts of federal environmental regulations: a measured increase in the CPI does not mean that such requirements, on balance, cause inflation. Inflation is best understood as an increase in price without a corresponding increase in value. It follows that as long as the full benefits of environmental regulations exceed the full costs—and I believe that this is clearly the case today—these regulations cannot be considered truly inflationary. The Council of Economic Advisers made a similar point in its 1978 economic report to the President when it noted that insofar as federal regulatory efforts "result in improvements in public well-being, we may simply have taken part of our productivity gains in forms that are not measured in GNP."

Occasionally some unusual incident brings the limits of our economic measures to our attention. In 1952, London experienced a five-day episode of extreme air pollution. Annual pollution damages to health and property resulting from that incident were estimated at \$700 million—and there is, of course, no method for quantifying the value of a human life in terms that make sense to anyone but an insurance company.

We have had plenty of analogous incidents more recently, ranging from the Kepone disaster in Hopewell, Virginia, to the destruction of the Amoco Cadiz off the coast of Brittany. Such dramatic events help us gauge the costs of environmental disaster or weak regulation. Perhaps even more important, they suggest the unmeasured but nonetheless real benefits of property drawn and properly enforced environmental statutes that prevent damage. Our economics counts up the money we have spent; it is not beginning to take account of the money that we did not have to spend to repair the consequences of our carelessness.

I believe that we must make every effort to ensure that environmental and health regulations are not unnecessarily expensive and are set after due consideration of economic impacts—and I want to stress that this is required by almost all federal environmental laws and is an integral part of the program of the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies—but we must look elsewhere than environmental regulations for the underlying sources of inflation and the appropriate targets for our anti-inflation efforts.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR HANOI

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following article from the Air Force Times of August 4, 1978:

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR HANOI

(By Ira C. Eaker)

The World Bank and associated agencies have promised \$90 million to Hanoi, \$60 million as a 50-year, no-interest loan, \$30 million as a three-percent interest, 25-year loan. Ostensibly this is provided to repair war-damaged Vietnam rice production, now 15 percent short of need.

Red sympathizers in this country pointed out that the Marshall Plan helped Germany and Japan to recover with mutual benefit to their conquerors.

There are some obvious errors in this slanted sophistry:

Hanoi did not lose the Vietnam War; we did, because of Hanoi's callous repudiation of the Paris Peace Treaty.

The Marshall Plan did not aid Germany and Japan until each had installed democratic, non-tyrannical governments allied with the free world.

It was the vast, forced urbanization program, post-war, which decreased rice production. Millions of people were thrown out of the cities to starve. Other millions were thrown into concentration camps for "reeducation." It was this convulsion that drastically reduced the food supply.

The volume of human suffering and tragedy which has occurred in Southeast Asia as a result of the Red tyranny exceeds that caused by either Hitler or Stalin, as a percentage of population. Hitler's holocaust accounted for some six million dead out of a half-billion conquered peoples. Stalin killed 10 million farmers who opposed his collectivization program, out of 180 million people.

The World Bank gets 98 percent of its funds from the free-world nations. Why should communist-dominated nations get most of its gifts or loans? Are there no needy, worthy recipients in the free world? What about the brave "boat people," the 150,000 refugees who have fled from the hell of Red-controlled Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia? This \$90 million could be of great help to the 150,000 escapees now living in poverty in refugee camps in Thailand and elsewhere.

This unconscionable gift to Hanoi could not have come at a more inappropriate time. It makes a mockery of President Carter's campaign for human rights, when the most flagrant violators of human rights in this century are thus rewarded for their tyranny.

There are other astounding international implications. It rewards a Soviet ally; it helps Russia to achieve world domination. For example, the vast naval base at Cam Ranh Bay, which we built, is now available to the Russian fleet, greatly aiding its threat to free-world oil routes, including those to the Philippines and Japan.

It also trumps our "China card." At the very time Red China is withdrawing its support from the Vietnamese tyrants, the World Bank rushes in with aid.

The tragic consequences of this error are redoubled since the World Bank head is an American. I can already hear the worldwide Red propaganda machine grinding into gear for endless repetition of the condemnation, "The U.S. now admits its war crimes in Vietnam."

Two excellent articles, by eminent authorities on Southeast Asia appearing in the 1978 summer issue of *Strategic Review*, completely confirm the fallacy of these World Bank gifts and loans.

It is irrational to take money earned from the free enterprise system and use it to aid the always-faltering economies in communist countries.

The Carter administration and Congress must stop this outrage.

The writer, an air power pioneer, is a retired three-star AF officer. ●

## DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS: A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the problems faced by that segment of our society known as displaced homemakers are receiving necessary and warranted attention. As important as the role of the Federal Government is in providing funds for pilot projects for displaced homemaker job placement and counseling centers, the equal importance of community involvement cannot be overlooked.

In the Buffalo, N.Y., area, we are fortunate to have displaced homemaker centers providing excellent programs for widows and separated or divorced spouses in need of counseling for entry into the job force. In addition to these centers, we have active community involvement on behalf of widows, whose emotional adjustment is sometimes greater than, or at least equal to, the financial adjustment following the loss of their husbands.

I would like to share with my colleagues a program initiated by Dr. and Mrs. Andre Toth who organized, through Sisters Hospital in Buffalo, N.Y., free group counseling sessions for widows. I believe this kind of community program, which helps widows realize that their feelings of identity loss, fear, frustration, guilt, and loneliness are shared by others, is an excellent example of the comprehensive approach which must accompany career planning for displaced homemakers. A summary of the Toth's program follows:

## ABSTRACT

It describes a group therapy approach designed to help the widow deal less painfully with her situation. This is done by focusing on questions relevant to this population, by individual catharsis and by reinforcement of behaviors which would otherwise be thought as "abnormal". It also tries to find some common denominators so that others may use the information and start similar groups.

GROUP WORK WITH WIDOWS  
STATISTICS

In 1976, of the 12.6 million widowed individuals in this country, 10.7 million were widows. Further: "the chances that the marriage of today's typical bride of 20 and groom of 23 will eventually be broken by the death of the husband are 70 in 100." Lastly, "one out of every eight women 14 years or older is widowed." Even the cold and detached aseptic quality of numbers cannot hide the pretty grim reality that there must be a whole lot of lonely women out there.

## PLANNING

It was partially in response to these numbers that in March of this year, we began thinking about, and planning for a group therapy program for widows. As another group program we had been running for three and one half years for post myocardial infarction patients and their spouses, it was also to be sponsored and housed by our employer, Sisters of Charity Hospital of Buffalo, New York. In some ways, both of these programs have been an attempt to fulfill roles that go beyond those traditionally associated with hospitals.

In any event, even though we had experience running groups of different types, we had none with widows; a search of the literature found a relative abundance of books written by widows for widows, but nowhere could we locate a formally organized group therapy program for this particular population.

As we continued reading, we found that the death of one's husband provided such a strong common denominator that our initial question concerning the composition of the group was indirectly answered and we felt that we could try to mix women of different socio-economic background and ages without jeopardizing the quality of the therapeutic experience; it turned out that we were right.

We decided that we would conduct six sessions, and that we would limit the group size to a maximum of 12. We selected a number of issues we had learned to be significant to widows, but we also left plenty of time for the clients to express individual concerns. Should this require a couple of additional sessions, we would add them, but we did not want to keep meeting indefinitely as we did not care to foster dependence and repetitiveness.

To find our widows, we went through our medical records and located a number of women whose husbands had died in our hospital. We selected women who had been widowed for no less than six months and no more than fourteen. These, we realized, were in some ways arbitrary decisions, for if it is true that the first three or four months, identified as the shock stage (4), will not allow the individual to be therapeutically receptive, it is also true that it is a highly individualized process that hinges on a long list of variables. We tentatively excluded individuals at the other end of this period because we felt that probably, the most difficult time would be in the eight to ten months following the initial shock, and since we would only have one group of ten to twelve individuals at the time, we wanted to reach those whom we felt needed it most.

We also tried not to include women whose present status did seem to indicate psychological problems that went beyond grief and whose presence in the group, we felt, may be distracting or disruptive of the group process. In so doing, we realize that these individuals too should get help, but we could not provide it. As it turned out, some of the individuals that were not included were already receiving active psychiatric support.

## PURPOSE

Our program would allow individual widows to share with each other, in a protected environment, the meaning of the widowhood experience. We, as therapists, would provide this environment, prop up emotional casualties and prevent the development of pathology. Our hope was that the catharsis and the sense of group identity would help our clients develop insight that would help them to deal more effectively with their situation.

## CATHARSIS AND IDENTITY

The first session found us with twelve women who had never seen each other before and whose only link was their widowhood. After a brief introduction to the program and a statement concerning confidentiality, we asked that each widow narrate the events that lead to the death of the spouse: length and type of illness, location of death, memories of the last days or weeks, or in lengthy illnesses, months, the funeral, the first few days following it, and anything they felt significant to the event. This was perhaps the most dramatic portion of any session: as every widow narrated her story, interrupted by her tears at recollecting those very painful moments, those listening nodded their heads each time they heard facts and feelings they themselves could identify with. As this process of identification began, some

of the pain lessened. As one of these widows told us later: "After listening to each lady tell her sad story, it suddenly became clear that I wasn't alone anymore. I really found a place I belonged. I am a widow and so are all the other ladies."

At the end of our first session, something rather significant happened: where we had one and one half hours earlier 12 total strangers, we now had a group. So strong was the bond of widowhood that their behavior was that of old friends who had gotten together after a long separation. The occasion was obviously not a happy one, but the feeling that the group exuded, somehow, lacked the earlier depressing pall; we would characterize the atmosphere as one of nervous exuberance—nervous, yes, but nonetheless exuberant.

DEPRESSION: SLEEPLESSNESS, ACHES,  
AND PAINS

Following the first few weeks after the death of the spouse, most of our clients began experiencing all kinds of somatic complaints. Sleeplessness was regularly experienced by all group members. Headaches, backaches, and a general feeling of malaise were also experienced by most participants, even by those who had had no such problems prior to their husband's death. There was no change that group attendance produced in terms of these various aches and pains, however few members reported on our second session, that on the night following the group, they had had the first good sleep in weeks. Obviously, we do not know if there was a connection, but we were nonetheless pleased. At the end of the sixth session, several members were sleeping better, but not regularly so. Others still experienced troublesome insomnia. One of the women whose insomnia continued, however, stated to the group that, "Now when I can't sleep, I know other women who are going through the same thing and somehow it helps."

Another symptom of depression everyone in the group felt to varying degrees was a general feeling of aimlessness, a felt difficulty in making decisions, an inability to get going, especially in the morning. As in many other grief caused situations, we let the group express these thoughts, we then threw the question back at them, but the responses were of an intellectual nature and we were at an impasse. Since that first group, we have learnt that there are no formulas to deal with this type of situational depression, but that the understanding on the part of the client that what she is experiencing is a part of a normal and healthy grieving process helps her to deal with it somewhat better.

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT: FRIENDS  
AND RELATIVES

Realizing the supporting role that friends and relatives can play, we asked the group to share their experiences in this area; what we heard was another proof that no matter how much we, in the field, think that death and dying have become overly popularized and have saturated the field of human services, we have apparently reached a very small minority: the fact of the matter is that most people feel uncomfortable with the subject of death and act clumsily at best, in these supportive roles.

It was the consensus of the group that there seemed to be a conspiracy of silence among many of their friends and relatives. In social situations, the name of the deceased was carefully avoided, as was any reference to anything, however remotely connected with him. In the words of one of the widows: "It was as if he had never existed. I kept on bringing his name up and they kept on changing the subject. I felt a tremendous resentment against them all, even though I realized that it was because they wanted to spare my feelings."

One of the sources of strength for the wid-

ow is the realization that her husband has not been forgotten by all those who loved him while he was living. Hearing people reminisce about positive experiences they may have had with him, humorous episodes, anything good linked with him, will provide the widow with temporary, but nonetheless, significant coping ability.

Additionally, we found another example of people's discomfort with death. This manifests itself in wishfully expecting the widow to exhibit a stiff upper lip attitude, not caring to witness any display of emotions, and generally handling the whole situation with as many platitudes as available at the time. This Hallmark Greetings mentality is one additional piece of evidence in the case of lack of understanding vs comforting the bereaved. "People were asking me, how are you, and you know darn well that the only answer they wanted to hear was "fine", commented one widow. Another said, "Everyone was telling me how great I was doing and how fine I looked. All I wanted to tell them was, 'What do you want me to do, crawl and writhe on the floor? Paint my face black?'"

#### IDENTITY

"When I walk alone into a room full of people, I feel terribly uncomfortable." "When confronted, even with the simplest situation, I have a very hard time." "Ever since he died, I have had these overwhelming attacks of insecurity. Where do you think they are coming from?"

These, and other similar comments, have reinforced for us, at a very practical level, the cultural notion that thinking of women as spouses, mothers, and perhaps lastly, as individuals will accentuate the trauma of widowhood. Having been known for 20-30 years as "John's wife", it should not come as a surprise that on his death, she should have tremendous identity problems. "Now that my husband is gone, who am I?", one of our clients cried very pointedly.

When one's children grow up and leave the household, a similar identity question emerges, especially for the woman whose primary concept of the self was derived from motherhood. The difference of course, is that growing up is a gradual and timely process; the death of one's spouse, is not.

We handled this topic by finding its intellectual explanation, and by first encouraging each participant to gradually begin the rediscovery of the self as unique individuals, slowly disassociating themselves from labels that had become painful.

We realized that the search for identity is a task so complex that it cannot be handled in such a cursory fashion, however, we felt that implanting the intellectual awareness was at least a necessary, if not sufficient condition for change.

#### GUILT

Although not always at a conscious level, guilt seems to be a feeling that many widows have; when it is not conscious, it may bring havoc to the resolution of grief. The obvious advantage that group interaction creates, is that those who are able to verbalize it, may allow others to bring this vague, uneasy feeling to a level of consciousness where it can be dealt with intellectually at first, and hopefully, emotionally later on.

For the widow, guilt seems to originate, in many instances, from the sorrow at not having been able to do more to prevent the death. "Had I just taken him to one more doctor, had we tried some different drugs" was an often voiced regret. There also is a tendency to remember episodes where the widow, either rightfully or not, perceives her behavior as unacceptable, as during arguments for instance, and wishes she could take her words back. Even when unable to pinpoint the specific origins of these feelings of guilt, it was obvious that they existed none-

theless and were based on feelings of failure; that his death was a direct reflection on her inability to care for him adequately, that somehow, had she been a better person, this would not have happened. Positive feedback was a natural way to handle these situations in our group and it was provided by both the other clients, and by us. It is our impression that these feedbacks provided the beginning of insight that would, in most instances, lead to a healthy resolution of this problem.

#### ANGER

Anger, as it pertains to the widow, is a rather puzzling response, and it too will cause the widow to feel guilty.

One of the new behaviors is that of the widow talking to the deceased. This will take many forms; it may simply be an exclamation at the widow's inability to find a missing document, it may be when she experiences car troubles of the type that he used to fix, it may be during a particularly painful moment of loneliness, when she may say: "Oh John, why did you leave me?" First of all, one of the immediate results of the widows' ability to share these one way conversations was that, where as before they were beginning to experience doubts about their sanity they now knew that others did the same thing and that it was perfectly acceptable and normal behavior; this and the wearing of his favorite robe, sweater, or the keeping of a particularly significant item.

Secondly, and just as significant, we began to explore the feelings connected with some of the things the widows were saying.

"I remember getting badly stuck in a snowbank at the end of my driveway and saying, "Where are you John now that I need you," and yes, there was some anger in me; a few seconds later I felt so terrible for feeling this way. How could I possibly feel angry with him, as obviously, he didn't die by choice."

As we explored similar episodes, we found that one of the commonly shared feelings was that of abandonment. Intellectually, they all knew that their husbands did not choose to die. Emotionally, they felt abandoned; their anger was perhaps abstractly directed against circumstances; on a more concrete level, with all of its frightening implications, it was directed towards those who had done the abandoning.

Although, not all members of our groups identified with all this, those who did, received some therapeutic benefits when they realized that what they were feeling was a normal stage in the grieving process and that they were not experiencing it alone.

We are now at the point where we have finished six sessions each, with three groups of widows. A follow up will take place at three, six, and twelve month intervals. Many of the participants confirmed to us what we had already suspected: that the experience had been a worth while one.

In the words of one of the group members: "The group did so much for me; to be able to talk it all out, all the sorrow, guilt, abandonment, and hurt from friends. There was so much inside of me that I couldn't express to relatives or friends, but with the group, I could say it all." ●

#### THE NEW POPE AND THE PRESIDENT

### HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, his brother said: "Don't be misled, behind that charming smile, he is like a diamond—brilliant, strong. What more can one ask of a leader?" And so, not only 700 million

Catholics, but the world rejoiced at the selection of a new Pope.

Some knew of his deeds, but no one really knew the man. As a parish pastor, he sold his church's gold to help the poor. He voted for the pill as a birth control device, but silently accepted Paul VI's rejection of it. His father was a migrant bricklayer. He himself was outgoing and learned, but not a world traveler. The media enthusiastically delivered these tidbits providing the hint of a vignette, yet no clear picture emerged.

But this man—now a direct descendant of Peter—imbued with the inner strength of Jesus Christ—assumes the burdens of an office that are staggering; and the world rejoices even over one hardly any mortal really knows.

It may be that this very limited knowledge of the man raises so many expectations. Surely, mystery can be magic for it can turn out many ways. Consider Pope John, an unknown cardinal who ascended Peter's throne. No Pope in the memory of living man did so much to transform the church, while projecting the image of a jovial and benign grandfather—a pious Santa Claus. Did not Albino Cardinal Luciani unabashedly take as one of his papal names that of his universally loved predecessor? That, in itself, we are assured by all and sundry, has great symbolic meaning.

This planet's masses for a brief moment are riding on the high tide of hopeful euphoria. Just as they were when John Kennedy became the 35th President of the United States, and just as they were on January 20, 1977, when a little known former Governor with an enchanting smile became the Chief Executive of this great Nation.

John XXIII proved to be mortal; John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the victim of a mindless atrocious act. They both died in the same year.

Jimmy Carter is still with us. Many are still mystified by this President who, as with the new Pontiff, inherited problems that the less courageous and less compassionate of his predecessors refused to address.

John Paul I comes to his pontificate at a time when his church is in a period of transition and questioning. The two, Pope and President, will eventually meet as did John F. Kennedy and John XXIII. The two will recognize in each other deep similarities in their even deeper disparities. And maybe they will come to know that fate placed them in tandem to do the deeds that others would not dare for surely they know, as does the world, that God works in mysterious ways. ●

#### NCSL SUPPORT FOR CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter of support from the National Conference of State Legislatures for the Civil Service

Reform Act. The letter expresses the belief of the conference that the Civil Service Reform Act will substantially improve the effectiveness of the Federal departments and agencies and thereby improve Federal-State relationships. The letter follows:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE  
OF STATE LEGISLATURES,  
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1978.

HON. MORRIS UDALL,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Conference of State Legislatures wishes to express its full support for HR 11280, the Civil Service Reform Act, as reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Our association of legislatures is deeply committed to making government employees at all levels more responsive to the citizens and more efficient in carrying out their public duties. HR 11280 incorporates many of the goals established by state legislatures in their civil service reform laws and would also serve as a model for effective personnel management at the state and local levels of government.

We believe that the Civil Service Reform Act will substantially improve the effectiveness of the federal departments and agencies, thereby improving federal-state relationships which depend upon responsive and experienced civil servants. Toward this end, we would support an amendment to HR 11280 which would expand the Senior Executive Service to make it a government-wide improvement immediately rather than an isolated pilot project.

We would appreciate it, Congressman Udall, if you would please convey our support to the full House during the floor debate on HR 11280. Legislatures at every level of government in our federal system have a fundamental and continuing responsibility to review and improve our personnel management systems to insure an effective and efficient government for the benefit of our common constituents. Concurrently, we legislators must be sensitive to the reasonable expectations of our partners in governance, the professional civil servants. Our organization, representing all 50 State Legislatures, believes that your Committee bill satisfies these demands and merits the support of your House colleagues.

Sincerely,

STANLEY STEINGUT,  
Chairman,  
NCSL State-Federal Assembly. ●

#### FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT WOULD DAMAGE U.S. INTELLIGENCE EFFORTS

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the House will today start consideration of H.R. 7308, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which I can say with assurance after a full career as a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation would severely damage and weaken our Nation's security.

Serious flaws in the bill, as reported to the full House by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, would be remedied by a substitute bill to be offered by our colleague, ROBERT McCLORY, of

Illinois. I strongly urge adoption of this substitute.

Other good amendments to improve H.R. 7308 will be offered by Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK and others, for which I also urge support by all our colleagues. Without them, the bill should be defeated.

A good article spelling out the flaws and weaknesses of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was published in the current issue of Human Events, a weekly Washington newspaper.

I would like to include that article at this point in the RECORD:

[From Human Events, Sept. 9, 1978]

#### CARTER-BACKED BILL WOULD DAMAGE INTELLIGENCE EFFORTS

The Carter Administration is helping to push through the Congress another measure to weaken this nation's security. Called the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and also heavily championed by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D.-Mass.), it has overwhelmingly passed the Senate and this week may be taken up by the House.

In essence, the bill (which, ironically, has the support of the new FBI director and the American Civil Liberties Union) would require a judicial warrant before our intelligence agencies could use electronic surveillance to gather foreign intelligence information in this country. Currently, the executive branch has the power to use wiretaps and bugs to obtain foreign intelligence without having to seek prior approval from the judiciary.

Despite some prestigious backing, the bill, as Rep. Robert McClory (R.-Ill.), a key member of the House Intelligence panel, has noted, is seriously flawed. For the first time, a single judge will have the authority to block surveillance of foreign spies and potential saboteurs. Moreover, the Judiciary has neither the expertise nor the background to determine when surveillance is needed.

As Federal Judge Albert V. Bryan said in the recent opinion in the Humphrey/Truong espionage case: "It is not at all certain that a judicial officer, even an extremely well-informed one, would be in a position to evaluate the threat posed by certain actions undertaken on behalf of or in collaboration with a foreign state. . . . The Court is persuaded that an initial warrant requirement [for foreign intelligence electronic surveillance] would frustrate the President's ability to conduct foreign affairs in a manner that best protects the security of our government."

Aside from giving a special panel of 17 judges the power to "frustrate" the President's current ability to employ electronic surveillance against foreign enemies, the measure would also jeopardize our most sensitive secrets by greatly expanding the number of people who would be privy to them.

As McClory points out, the bill requires that a steady stream of highly sensitive written information flow to at least 17 judges, their clerks, reporters and bailiffs, none of whom is trained in the proper security procedures needed to protect this material. Clearly, the more people who become familiar with these intelligence activities, the greater the risk of disclosure.

As the Director of Central Intelligence Adm. Stansfield Turner has said: "Minimizing the number of people who have access to this information is a basic security principle."

Judges would not only receive briefings as to why a tap should be placed, but, should they issue a warrant for such surveillance, they would then be allowed to gain access to all the information obtained by the intelligence agency to see that it was not misused

or improperly received. Thus the courts, as a repository for top secret information, would themselves become key—and highly vulnerable—targets for espionage.

Yet the judicial warrant requirement is only a small part of what's wrong with this legislation. The wording of this measure is so restrictive that the U.S. Government would be severely hamstrung in its ability to engage in electronic surveillance for the most reasonable of purposes. For instance:

Even if a domestic terrorist group is suspected of acting in concert with a foreign power (or a foreign organization), that domestic group could not be tapped if the government couldn't prove to a judge's satisfaction that the group was receiving both substantial "direction and control" from a foreign power.

If a domestic terrorist group is largely subsidized by a foreign power, this group could still not be surveilled unless the government could show that the money went to the group's illegal—rather than legal—activities.

If it is known that someone is setting up a large, anti-American propaganda campaign in behalf of a foreign power, the U.S. government could still not tap that person unless it could be shown that the campaign was "about to" go into effect, and that when it did it would unquestionably violate the law.

An American citizen engaged in espionage for a foreign country could not be placed under surveillance if the judge believed that the information sought was not "necessary" to U.S. security or foreign policy interests.

Under this bill, U.S. intelligence agents in this country would not be able to use electronic surveillance to target the head of a non-government sponsored foreign trade mission; an intimate of a foreign leader who does not serve in an "official" capacity for his government or a junior minister of a foreign nation who is visiting friends in this country.

In testifying against this bill, the Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO), whose members include such prominent figures as ex-CIA director William Colby and the ex-chief of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Gen. Daniel O. Graham, pointed out that there are hundreds of thousands of foreigners in the United States at any given time, and to limit intelligence collection efforts only to employes of foreign powers and to those who may engage in clandestine activities is far too restrictive.

"Why," ask AFIO, "should our policymakers be denied valuable positive foreign intelligence by barring collection from a visiting scientist, businessman or any other foreigner in the United States known to possess information of value to the United States? We know of no other country that so limits its intelligence capabilities. . . ."

Indeed, even though U.S. intelligence officials, because of clear Administration pressures to approve, okayed the proposed restrictions, it is equally clear that they recognize the risks involved. Adm. Turner, for example, acknowledged there would be "risks" and said it was possible that the definitions will prove "too narrow . . . to permit the acquisition of genuinely significant communications. It is likewise possible that justified warrant applications will be denied or that application papers will be mishandled and compromised." The proliferation of information, he also stated, always involves risks, and the "statutory procedures will unquestionably lead to such a proliferation." Compliance, he added, will also "be somewhat onerous." Nevertheless, Turner says he now wants to share the surveillance power with the "courts."

This legislation is zipping through the Congress because of supposed abuses of foreign intelligence surveillance by the executive in days gone by, but just what those abuses were is not quite clear. Furthermore,

even the supposed abuses have been corrected in that warrantless electronic surveillance in the field of foreign intelligence can only be implemented pursuant to very strict procedures—some would say too strict—laid down by the attorney general.

In short, the legislation is not only not needed, but will dangerously hamper our efforts to gather critical information. Nevertheless, unless Rep. McClory and Rep. John Ashbrook (R.-Ohio), who are expected to lead the fight against the legislation's most injurious provisions, receive strong support from their colleagues, another blow will have been struck at our government's rapidly declining capacity to collect information vital to American security. ●

#### HOG BOOK NO "PIG IN A POKE"

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to your attention a recent publication that has tickled my fancy entitled "The Hog Book," written by William Hedgepeth and published by Doubleday.

For years I have worn a "Hogs are Beautiful" pin—sometimes even on the floor of the House. I speak with special pride today, because my hometown, Pittsfield, Ill., has earned the title, "Hog Capital of the World" and proclaims that honor with a marker in the town square. Pittsfield is the county seat of Pike County, which has the prestigious and enviable record of producing over 100 million pounds of pork annually. Most of that good ham is shipped nationwide, and occasionally one even comes to Washington. Which brings me back to Mr. Hedgepeth's delightful book that should be recognized from now on as the "Webster's of Hog Insight"—what it does not tell you about hogs is not worth knowing, or is not funny.

Mr. Hedgepeth delves into such areas as the ancestry of the swine world, how to tell a hog from various other four-footed creatures of the Earth, how hogs broke into show business, and even some of his favorite selections of hog poetry to wit:

You can't put a hog in a zoo—  
There's no telling what he will do.  
He may get loud  
And charge at the crowd  
Or just lie there not looking at you.

As Mr. Hedgepeth says:

The attainable possibilities for developing hogs of pleasure are virtually infinite. It is just a matter of breaking through the public's resistance to unfamiliar concepts; yet the fact remains of the hog's emerging potential for greater freedom and fresh manifestations of soul. The barriers exist only in the minds of men. But improbable enterprises are often sustained by faith. And there is ample reason for faith in the creature, for it has long been realized that "the hog may be on to something."

A chapter on Hoglore, placing the porcine creature in its rightful place in Greek mythology, is perhaps the most enthralling of all. Hedgepeth relates various cultural ties with the hog and

reminds us that a consistently recurring figure in the earliest myths of ancient folk is that of an Earth-Mother goddess who is associated with the soil, planting, fertility, and with human sacrifice, and who—more often than not—is represented in porcine form.

The importance of hogs to American politics is not overlooked, either Harry S. Truman, while on a campaign trip around the country, once stepped into a hog lot and declared, "No man should be allowed to be President who does not understand hogs, or has not been around a manure pile." Hedgepeth would no doubt heartily agree. The "Hog Book" seems to point out the inevitable fact, we are becoming pig-aware people.

For the most, of course, the hog is still admired in the form of refrigerated meat or in the shape of a football on lazy Sunday afternoons, rather than a bona fide animal come into its own. However, the fact remains, the hog is an animal of unique beauty. It has made a tremendous contribution to man for more than 9,000 years and William Hedgepeth is right on target with his perception of a country united with hogs. Hedgepeth suggests we embark on a series of consciousness-raising activities in the name of the hog and get people tapping into the hog current. From here the possibilities are endless. Noteworthy citizens could hold gala hog expositions, there could be multimedia displays, pig exhibit halls, and Broadway plays based on the lively hoover.

I am proud to mention that in my hometown of Pittsfield one such awareness session, "Pig Day," is already an annual event. The happy occasion was on July 7-8 this year, and included such hog-honoring events as choosing the Pig Day Queen and Little Miss Piglet (chosen by the length of her pigtails), a huge sidewalk sale, roast pork sandwiches, games, and just plain fun for the hundreds of pig-enthusiasts who attend yearly.

The hog has been a misunderstood creature of circumstance for too long. I congratulate Mr. Hedgepeth and the "Hog Book" for joining the evergrowing ranks of pig lovers everywhere. The future can only hold more glorious tributes for this porcine animal as the world catches up on 9,000 years of delayed thanks to swinedom. And, as Mr. Hedgepeth speculates, perhaps someday there will be the formation of hog clubs around the country—not the existing breed associations but urban organizations whose members devote themselves to the pure esthetics of fine swine, pig poetry reading, and fine cuisine. I would proudly join, as even now I think of myself as a "pork scout" at heart. ●

#### A SOUND INVESTMENT

### HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. JOHN T. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the recording industry is a major em-

ployer in my district with several thousand jobs directly related to the production and marketing of sound recordings. We are proud to have Columbia House in Terre Haute and know how important the recording industry is to our area.

Over the years, I have read and heard much about the pleasures of listening to sound recordings. The following article, which appeared in the New York Times, should be read by all who enjoy recordings.

As author Hans Fantel puts it:

High-quality music reproduction in the home has advantages no concert hall can match. . . .

Besides, the disk never has an off night. It is never indispensed, or simply bored. The moment of inspiration can be recaptured. It no longer perishes with its own sound.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1978]

SOUND—PHONOGRAPH CONVEYS MORE THAN ONE HEARS IN THE CONCERT HALL

(By Hans Fantel)

On a buggy but otherwise balmy evening in the Berkshires last week, we were listening to some Haydn on the porch, looking out on the darkening hills. Music and landscape conjoined and gave rise to a feeling of surpassing serenity, such as probably would not have been induced by the same performance in a concert hall. Afterward, my wife remarked that we were the first generation in the millennial history of music for whom such an experience was possible. For, thanks to electronics, music has become independent of time and space.

To hear music at the time and place of our choice seems to have been an ancient desire. Princes and potentates (to use the ringing phrase of the Founding Fathers) would take their private musicians to their chambers or on trips. King Saul, according to reliable sources, had a young harpist named David. Goldberg, for whom Bach wrote his famous variations, would lull his Saxon master's insomniac nights. And the mostly scandalous annals of the Congress of Vienna took awe-struck note of the fact that Talleyrand traveled with his own pianist to play for him wherever he went.

But such privilege belonged to the few, and their enjoyment of the music may have been colored by the fact that the artists were their servants. Besides, the repertory was necessarily limited to what could be performed under portable conditions, while we enjoy the effortless electronic transport of entire orchestras into our homes or even our automobiles.

Our conversation naturally ambled toward musical settings—concert hall contrasted to living room, and the astounding fact that in this electronic age most music is no longer heard in the presence of the performer.

Today's sound equipment, as the ads relentlessly tell you, aims to give the listener the virtual equivalent of a concert. I think the ads, for all their flamboyance, understate the case. The fact is that, due to sophisticated multichannel recording techniques, the phonograph today conveys more of the music than you are likely to hear from the average seat in the concert hall.

Still, no amount of technical finesse can replace the actual concert. The physical presence of the artists adds an extra dimension that still eludes even the best phonograph—the rapport between the performers and the audience. In this respect, a concert is a unique experience, as personal as a handshake. And even at its best, reproduced music cannot convey the excitement and the festive mood of a gala occasion.

Conversely, high-quality music reproduction in the home has advantages no con-

cert hall can match. By delivering music directly into the living room, electronics opens up a wholly new range of musical experience. It forms a direct bridge between the music and the listener. No matter where or when the music was played, modern sound equipment always puts it in the present, always on the spot. No concert organization in the world could match the range of repertory or the impressive roster of artists we command with the flick of a switch.

Besides, the disk never has an off night. It is never indisposed, or simply bored. The moment of inspiration can be recaptured. It no longer perishes with its own sound.

Finally, there's the matter of your own mood. After a frantic rush to get ready, a hectic drive to the concert hall and a desperate search for parking space; you may strive in vain for the frame of mind that lets you abandon yourself fully to the music. And concert hall seats, invariably designed for very proper people who like to sit up straight in the presence of the muse, aren't much help when it comes to relaxing. As one critic observed apropos Wagner, "The mind will absorb no more than the seat of the pants will endure."

By contrast, you can attend your home concerts comfortably recumbent, with no neighbors to rattle their programs, dive for pralines or snap their handbags. And with the help of a snifter of brandy you may find yourself far more responsive to the music than in the formally restrained atmosphere of the concert hall.

And, of course, you can always revise the program. If you don't quite feel up to the subtleties of the B-minor Mass, you can unceremoniously switch to a casual Mozart Cassation or maybe some Scott Joplin. You're your own impresario, in complete control of the musical proceedings. You pick the program, the time, and the artist—an inestimable advantage over the concert hall, where you have to take your music as, and with whom, it comes. In effect, a sound system is like a permanent house party with the world's best musicians as your guests. Paradoxically, their physical absence may be an added boon—a contribution to the kind of privacy that opens the doors of imagination.

That evening last week with Haydn in the Berkshires, I remembered briefly how I first became aware of the phonograph's uncanny ability to transcend time, place, and circumstance. It was long ago in Africa, where I had gone as a very young man to get away from the Gestapo. In the parlor of a dingy Tunisian "pension," I discovered a wind-up Victrola with a few records of Schubert songs and a couple of arias from "Aida." Even the wheezy sound of that ramshackle machine had the power to banish the war for a life-sustaining moment and take me back to the home I had left. In doing so, that old phonograph transformed a dark time and somehow kindled hope for the future. ●

#### AMENDMENTS TO CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT

**HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced into the RECORD three proposed amendments on H.R. 11280.

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment which I have introduced to H.R. 11280, the Civil Service Reform Act, establishes that employees should not waive statu-

tory rights by pursuing negotiated procedure rights.

I have submitted this particular amendment because I believe that the intent of the Congress in defining "conditions of employment" in section 7103 (A) (14) is unclear.

Since we have all studied the bill, or at least I suppose I can safely presume so, we know that section 7103 (A) (14), page 315, defines "conditions of employment" as meaning personnel policies, practices, and other matters whether established by rule, regulation, or otherwise; however, policies, practices, and matters relating to discrimination, prohibited political activities, and policies specifically provided for by Federal statute are excluded from the concept of conditions of employment.

It is obvious that this definition is intended to exclude certain matters from the negotiated provisions. However, inasmuch as precedent under the National Labor Relations Act will be important in determining how chapter VII will be interpreted, it is submitted that providing exceptions to the definition of "conditions of employment" simply leaves a gaping hole in the intent of Congress.

It is generally recognized that there are three types of bargaining subjects; namely, mandatory subjects, prohibited or illegal subjects, and permissive subjects. By defining "conditions of employment" to eliminate racial discrimination, political activities, and matters specifically provided for by Federal statute, Congress has not prohibited a labor organization and an agency from bargaining concerning such subjects. In other words, they would be permissive subjects and thus it would not be unlawful for an agency and a labor organization to negotiate with respect to a clause pertaining to them.

With the negotiation, an issue would arise concerning whether or not employees must follow the negotiated grievance procedure in resolving their complaints regarding this clause, or whether they would be free to use the statutory procedures. I am not so concerned that the employees would have rights in both areas. That is quite clear. However, it is not clear that they would have remedies in both areas. While it is suggested that at least in the area of title VII discrimination, employees have remedies in both areas, with respect to political activities and matters specifically provided for in Federal statute, dual remedies are not so guaranteed.

My amendment is specifically designed to hopefully prevent the possibility that the courts will misinterpret the intent of the Congress in this matter. It should be clearly stated that employees will have the right to pursue remedies other than remedies provided in the negotiated procedure in any instance where there is an overlap between the negotiated procedures and those provided by Federal statute. Further, it should be provided that employees will have the right to pursue their statutory remedy and their negotiated procedures remedy in all cases. To impose exceptions would be to defeat the purpose of the intent.

There may be a question that such an

amendment as the one which I have proposed would result in duplication. To that, let me respond by saying that such duplication is not uncommon where dual rights are provided by Congress. For example, in many cases, employees who claim racial discrimination must pursue their administrative remedies through a hearing, and these same employees get a full blown trial in court if they lose at the agency level.

In this vital matter, it is of the utmost importance that we in Congress make our intent very clear. We must undoubtedly show that in all cases, the employee will have a right to utilize both the statutory and negotiated procedures.

Mr. Speaker, my second amendment to H.R. 11280, the Civil Service Reform Act, is a genuine reflection of my belief that the right of an employee to select a representative of his own choosing should be protected in all respects.

If we refer to section 7114 (A) (2) of the bill, dealing with representation rights and duties, we will note that the following appears:

The rights of an exclusive representative under the preceding provisions of this subsection shall not be construed to preclude an employee from being represented by an attorney or other representative, other than exclusive representative, of the employee's own choosing in any appeal action under procedures other than procedures negotiated pursuant to this chapter.

This section is indicative of the fact that in view of the proposed expanded scope of bargaining, an exclusive representative would be able to negotiate with respect to virtually every aspect of the employee's working conditions mandatory negotiated procedures required to be followed in resolving claims of violation, thus placing the employee in a position where his total rights as a Federal employee would be contingent upon the good faith with which the exclusive representative handled his claim. It is my fear that this would place many employees, particularly minority group employees, in a position where the exclusive representative would control their fate.

As you all probably know, in January 1977, I sponsored H.R. 2722, a bill relating to collective bargaining representation of postal employees. If I may, I would like to briefly touch on a few of my findings while working with this legislation.

The experience with what happened in the Postal Service raises serious doubts as to whether or not minorities are being protected by the predominately white exclusive representative where all procedures must be handled through the negotiated grievance procedure. Thus, prior to the Postal Reorganization Act minorities composed approximately 19 percent of the working force in the post office. In a recent survey, it was cited that this number has dwindled to 16 percent with a special note that this statistic is based upon an expanded definition of minorities which includes many individuals who are not black. Let me further state that in addition, in the mail-handlers craft of the Postal Service the minorities have lost in excess of 8,000



jobs since the enactment of the Postal Reorganization Act.

It is quite clear that this pattern of systematically removing minorities from gainful employment in the Postal Service came about when the so-called craft unions were given the power by the courts pursuant to language provided by Congress, to be the "exclusive union" of postal employees. Consequently, it is sad but true that the interests of the blacks and minorities in the Postal Service simply has not been protected by the so-called craft unions.

It is my concern that this very same thing could easily occur in the Federal service unless there is adequate language to protect the right of the employee to select a representative who will protect his interest and not allow the agency to further the cause of "institutional racism."

As originally envisioned by President Kennedy the Federal employee occupied a position substantially different from that of the private sector employee. Thus, President Kennedy gave to Federal employees the right to be represented in every respect of his or her employment relationship, even under negotiated procedures, by a representative of his own choosing so that the Federal employee when adversely acted upon by an agency would not be able to claim that he did not have the representation that was best for him or her as opposed to the best for the Federal service or best for a particular organization.

I believe that my amendment which on page 332, would strike out line 14 and all that follows down through line 7 on page 333, and insert "(d) The processing of any grievance of any employee under a procedure negotiated under this chapter shall not preclude the employee from pursuing any right provided to him by or under any other provision of law," would be appropriate to protect employees against weak, corrupt, ineffective, biased, or otherwise unsatisfactory representation.

Mr. Speaker, the third amendment I have introduced to H.R. 11280, the Civil Service Reform Act, will hope lend greater clarity to the meaning of a "labor organization" as it is defined in section 7101(4) (A) of the bill. Of course I realize that we are going to have organizations that do not fit into this definition. These types are very clearly cited in that section of the bill which I seek to amend. However, although I do not believe that the definition of a "labor organization" in H.R. 11280 is intended to exclude "exclusive representatives," this cautious step certainly cannot hurt.

My amendment, which simply inserts on page 292, line 22, after "organization," the following: "(other than an exclusive representative as defined in paragraph (16) (B) of this section)," is strictly a technical one to assure that none of our Nation's 86 labor organizations holding exclusive recognitions will be adversely affected by the definition of a "labor organization" as has been cited in H.R. 11280.

It is imperative that the language in section 7103(4) (A) be amended in order to eliminate any question that may be raised with concern for whether or not

the large number of labor organizations which are smaller than the giants are organizations "limited to special interest objectives." By amending this language we can remove all doubts that organizations such as the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Workers which were founded out of the discriminatory practices of several white controlled unions would not be regarded as organizations "limited to special interest objectives" merely because they are gravely concerned with the fight against racial and other discrimination.

With regard to the connotation of a "special interest objective," let me just briefly add that because of the absence of a clear definition in this area, the enactment of the Civil Service Reform Act, would leave the courts and the Federal Labor Relations Authority with the task of determining which organization is and which is not a chapter VII labor organization. Thus, it is entirely possible that by simply indicating that an establishment is a "special interest" organization, the Federal Labor Relations Authority could eliminate the structure.

Let me reiterate that I do not believe that the intent of the Civil Service Reform Act's definition of a "labor organization" is to exclude exclusive representatives. However, I do believe that at this point, it is feasible to be cautious in this area so that by no means of interpretation can these structures be placed outside the realms of labor organization status.●

#### SHORTSIGHTED VIETNAM POLICY SHOULD CHANGE

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, our policy toward Vietnam is a shortsighted one.

Other nations now recognize that Vietnam is trying to build a course of international political independence and economic independence, and so other countries are establishing ties, both diplomatic and economic, with Vietnam.

I learned recently that Japan is providing assistance to Vietnam. For fiscal year 1978, Japan has provided 10 billion yen of credit, which will be used for commodity aid.

They gave the Vietnamese the following list of items from which they could choose their commodity assistance:

(A) Equipments and General Merchandise (5,500 million yen)

1—1,400 million yen: Electric fittings; magnetic wire; electric cable and electric spare parts (including materials for manufacturing of electric fans).

2—700 million yen: Fine chemicals (for hides and leathers), electric bulbs; welding rods; printing ink; phosphoric acid.

3—460 million yen: Dye-stuffs.

4—1,300 million yen: Paper of different varieties; packing paper board; printing paper, and cigarette paper.

5—30 million yen: PVC for artificial leather.

6—920 million yen: Metal of various kinds; steel strips, steel wires, non-ferrous-metal, etc.

7—650 million yen: Woolen acrylic yarns, satin.

8—40 million yen: Diamond powder.

(B) Machinery and Parts (2,500 million yen)

Motor for water pumps—230 million yen; electric motors—200 million yen; ball bearings—230 million yen; tools (sawing blades, milling nipper, precision tools)—460 million yen; tyres and tubes, spare parts for trucks HB3-120—115 million yen; machines and spare parts for soda, electric power, freezing, fiber-cement, paper, spinning, thermos bottle, gourmet, power plant—1,265 million yen.

Mr. Speaker, what Japan is doing in the process is, first of all, helping Vietnam, but they are doing much more than that.

They are establishing ties of friendship with Vietnam that help to nurture political and enormous independence on the part of the Vietnamese.

In addition, the items which they are providing will provide jobs for people in Japan.

And, third, and by no means insignificant, the Vietnamese become accustomed to using the Japanese products and, presumably, will buy the Japanese products as their economy improves.

I am aware that our colleague, Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY, has led a delegation to Vietnam and Laos, and I hope that delegation will keep in mind the Japanese example.●

#### CONTINUING CRISIS IN FOSTER CARE

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a front page story today, the Wall Street Journal calls attention to the continuing crisis in foster care and adoption in the United States today. The facts and figures recited by the Journal in this very fine story are all too familiar to the Congress: Thousands of children kept in inappropriate foster placements for years, at great cost to taxpayers; inadequate reviews and placement procedures; insufficient attention to preventive and reunification services; funding priorities favoring long-term placement over permanency for these children.

The story does not mention that the House has recognized these serious problems, and has addressed them in comprehensive legislation passed last year, H.R. 7200, in the House version, includes many of the recommendations proposed by foster care and child welfare experts in the Journal's story. In fact, many of these same experts testified before House and Senate committees in 1975, 1976, and 1977, and were active in the preparation of the legislation which has become H.R. 7200. These proposals, which have the widespread support of nearly every child welfare organization in the country, of many States and local program officials, of the Carter administration, and many others knowledgeable in the field, would not only better protect the

rights and interests of natural and foster parents, and the children, but would substantially reduce costs by emphasizing cost effectiveness, accountability, and prevention.

The House, in passing H.R. 7200 by an overwhelming margin in June 1977, spoke out for reform of the foster care program. The legislation, unfortunately and unnecessarily, has been stalled in the Senate Finance Committee where it has not only been weakened, but also burdened down with wholly irrelevant welfare amendments. In the year since this measure could have been enacted, and should have been enacted, tens of thousands of children have unnecessarily entered, or remained within, the foster care system. The cost to those children, and to the taxpayers who pay for unnecessary and inappropriate care, will continue to grow so long as we delay implementing needed, broadly supported change.

The House has spoken, and the experts are in support of the child welfare provisions of H.R. 7200. The Journal's story forces us again to confront this issue, to turn to the Senate and ask, when will the Senate, too, indicate its concern for these children and their families, and pass the child welfare provisions of H.R. 7200?

The story follows:

NOBODY'S KIDS—FOSTER-CARE SYSTEM IS ACCUSED BY CRITICS OF HARMING CHILDREN

(By Jonathan Kwitny)

Seven-year-old Bobby lives in foster care. He was born in San Francisco, the fourth child of a woman with a decade-long record of arrests for prostitution and heroin possession (Bobby himself became addicted in the womb). He went immediately into foster care.

In 1975, some foster parents sought to adopt him. Bobby liked the idea, and so did the social worker who had his case. But a judge refused to free him from his biological mother (the father was long gone). After two years of investigations and hearings, the mother moved to Los Angeles. So the judge ended Bobby's adoption hearings in San Francisco and sent him to a Los Angeles judge, who ordered him to live with his biological mother (she had kidnapped two of her other children from their foster home, and so they also lived with her). Two weeks later, she was arrested again, and Bobby and his siblings, now under Los Angeles jurisdiction, went on to new homes and new social workers there.

CASE CALLED TYPICAL

Bobby's current social worker says he is typical of the cases she handles. Indeed, he seems typical of the nearly 200,000 American children believed to be in long-term foster care (nobody keeps an accurate count). Under the current system, these children spend their formative years bouncing from one foster home to another, deprived of roots, unsure of the future, caloused in outlook and, authorities say, much more likely than the average youth to wind up an unemployed adult living off welfare and crime.

Yet, according to numerous adoption workers, there doesn't seem to be any shortage of families eager to adopt most of these children. Critics say many children are kept in foster care only by outmoded laws and by the self-preservation instincts of a social-service industry that would shrink drastically if foster children were put into permanent homes.

Stories like Bobby's have sparked a growing movement to encourage adoption and to

put the foster-care industry under federal regulation. Critics already have the Carter administration's ear and think they can win over Congress next year. Peter Forsyth, a leading critic, says, "My guess is we spend in this (foster-care) system about \$2 billion a year, of which \$1 billion could be eliminated. And the kids would be much better off."

MANY STUDIES

Mr. Forsyth, a former chief of the Michigan Department of Social Services, moved to New York in 1973 to head a foster care project being started by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Many of his complaints about foster care are echoed in a 1975 congressional report, a 1977 General Accounting Office report and a 1977 audit of New York City's foster care agencies by the city's comptroller, Harrison Goldin, as well as by social service workers across the country. The Clark Foundation also financed creation of the National Commission for Children in Need of Parents which has been holding hearings for the past 10 months and is expected to recommend federal regulation in a report this month.

Defenders of the foster-care system term much of the criticism unfair and express doubts that adoption really is a panacea, although even they concede that some changes in the relevant laws might be desirable.

What opened the door for reformers was the revolutionary impact of legalized abortion on the once-booming adoption market, because of a shortage of healthy, young, adoptable children, hundreds of thousands of qualified childless couples are being turned away by adoption agencies. Demand has jumped even for older, problem and handicapped children, who previously had nearly always been consigned to foster care. Yet most of these children haven't benefited from the strong demand. Critics of the system pin much of the blame on two kinds of laws, which are fairly consistent from state to state with certain exceptions.

One set of laws tends to preserve the rights of biological parents to prevent adoption of their children by other people, even when the children have been removed from home because of beatings and other abuse and even when parents haven't tried to see their children for years. So the children stay as Bobby did, in foster care.

AID CUT OFF

The other laws tend to cut off government financial aid for foster children as soon as they are adopted, or shortly afterwards. Thus foster parents lose their expense allowance—perhaps \$200 a month—if they adopt the children and give them permanent homes, as many want to do. And because the children typically need expensive medical, educational or counseling help that the government will pay for only in foster care, adoption often is simply impossible.

The cutoff in support funds after adoption also creates a conflict of interest for professionals in the field. More than half of the nearly \$2 billion a year paid by taxpayers to support foster children goes for salaries of social workers and their bureaucracies, authorities say; by encouraging adoptions, social-service agencies would be putting themselves out of business—a threat that they naturally resist even though they are non-profit.

That, at least, was the gist of the Harrison Goldin study of 35,000 foster children in New York City. The study found that they had been in foster care an average of 6.7 years and that only one in seven was either returned home or adopted in 1976, the year of the study. The report found that the agencies had failed to plan a future for nearly a third of the children and that most other children weren't benefiting from supposed plans for their return home or adoption. The report concluded: "The discrepancy between the number of children who

the agencies say should be adopted and those actually adopted last year is so enormous that it leads one to question the agencies' seriousness of purpose."

The privately run agencies attacked in the Goldin study are represented by the Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies (COVCCA—pronounced "Kafka"). Its members—many with religious affiliations—get more than 90 percent of their income from per diem foster-care stipends from governmental bodies. COVCCA contends that the Goldin report is "full of holes," that the "emphasis on adoption" is "relatively recent" and that the desirability of adoption is "still open to some doubt."

Similarly dubious about adoption is the National Association of Homes for Children, an organization of 400 agencies housing 30,000 children in group foster homes. A leader of the association says that he can't estimate how heavily his members depend on government funds, but that he is sure the children are where they belong.

Even COVCCA and the National Association of Homes for Children say they support the major specific suggestions being made for change in the laws relating to foster care and adoption. But their arguments come out with a different emphasis. Says Joseph B. Gavrin, executive director of COVCCA, for example, "In general, we're in favor of measures to make it easier to terminate parental rights. We also want to make sure that kids aren't snatched from their natural parents until they (the parents) have had a chance to rehabilitate themselves. We want to make sure that when parents place a child into foster care, they aren't ceding all rights to get that child back again."

Mr. Gavrin says he agrees with suggestions that a judge should tell biological parents at the outset of a child-care case exactly what they will have to do to prevent termination of rights, and should give them a date for compliance. But Mr. Gavrin emphasizes that the conditions and the date shouldn't be "unrealistic."

"I HAD A TOUGH MOTHER"

Says a spokesman for the National Association of Homes for Children, defending institutional care, "I don't know how your childhood was, but I had a tough mother and I've paid for it over the years. I don't think family life is always best."

Nevertheless, Mr. Goldin says another audit, to be released this month, will show that nearly half of the foster children confined to institutional care in New York—largely with COVCCA members—could be put in private homes and would be better off there. And the most extensive indictment of the foster-care industry across the country is expected this month as the result of the study by the National Commission for Children in Need of Parents.

In thousands of pages of testimony before the commission, the foster-care system is depicted as rife with inefficiency, waste and downright cruelty. State officials have confessed that they don't even know how many foster children are under their supervision, or the children's ages. Interagency squabbles have kept qualified couples from adopting handicapped children in other cities. Turn-over among caseworkers has run so high—100 percent a year in some places—that real supervision is impossible.

SUPPORT FOR CHANGE

Although the social-work industry is severely criticized by the commission staff, some of the strongest support for change comes from within the industry itself. Many social workers are truly dedicated people. Unlike coworkers who have become so frustrated by the conditions that they do little more than go through the motions, the dedicated ones still toll in the slums and

the courts trying to help children, often despite staggering caseloads.

Occasionally, they contend with real horror stories. In Chicago, for example, judges continued to send six-year-old Johnny Lindquist back to his biological parents despite repeated evidence that they beat him. Then, in 1972, the parents killed him. Both went to jail, but continued to claim parental rights to their other four children until last year, when Mrs. Lindquist, out on parole, finally agreed after heavy newspaper publicity to free the children for adoption (as had her husband shortly before).

While such extreme cases get heavy publicity, the sad stories such as Bobby's are perhaps more important because apparently they occur day after day without any publicity at all. They are routine, not unusual. Social workers and agency chiefs interviewed in various parts of the country complain of an almost-identical list of problems.

#### SOME CASES CITED

One such critic is John F. Boyne, director of Spaulding for Children in Orange, N.J. (one of five Spaulding centers operating independently in different states and specializing in adoption for children with serious emotional or physical handicaps). Mr. Boyne tells of a mentally retarded, heart-damaged infant girl in Saratoga County, N.Y., for whom he found a qualified adoptive family in New Jersey. He offers copies of correspondence in which the Saratoga County Department of Social Services refused to give up the child because, the department said, it would lose federal supplements paid on behalf of the infant and also because the department didn't want to pay Spaulding's \$750 placement fee.

The department suggested that the infant be sent to the family as a foster child so that Saratoga County could continue to get the federal money, of which \$7 a day would be sent to New Jersey for expenses. Mr. Boyne, a believer in adoption, declined. The infant remained in foster care in New York, and the New Jersey family later adopted another retarded child. Mr. Boyne says that only the blatant candor of the Saratoga County department's letter distinguishes this case from many others.

Joseph Gemmiti, Saratoga County Commissioner of Social Services, whose name is typed at the bottom of the letter to Spaulding, says he won't comment unless he is told the child's name. He agrees, however, that Mr. Boyne can't ethically disclose it. So there isn't any comment.

New York State law at least theoretically provides for continued subsidies to children adopted in, say, New Jersey. But many states refuse to pay medical and other expenses for children who leave, or do so only after much foot-dragging. Mr. Boyne says that he twice found adoptive homes for the same retarded boy from Washington County, Md., but that both arrangements were scotched by the county's refusal to pay Spaulding's \$750 fee (which the agency says it needs in order to survive). Richard Bateman, Maryland's Director of Social Services, says that this might have happened a year ago, but that under a new state law such payments and other subsidies now are permitted and that a deserving adoption wouldn't be prevented again.

#### DUNNED BY HOSPITALS

In another case, Kenneth and Beth Larson of Succasunna, N.J., have adopted three children with spina bifida, a severe birth defect. They say that Massachusetts, from which two of the children came, balked at paying the heavy medical bills (one child has had 17 operations) as it had promised. So she thanks that the Larsons got for giving the children a home was harassment from hospitals. "They were trying to take our house away," Mrs. Larson says. She adds that the office of New Jersey Sen. Harrison Williams, after contacting the office of Massachusetts

Sen. Edward Kennedy, eventually persuaded Massachusetts to accept responsibility, although nearly \$20,000 of bills still haven't been paid.

Social workers complain that it's useless even to try to bring in children from many states, particularly if the youngster is severely handicapped and adoption would saddle a family with staggering medical bills. Some states discontinue benefits after adoption even within the state, although the taxpayers pay the medical expenses anyway, plus much more, if the child stays in foster care.

Some states' rules have peculiar—and regrettable—effects. California, for example, puts a five-year limit on benefits; as a result, children often can't be adopted until age 13 (five years later, at 18, the children would lose foster-care benefits anyway, and at the age of majority can apply for state assistance regardless of their adoptive parents' income). Mr. Boyne comments, "No way is a kid with cystic fibrosis going to get cured in five years."

The courts also are a major source of complaint. Social workers say that many judges, inexperienced in child problems, are unpredictable at best. One of Chicago's two adoption courts has been presided over by six different judges in two years; two were reassigned to other duties after Chicago Tribune editorials blasted them for returning children to unfit parents. "Judges don't want the assignment," says Carol Amadio, attorney for the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services. "You make decisions where children end up dying a lot of the time."

In Los Angeles, Janet Ter Veen, the social worker assigned this year to supervise Bobby, gripes that although state law allows a child to be freed for adoption if his biological parents have either abused or neglected him, judges usually won't act unless there is both abuse and neglect. She explains that charges of abuse usually are plea-bargained away when the child is first taken from home. To avoid a lengthy court fight and to get the child out of an unsafe home quickly, the state agrees to drop charges of abuse, which can bring criminal penalties; in exchange, the parents agree to put the child in foster care on grounds of mere neglect. Years later, when another social worker brings the child up for adoption, the record doesn't contain evidence of abuse, and so the judge refuses to free the child from his biological parents.

Moreover, many courts don't consider a child legally abandoned even if his parents haven't tried to see him in years, adds Marilyn Wright, an attorney for the Los Angeles Department of Adoptions. A social worker—who may have scores of cases—must find the parents (often living in different cities), notify them where and when they can see the child and provide them with transportation and even such services as job help or drug rehabilitation. Only if the parents still don't want to see the child has "abandonment" taken place.

Judge John Mendoza of Las Vegas, vice president of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, acknowledges "some partial validity" to social workers' complaints that judges are more interested in parents' rights than in children's. But he and other judges prefer to blame the lackadaisical attitudes of social-work agencies.

#### SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

Judge Mendoza, whose council recently reviewed foster-care case files in 23 courts, recommends a federal law requiring agencies getting federal foster-care funds to make plans for each child's removal, if possible, from foster care. He also wants frequent judicial reviews of such plans to be required.

In a similar stand, the staff of the National Commission for Children in Need of Parents, urges mandatory reviews, by a court

or other outside authority, of every agency's plans for every child every 60 days.

Other recommendations currently being studied by commission members include a full federal takeover of the system or a federal law withholding money from states whose own laws don't meet certain guidelines; clear standards for terminating parental rights; defining adoption as a service to children, not parents, so that the child's medical bills would be paid for regardless of the adopting parents' income; federal funds to pay for services, such as day care, that might prevent children from being removed from homes disrupted by hospitalization or other problems; federal or state licensing of tax-aided foster-care agencies, plus standards for social workers' qualifications, maximum caseloads, etc.; and a national exchange to register children needing homes and to facilitate placement. ●

#### WHERE ARE THE CARRIERS?

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in the latest issue of Horizons, is an article based on conversations with the naval expert Norman Polmar. The title of the article is taken from the conclusion of the article:

It's no wonder that whenever trouble flares up around the world, one of the first responses by our leaders in the White House, State Department, Pentagon and Congress: "Where are the carriers?"

I insert entire article at this point in the RECORD.

#### WHERE ARE THE CARRIERS?

(NOTE.—In their 56-year history, U.S. aircraft carriers have been active in more than 50 wars and lesser crises. Among the more memorable: the Korean conflict, early 1950s; Lebanon uprisings in 1958 and 1976; Cuban missile crisis, 1962; Dominican Republic civil war, 1965; Southeast Asian combat and evacuations, 1960s and 1970s; Jordan uprising, 1970; India-Pakistan war, 1971; Arab-Israeli war, 1973; and the Mayaguez "rescue," 1975. Clearly, when the United States wants to shake its fist, carrier aviation provides the muscle—ready for any degree of response.)

If you were to fly over Truk lagoon in an Air Micronesia airliner today, you would see a scattering of masts poking mournfully from the sparkling waters—tombstones for some 30 ships silenced three decades ago by U.S. aircraft carriers. These are the visible remains of thousands of tons of naval and merchant shipping sunk or disabled at the Pacific atoll, largely by Hellcats and Avengers from the fast carriers *Bunker Hill*, *Enterprise*, *Essex*, *Intrepid*, and *Yorktown*.

The striking power and extreme mobility of American aircraft carrier task groups revolutionized naval warfare. The carriers could destroy the enemy's fleets and his air power, preventing interference with our amphibious assaults. And they highlighted a basic flaw in Japan's island chain of "unsinkable carriers": the islands, like Truk, couldn't be moved to safety. But the aircraft carrier, truly a floating island, was able to elude its attackers while moving to and from the scene of action.

#### CARRIER IS MORE SURVIVABLE THAN LAND BASE

Despite the advent of advanced weapons, the aircraft carrier is more survivable than any land base. One big reason, Norman Polmar says, is that the ship cannot be pre-

targeted. An aerial or satellite photo of a land base, even if several months old, permits pinpointing of the target—firmly anchored in concrete—right down to the nearest foot. In contrast, the carrier could probably move more than 15 miles in any direction during an ICBM's time of flight. Although the enemy might know the ship's position precisely at a given time, the carrier could be anywhere within a 25,000-square-mile circle just three hours later.

#### FLEET'S BEST DEFENSE AGAINST CRUISE MISSILES

Today the carrier is the fleet's best defense against cruise missiles because its aircraft can attack most launching platforms—ships, aircraft, or submarines—before they are within missile-firing range. And, with proper warning, carrier-based Grumman F-14 fighters can shoot down some anti-ship missiles in flight with their long-range Phoenix missiles.

In fact, carriers proved highly survivable against guided missiles in World War II. More than 2,300 kamikaze attacks were made against U.S. ships, with carriers the principal targets. Although these suicide aircraft were controlled by the most sophisticated guidance system known—the human brain—they failed to sink a single fast carrier. Kamikazes did damage several American fast carriers, some rather severely. However, those were "thin-skinned" ships when compared to their British contemporaries which had armored flight decks, as do modern carriers. When, on several occasions, British flattops were hit by kamikazes, they were usually back in full operation as soon as the debris could be pushed off the flight deck.

No U.S. carriers designed in World War II or later have been sunk, despite their active role in many of more than 50 wars and lesser crises. Land bases have not fared as well. For example, all the jet-capable air bases in South Korea were overrun by enemy ground forces, not once but twice. In South Vietnam, more than 400 planes were destroyed on the ground and some 3,000 more damaged by enemy attacks. Also, not one of the dozens of major air bases that were built in the past 28 years on the Asian mainland remains available to U.S. forces today.

Similarly, most of the U.S. air bases that once ringed the Mediterranean—in Morocco, Greece, France, and Spain—are effectively gone. We spent some \$10 billion to build or lease bases in France, Libya, and Morocco. But they've all been "repossessed," something that has never happened to any of our aircraft carriers.

#### CARRIER IS TOUGHEST SHIP TO SINK

Today's large carrier, with armored flight deck, improved torpedo protection, and internal damage-limiting features, is the toughest ship in the world to sink. When nine large bombs with the explosive force of a half-dozen Soviet cruise missiles accidentally detonated on the flight deck of the nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, the ship was judged to be capable of resuming air operations within one hour of the accident, had the need arisen.

And, despite its size, a fast, large-deck carrier is not easy to track. An enemy planner who knows where the ship is today cannot automatically order her attacked tomorrow because his shadowing forces may lose contact or the carrier may move out of range of his land- or sea-based attack forces.

It's not that hard for even the world's largest warship, the nuclear-powered *Nimitz*, to "get lost." The ship can sail off at night in a silent EMCON (electronic emission control) mode, with a Grumman Hawkeye early-warning radar plane overhead to provide undetectable eyes, ears, and communications functions. Even a ship's infrared signature can be suppressed. Decoy merchant ships fitted with radar reflectors could also spoof enemy trackers, and it could take until daylight the next day for the enemy to figure out exactly who is where.

#### LARGE-DECK CARRIERS ARE BEST PROTECTED

The carrier's escorts—surface ships and submarines—also have warning and attack capabilities to defend the carrier. Of course, the principal defensive weapons of the carrier are her high-performance fighters and attack aircraft. The latter, augmented by ASW planes and helicopters, are equipped to destroy hostile surface ships and submarines before they can attack the carrier. But vulnerability must be a secondary consideration in evaluating aircraft carriers. As Admiral Elmo Zumwalt stated in 1971, when he was Chief of Naval Operations:

"We do not buy ships because they are invulnerable, but because they are useful despite their vulnerability, and then we work hard to minimize the vulnerability... The *Nimitz* class carriers... will be the best protected and least vulnerable carriers ever designed."

The only way the U.S. can maintain forward deployment in the world is to station large aircraft carriers and their air wings on the vast oceans that cover more than 70% of our planet. Today, two such carrier task groups are deployed in the Mediterranean (the Sixth Fleet), two in the Western Pacific (the Seventh Fleet), with one more normally operating out of Hawaii (the Third Fleet), and one along the Atlantic Coast and in the Gulf of Mexico (the Second Fleet).

To maintain four carriers forward in peacetime requires eight others in local operations, training, overhaul, and modernization. This seemingly inefficient two-back-for-one-forward deployment schedule is based mainly on the current personnel situation. In today's all-volunteer environment, the Navy must compete in the United States for skilled personnel to man its ships. Trained sailors are always in short supply. Even when not deployed, a flattop is often at sea for trials, training, and actual operations.

Generally, a carrier sailor spends half or more of his time at sea. In periods of international crisis or conflict, the percentage of carrier force forward-deployed climbs dramatically. During the Vietnam War, for example, well over half the total number of carriers were maintained in the combat zone, a ratio of about one-for-one.

The Navy now has 13 carriers in commission: eight post-World-War-II *Forrestal* types, the nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, the two nuclear *Nimitz*-class ships, and the wartime-built *Midway*. The 13th—the wartime-built *Coral Sea*—is a non-deploying ship, soon to be used only for pilot and reserve training. Another *Nimitz*-class ship—the *Vinson*—is scheduled to be completed in the early 1980s. Thus, in theory, the Navy will sail into the next decade with 12 modern carriers.

However, the oldest of the *Forrestal*-class carriers were commissioned in the mid-1950s. These ships must undergo an extensive modernization, known as Service Life Extensive Program (SLEP), to gain a service life of some 40-45 years. While one carrier is in the yard for SLEP, she must have a replacement in order to keep the force at 12 operational carriers. The *Midway* will permit operation of the 12th deployable carrier as well as the training ship into the 1980s.

But the *Midway* (completed in 1945 and modernized in the late '60s) and *Coral Sea* (1947) simply will not last beyond the mid-1980s. Then, in order to have 12 deployable flattops while "SLEPping" one *Forrestal* at a time, another "large-deck" carrier must be built.

#### BETTER TO BUY ONE CVN THAN ONE CVV

The Navy and Department of Defense are considering two large-deck designs, a 60,000-ton, oil-fired CVV and another 95,000-ton, improved nuclear-propelled *Nimitz* CVN. "I am convinced," says Polmar, "that Congress will fund only one more large-deck carrier in the next 5 to 10 years. In that case, I would rather have one more *Nimitz*-class CVN than just one CVV. The nuclear-pow-

ered carrier has a number of operational advantages over the CVV, including, of course, virtually unlimited high-speed endurance.

"If I were guaranteed two more CVVs," he adds, "then I would start considering that option. If guaranteed three or more CVVs, I'd jump at it."

Current cost estimates are \$2.3 billion for the next *Nimitz* CVN and up to \$1.75 billion for the first CVV. Some analysts immediately cite the comparative life-cycle fuel costs of the two ships to further demonstrate that the nuclear carrier is a better option; however, says Polmar, considering the additional costs for the CVN and certain other factors, it makes more sense to compare the ship construction costs. Put more simply, the additional \$550 million for a CVN provides a much greater combat capability because it carries nearly double the number of aircraft on a CVV, plus twice the ammunition and almost three times the aircraft fuel storage, and twice as many catapults, elevators, and propellers.

It's important to note, also, that the higher CVN cost includes the initial set of two reactor cores which will provide at least 13 years of operation. This is the equivalent of some 11 million barrels of fuel oil which would cost about \$360 million to buy, store, and deliver at today's prices.

#### NEED MORE THAN 12 CARRIERS

Actually in Polmar's view, the debate over holding to a 12-carrier force makes little sense, budgetary arguments notwithstanding. We actually need more than 12 large-deck carriers to meet our worldwide roles and commitments. The crucial need is for more air power—on land and sea—to offset the disparity between U.S. strength and that of our potential adversaries.

The trends have been made clear... and they are most disturbing. Polmar lists them as follows:

Decline of the U.S. Navy from more than 5,700 ships at the end of World War II, to just over 800 active ships before Vietnam, to less than 460 today.

The increasing capabilities and operations of the Soviet Navy.

The arming of several Third-World nations with modern aircraft and cruise missiles.

The demise of British carrier aviation.\*

Increased Western reliance on African and Middle Eastern resources.

All of these developments point to the need for an increase in U.S. tactical air power for use at sea worldwide. And, some of this can only come about through an increase in carriers.

V/STOL technology, once it matures, will surely provide a way of increasing the amount of air power we can deploy at sea. But it does not rule out the need for the conventional type of aircraft carrier. The latter will still be the most efficient way of concentrating air power—whether it be vertical or conventional takeoff and landing.

#### V/STOL CARRIERS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR LARGE-DECKS

Within the next few years, Polmar figures, advanced fixed-wing V/STOL aircraft (as distinct from helicopters) should prove themselves suited to shipboard use. There already has been, he notes, a significant degree of success with use of the Marine Corps AV-8A Harrier jet at sea. Even further advanced V/STOLs will offer the extremely important opportunity of putting more fixed-wing aircraft to sea—on aircraft carriers and, possibly, on cruisers, destroyers, and amphibious vessels as well.

Such new V/STOL planes will permit us to

\*The last remaining conventional British carrier, HMS *Ark Royal*, is scheduled for decommissioning within a year. Then the Royal Navy will retain only a limited carrier capability with helicopters and V/STOL aircraft at sea.

build considerably smaller carriers of a new class, the V/STOL Support Ship (VSS), which should weigh-in at about 25,000 tons. The VSS carrier would be deployed not as a substitute for, but rather in addition to, our 12 or 13 large-deck carriers. And there is every reason to predict, says Polmar, that V/STOL aircraft will eventually share space on the large-decks with F-14s, A-6Es, and other carrier-based aircraft, especially in antisubmarine warfare (ASW) and airborne early warning (AEW) roles.

The VSS would, in Polmar's view, embark perhaps a dozen V/STOL aircraft plus a similar number of helicopters. The V-planes would perform limited strike, reconnaissance, air intercept, and other tactical missions in areas where we might not, for economic reasons, be able to deploy a large-deck carrier or where the potential threat was limited.

Thus, the VSS would bring fixed-wing air power to bear in areas and situations that do not warrant use of the more extensive and powerful capabilities of the large-deck carrier air wing. In particular, the smaller carrier would conduct anti-submarine warfare operations in mid-ocean areas where the size of the larger carrier and its fighter/attack aircraft would be superfluous. In addition to ASW, the VSS would use fixed-wing V/STOL aircraft and helicopters for AEW, radar jamming of missile attacks against convoys, interception of enemy reconnaissance planes, and mine counter-measures.

The same V/STOL aircraft would also be operated in smaller numbers from cruisers and possibly destroyers, for reconnaissance, over-the-horizon targeting for ship-launched cruise missiles, and even for long-range ASW against contacts located with the ship's long-range passive sonar arrays (TACTASS). Of course, the Type "A" V/STOL concepts being studied by the U.S. Navy for ASW and AEW would also be available in a troop-carrying variant for amphibious assault, either from specialized amphibious ships or, on an emergency basis, from the VSS.

#### CARRIER AIRCRAFT FIGURE IN FUTURE USE OF THE SEAS

Inevitably, Polmar asserts, the future of the large-deck carrier—and all other possible variants for that matter—figures pre-eminently in the future of the U.S. Navy, despite the debate and controversy that currently obscure it. Based on his grasp of naval history and close analyses of probable future conflict scenarios, Polmar feels it is safe to conclude that manned carrier-based aircraft will remain a dominant factor in the future use of the seas by the United States.

Land-based aircraft such as the Navy's P-3 Orion long-range patrol plane and even "navalized" B-52 bombers could doubtlessly undertake many naval missions. However, for the foreseeable future, such high-performance aircraft as the F-14 Tomcat fighter, A-6E Intruder all-weather/night attack plane, and other specialized types, embarked on forward-deployed carriers, will be vital to the United States, if this nation is to continue to derive political, economic, and military benefits from use of the seas.

While noting that sea-based air can play a particularly valuable role in Third World areas, Polmar tends to downplay the need for carrier-based action in possible NATO-Warsaw Pact conflicts. Of all potential tinderbox areas in the world, he feels the Central European front is the least likely to flare up first. The fact that the U.S. and its NATO allies have faced Soviet-led forces for so long—armed, trained, in place, and psyched-up for any of dozens of well-rehearsed eventualities—diminishes, in his view, the chances of actual conflict.

"Were the Soviets to move against NATO," says Polmar, "I believe it would be more likely to be against the northern or southern

flanks. Here, again, the U.S. aircraft carriers in the eastern Mediterranean could be exceedingly valuable in view of the limited availability and relative vulnerability of the relatively few land bases for air responses to protect NATO's flanks."

#### CARRIER AIR COVERS MIDDLE EAST OIL

The carriers in the eastern Mediterranean or in the northwest Indian Ocean also represent the only effective U.S. tactical airpower in the Middle East—the region that supplies vital oil resources to the West. And, notes Polmar, most of the region is within range of long-range *Backfire* bombers based in the Soviet homeland which are closer to the vital oil routes than any existing air bases in the U.S. or possible ones in the NATO countries. "Aggravating the threat to our interests in the Middle East," he adds, "is the possibility that the Soviets may strengthen their own tactical air capabilities in the region by sending their *Kiev*-class V/STOL carriers into the Indian Ocean."

Reflecting the lesson of the impermanency of U.S. bases in foreign countries, airfields have become somewhat questionable alternatives for U.S. leaders to consider when evaluating our military or political options in the Middle East or many other troubled areas. The October 1973 "Yom Kippur War" showed how precarious even the NATO bases were in support of U.S. national interests.

#### CARRIERS WERE READY OFF LEBANON

Then, too, there was the recent crisis in Lebanon. Our carriers were first on the scene to cover the evacuation of U.S. nationals and conducted tactical air patrols off the Lebanese coast for 52 days before being relieved by Air Force units. On a typical day during that crisis, the *Nimitz* carrier task force was in position south of Crete ready to back up the *America* task force which, in turn, was deployed south of Cyprus in position to support the U.S. Marine Corps amphibious ready group on station 25 miles off Lebanon. At the same time, a further option was provided by the F-14s and A-6Es of another carrier task force operating in the Indian Ocean within three hours' flying time of the crisis area.

"The point I want to get across here," declares Polmar, "is that the flexibility and striking power of those three carrier task forces were many times greater than the U.S. land-based tactical air power available in that part of the world . . . or any other forces for that matter."

"It's no wonder that whenever trouble flares up around the world, one of the first responses by our leaders in the White House, State Department, Pentagon, and Congress is: 'Where are the carriers?'"

#### STARTING TO FARM ISN'T IMPOSSIBLE

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Keith Wilkey, farm editor of Quincy Herald-Whig, Quincy, Ill., is one of those agricultural journalists who not only covers the day-to-day news but who has a keen feeling for perspective, putting the past into focus with the present, which goes meaningfully beyond a simple nostalgic approach.

This is evidenced by the following column, "Starting To Farm Isn't Impossible," which appeared in the August 22

issue of the Herald-Whig. We commend it to your reading and to those in your constituencies who may have that same hopeful yearning to become farmers.

#### STARTING TO FARM ISN'T IMPOSSIBLE

(By Keith Wilkey)

The farmer who had been sitting in the porch swing rose to greet the young man who had walked up the front walk. "Hi, Jim. Come on up and sit down a while; take the weight off your feet."

The two men made small talk for a while. The farmer was in his mid-sixties, while Jim was approaching his 27th birthday. Presently Jim's tone took a different note.

"Mr. Johnston," he said, "I would like to get started farming, but I can't see any way. Everyone tells me that it is virtually impossible for a young man to start farming today, and I'm beginning to believe it."

The older man didn't answer right away; he seemed to be gathering words and thoughts. "Son," he said slowly, "there are some things that are impossible all right. Starting in farming is certainly one of them . . . for some. But not for everyone."

Jim started to speak, but Mr. Johnson continued; "I don't want to bore you Jim, but listen a minute. My grandfather came to this country during the German immigration of the 1850's. When he got off the ship he had less than \$10 in his pockets; didn't know a soul and couldn't speak a word of English. When he died he had owned this 240-acre farm for 30 years. So be careful what you call impossible."

The young man answered, "Yes, but costs weren't so high in those days. You didn't have to have all this expensive machinery and land could be bought for a low figure. It was easier to do in those days."

Again the elderly man paused. "Remember, son, he didn't get started immediately. His first job was being a handy man around a wagon factory. But he wanted to be a farmer and become a land owner."

"He worked as a farm hand for nine years; that's a long time to work virtually as a common day laborer—nine years. Finally he could rent a small patch and he farmed that for the next six years. That was 15 years and he still hadn't made what we could call much of a start today."

"Fifteen years!" ejaculated the young man. "If I'd do that today I would be 42 years old before I could buy a farm . . . practically an old man!"

The wisdom and tolerance that come with years restrained the farmer's answer. "Son, today it is really easier, and you know it isn't going to come over night. You have a pretty good job in town, don't you?" The young man said he did. "What time do you get off in the afternoon . . . 4 o'clock?"

"3:30."

"That 2:30 God's time. You could just about get in a good half day. I'll tell you what I'll do . . . I'll help you and we will see if we can't find some farmer about ready to retire, or a man who wants to give full-time to a city job. Then we'll try and find a little patch where you can raise some hogs. You can buy a tractor for \$400 or \$500 and comparable machinery. You are mechanically-minded, and can keep it running."

"When you've made a start, you can get an operating loan (OL) from Farmers Home Administration. When the situation is right, you can apply for an FmHA farm ownership loan. But you can't do all this in a few weeks. And it will take hard work, discouragement, disappointment and perseverance."

"Not everyone has these qualities, plus good judgment. But you do. You'll make it."

A silence fell between the two men. Then the old man spoke again; "You see, son, you have it easier than grandpa did." ●

## TRIAL OF ALI BHUTTO

## HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, judicial proceedings against heads-of-state and former heads-of-state are occurring with increasing regularity.

The case of former Pakistani Prime Minister Zulfikar A. Bhutto has been recently described in an article in *The Nation* by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, following a visit to Pakistan.

The impeachment proceedings against former President Richard M. Nixon furnish a standard of comparison, as do the proceedings against India's former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

In the continuing battle to prove to our young people that the systems of justice of the Western World merit our continued resistance to communism and a continued adherence to Anglo-Saxon standards of fairness, I am hopeful that the Pakistani Supreme Court will shortly bend over backwards to remove all sense of political influence or vengeance from their nation's judicial procedures in Mr. Bhutto's case.

I am attaching Ramsey Clark's observations on the subject for the review of our colleagues:

## THE TRIAL OF ALI BHUTTO AND THE FUTURE OF PAKISTAN

(By Ramsey Clark)

(NOTE.—Ramsey Clark, Attorney General of the United States from 1967 to 1969, recently returned from Pakistan where he went as a private citizen to observe the legal proceedings in the case involving the former President, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, now under sentence of death for murder. He was present for the opening arguments in Pakistan's Supreme Court in Bhutto's appeal and while he was there he met with General Zia ul-Haq, leader of the coup that ousted Bhutto in 1977, with Law Minister A. K. Brohi and with other government officials. He also conferred with lawyers, judges, labor leaders, politicians and students and met with the U.S. Ambassador and his senior political adviser.)

Rarely has a criminal proceeding held such potential to alter history as does the trial of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Its impact can reach beyond the fate of a man and the unity of a nation to affect fundamentally economic, political and military power worldwide. The Supreme Court of Pakistan is now considering an appeal from his conviction for murder and the sentence of death. Its decision is expected in the very near future. Executions are carried out immediately following final judgment in Pakistan.

The idea of Pakistan, nurtured by a poet, Allama Iqbal, and consummated by a statesman, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, was fragile from conception. To bind a political union of widely differing, proud and often warring people by a single tie, the religion of Islam, was a unique experiment. The dream of Pan Islam fitted neatly with desires of the Islamic populations of British India to be independent of the majority Hindu population when "freedom came at midnight" to the subcontinent of Asia. The result was a new nation of East and West Pakistan divided by 1,000 miles of land mass.

The West contained four distinct regions with diverse and sometimes hostile populations: the dominant Punjab, the North

West Frontier Province, the Sind and Baluchistan. The traumatic separation from India in 1947 split both Punjab in the west and Bengal in the east between India and Pakistan, resulting in waves of migrating millions and recurring massacres. Pakistan, containing the poorest areas of the former colony, was cut off from markets, industry and the continuity of government administration, all primarily located in India.

Movements for political separation were powerful forces throughout the new nation from its birth. A bloody civil war began in East Pakistan in March 1971. Four months after the India-USSR treaty of August 1971, Indian invaded East Pakistan and in two weeks crushed West Pakistan forces, ending the war. East Pakistan seceded and became Bangladesh. It contained the majority of the population of the former nation and an even greater majority of its poverty and problems. Henry Kissinger's "tilt" to Pakistan at that time probably deterred India from invading and partitioning the West.

Separatist movements were not limited to tensions between East and West. Within the West there were, among others, a Baluchistan Liberation Movement sometimes based in Iraq and a Pakhtoonistan movement involving both Baluchistan and the North West Frontier—giving rise to the possibility of a new nation in the event of the breakup of Pakistan, a nation that would include Afghanistan and most of Pakistan west of the Indus, excluding the Sind and Punjab, forming a corridor hundreds of miles wide from the Soviet Union to the Arabian Sea. The movements have involved guerrilla warfare countered by martial law and military casualties that may exceed those of the war in the East.

Bhutto came from a wealthy land-owning family in the very poor Sind. Graduated from the University of California at Berkeley and with a law degree from Oxford, he was Minister of Commerce for Pakistan at 30 and Foreign Minister when 33. He resigned as Foreign Minister in protest against military government policies in 1966, having established good relations for his country with China. He was imprisoned briefly in 1968 by President Ayub Khan for criticizing the government.

Founding the grass-roots Pakistan Peoples Party, Bhutto became the dominant political figure in the West by 1970. After the war in which East Pakistan was lost, he became President in 1972 (the first civilian chief of state in more than twenty years) and then in 1973, the first elected Prime Minister. Presenting himself as a democrat, a Socialist, a Populist and reformer, he initiated programs for land reform, economic development, social services, family planning, a strong Pakistan Peoples Party, internal security, Moslem leadership and international prominence based on nonalignment.

It is conceded by friend and foe alike that Bhutto is keenly intelligent, popular and charismatic. On the international scene he was called on to mediate in Cyprus, Korea and elsewhere. He assisted in preliminary contacts that led to President Nixon's visit to China. He negotiated difficult prisoner exchanges with India and Bangladesh, restored relations with Bangladesh, and eased tensions with India.

The United States expressed its strong disapproval of his role in calling for a Third World Summit, fearing concerted action by poor countries. President Carter urged Bhutto to abandon plans for a nuclear reprocessing plant France agreed to build in Pakistan. (India has had the bomb since 1974.)

Within the nation, he helped bring about the adoption of a new written Constitution in 1973 which some saw as a foundation for democratic government protecting human rights and securing economic justice. Economic policies stimulated growth despite difficult international problems including ris-

ing energy costs. Agriculture, health, education and housing were major concerns for his government and some progress was made.

But his years in power were in most ways the worst of times. He assumed office in the aftermath of a humiliating military defeat, the severing of the nation, loss of most of its population to Bangladesh and the psychological and physical impairment of the dominant power in the society—the Army. Floods (including those of 1973 which were called the worst natural disaster in the area's history), earthquakes and other calamities befell the people during those years.

And above all there was the random violence, gun-running, guerrilla skirmishing, constant tension and high risk of revolution or invasion caused by political, tribal, cultural and international ambitions for power and dominance in surviving Pakistan and its very different parts. The Shah of Iran strongly supported Bhutto's efforts to contain the separatist movements. The Shah has no interest in seeing another state arise capable of dominating the strategic Persian Gulf, particularly a Baluch state that could lay claim to the loyalty of Iran's own sizable Baluch population. (Within Iran live one-third of the Baluch people.) World powers, principally the United States, the USSR and China are also keenly interested in Pakistan.

Growing instability was addressed with tough military and police measures. While parliamentary government endured, there were political arrests and detentions numbering in the thousands, martial law for whole cities and provinces at times, and a growing Federal Security Force not greatly concerned for life and liberty. Amnesty International, among others, protested human rights violations in a well-documented 1976 report.

The first six months of 1977 were difficult. Bhutto's popular appeal seemed to slip badly with the turbulence and the harsh government reaction to it. He called elections which were held in March and the surprisingly strong showing of his party brought immediate outcry of vote fraud by other parties. Hundreds of protests and demonstrations, including some by women and children, led to violence and deaths and brief periods of martial law in major cities. Conditions were reminiscent of Chile before the golpe in 1973. Though most observers concede Bhutto candidates actually received a clear majority, probably 60 percent of the votes, a settlement among the parties that might have restored relative calm had not been reached by July, and new elections were planned for October.

On July 5, 1977 there was a bloodless military coup. General Zia ul-Haq, who had attended advanced command courses in the United States and the United Kingdom between 1972 and 1975, assumed government power as Chief Martial Law Administrator. The stated purpose was to stop the "drift toward political chaos." But drastic police measures were taken which created doubt as to General Zia's purpose. Severe penalties were immediately promulgated by fiat. Martial Law Order 12 provided for preventive detention and it was used liberally. Martial Law Regulation 11 of July 5 declared simply: "No one shall, either directly or indirectly, participate in any political activity. Maximum punishment 5 years Rigorous Imprisonment, fine and/or whipping not exceeding 10 stripes." Martial Law Regulation 13 provided the same punishment for any form of communication critical of the Armed Forces or "calculated to create alarm or despondency amongst the public."

Public executions and floggings were authorized and carried out. The amputation of a hand was made legal punishment. General Zia says, "It is the humiliating rather than the punitive aspect of flogging which is important." He tells one that the death penalty and life imprisonment were not deterrents to criminal conduct but the threat

of flogging was. His new Law Minister A. K. Brohi says floggings are necessary to control the people and asks what do you do with a "mad dog." He defends stoning women to death for adultery and is the principal government spokesman justifying these cruel, inhuman and degrading punishments as being ordained by the law of Islam.

Bhutto was arrested on the night of the coup and held for several weeks. Most of the high officials in his administration have been confined. Leaders of the Pakistan Peoples Party were also arrested. Many are still in prison, joined this year by leaders of other parties. Bhutto, released to campaign for the October elections, was greeted by enormous crowds. In early September he was arrested and charged with ordering the murder of a minor political figure in November 1974. General Zia publicly spoke of documentary evidence establishing Bhutto's guilt. Released on *habeas corpus* by a court, he was promptly rearrested under both military and civil process and has been detained virtually incommunicado since September 17, 1977.

While he was originally to be tried by a military court, it was decided he should be tried before five members of the High Court in Lahore. The two justices who had granted his writ of *habeas corpus* were excluded. The presiding judge was acting Chief Justice by appointment of General Zia; he was also an old enemy who had heard Bhutto's case when he was arrested in 1968. He should have been disqualified.

The murder charge, if believed, takes the case out of politics. Officials in the Zia government assure you this is a routine murder case. (Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines, a master at authoritarian deceit, has used an ordinary murder charge to convict and condemn Benigno Aquino, a major political opponent, to death.)

This murder charge, while the most serious that can be made, was not taken seriously at first. The allegations themselves are so inherently improbable. The murder rate in Pakistan is high enough to make Houston seem peaceful. This assault was said to have been an attempt to kill a man named Ahmad Raza Kasuri, a dissident in the Pakistan Peoples Party. On June 3, 1974 Bhutto had become irritated with Mr. Kasuri on the floor of Parliament and expressed his feelings sharply, but not threateningly. This incident is the prosecution's case for a motive. Others had spoken far more sharply. Even threateningly, including Kasuri himself who said of another group, "Time had come for their being killed."

Kasuri's father was apparently killed by automatic gunfire which hit a moving car occupied, according to the evidence by Kasuri, his father, mother and an aunt, near Lahore shortly after midnight on November 12, 1974. Kasuri, who had no way of knowing who fired or ordered the shooting, immediately blamed Bhutto and used the charge politically. In 1972 he had claimed nine attempts had been made on his life for which he had blamed another politician. He claimed three attempts were made on his life in 1974. An investigation of the death of Kasuri's father was closed in 1975 without charges being brought. From 1975 through June 1977 Kasuri sought through intermediaries to establish friendly relations with Bhutto, obtained a meeting with the Prime Minister and returned to the party.

Shortly after the coup, two members of the Federal Security Force were arrested, questioned and confessed to the shooting. Masood Mahmud, Director General of the FSF, was taken into protective custody on July 5, 1977, and on August 14 wrote General Zia making "a clean breast of the misdeeds of the Federal Security Force under the orders of Bhutto." He later confessed to ordering the assault on instructions from Bhutto. His testimony is the only evidence

directly linking the Prime Minister to the murder. It is more than suspect. He says Bhutto threatened him and made him personally responsible for "taking care" of Kasuri, commanding him to instruct a subordinate, Mian Muhammad Abbas, to "produce the dead body of Ahmad Raza Kasuri or his body bandaged all over." The body was never produced, of course. Abbas confessed, and then retracted, then on July 10, 1978 his lawyer again filed a confession before the Supreme Court.

The trial was not fair. The acting Chief Justice's conduct would make Judge Julius Hoffman in the Chicago 7 trial a model of decorum. He publicly commented on Bhutto's "guilt" outside the courtroom before conviction. His prejudice is spread through his 145-page decision. Even there he could not restrain himself from characterizing Bhutto, who did not present a defense, as a "compulsive liar," "unruly," "hurling threats as well as insults on us."

As one illustration, before the defense abandoned the case, Bhutto's lawyers had cross-examined Masood Mahmud, the prosecution's second witness. He was asked whether he had caused police to hold a Mrs. Ibrat while "rats were let loose in her *shalwar* and its ends tied." The purpose obviously was to examine the credibility and character of the witness. The acting Chief Justice, in referring to this cross-examination, wrote: "It appears that these questions were put to prove that P.W. 2 (Mahmud) was well-qualified from the point of view of the principal accused (Bhutto) to be appointed as Director General of the Federal Security Force."

The evidence presented against Bhutto, even if believed, would not support a verdict of guilt. The prosecution case was based entirely on several witnesses who were detained until they confessed, who changed and expanded their confessions and testimony with each reiteration, who contradicted themselves and each other, who, except for Masood Mahmud, were relating what others said, whose testimony led to four different theories of what happened, who were contradicted by ballistics and other physical evidence and who were absolutely uncorroborated by an eyewitness, direct evidence, or physical evidence. There were records showing that one of the FSF officers who allegedly fired the shots was in Karachi at the time, but no defense evidence was presented on this. Each of these witnesses had an urgent motive to inculpate the Prime Minister, each alleged that he resisted and protested but was forced by threat and command to participate in the shooting. That Kasuri remained alive in spite of the alleged fury of the Prime Minister did not seem to affect belief that his murder was ordered. Kasuri himself was shown to be a highly erratic, untruthful and opportunistic politician of no standing who sought favor from Bhutto until his overthrow.

Critical stages of the trial were conducted in camera. Comments and rulings by the court and conflicts between counsel and the court caused Bhutto to discharge his attorneys and boycott the trial before the prosecution completed its case. The remaining prosecution witnesses were not cross-examined, no defense case was presented and Mr. Bhutto was unrepresented during the concluding, critical phases of the trial.

All five defendants—Bhutto, the two FSF officers who allegedly fired the shots and their two superiors who were charged with participating in carrying out the order allegedly communicated by Masood Mahmud—were sentenced to hang, Mahmud, who alone testified that Bhutto ordered the acts, was pardoned. Efforts of the other four defendants to involve Bhutto and justify their conduct did not save them, at least not yet.

The decision of the High Court is full of

errors of fact and law. Its characterizations of evidence show its bias. There was no objective effort to determine fact.

The case is now on appeal in the Supreme Court of Pakistan at Rawalpindi. There from Saturday through Wednesday each week, the nine justices engage in a meticulous review of the trial record. They are impressive men, learned in the law and skillful in their examination of the trial transcript, counsel and each other. The Chief Justice Anwar ul-Haq questions most frequently, but all participate in a lively manner.

The Court has maintained some judicial power. In an important decision in Bhutto's wife Nusrat's application for a writ of *habeas corpus*, the Court boldly declared that precedents suspending judicial power under similar circumstances through the law or necessity were in error. But no writ was issued and Mrs. Bhutto remains incommunicado in custody, though not charged with any crime.

The Supreme Court of Pakistan is not in an easy position. The Chief Justice was selected by General Zia who had removed his predecessor. Four of his associates were appointed by General Zia. Everyone is looking for political motivation. Each justice has the rule of law in Pakistan, his professional reputation, his personal future, perhaps his own freedom and life before him in this case. The decision will be historic. It is due within weeks now.

We shall see whether the world sits quietly by and watches if Ali Bhutto is executed. Just 51 years old, he moved impressively on the international stage for nearly two decades. Many viewed him as a "scholar statesman," a phrase used by Kasuri in 1976. Political vengeance can be dressed up as a pure criminal trial. Such a method defames former leaders and dissipates support for them. It is not a happy or humane precedent. Even a commutation of the death sentence by the Supreme Court or by General Zia will only diminish the personal tragedy and perhaps temper political significance of this method of destroying democratic institutions.

For Pakistan and Islam, the execution of Bhutto would have devastating effects. If an election were held today, most concede that Bhutto would win overwhelmingly. He is the one leader with broadly based popular support in Pakistan. His prosecution and his mistreatment in prison, where no foreign observer has been permitted to see him or examine conditions of his confinement, have created new and greater public sympathy for him. Even some soldiers have openly expressed their view that the charges were fabricated.

Martial law does not sit easy on the people. Public lashings of members of the press (more than eighty have been arrested) and of many poor people has caused a bad reaction, so that General Zia was quick to observe in mid-July that there had been no lashings for four months. Still, even government-controlled daily papers report sentences of imprisonment and lashing by military courts presided over by a major or a colonel. The Law Minister, who believes in the law of the lash and says both Islam and the people demand it, doesn't seem to hear even supporters of General Zia say that the floggings, executions and threatened amputations are causing greater unrest and alienation. Both at home and abroad the Draconian punishments have greatly damaged the nation and its religion.

The execution of Bhutto would be extremely destabilizing. Rioting, even civil war, is a possibility. The military is not of a single mind. Eighty percent of the soldiers are from Punjab, which creates hostility in Sind, Baluchistan and the North West Frontier. A foreign power with a suitcase full of money might easily establish another General.

Poor Pakistan with its staggering human problems, hunger, violence, illiteracy, illness, population growth, underdeveloped economy, fragile confederation of dissimilar and warring people needs help. A haunting part of the planet running from the Arabian Sea coast to Nanga Parbat in the Himalayas, most of its more than 70 million people live in staggering want.

But foreign interest in Pakistan may prove its greatest problem and peril. It is the wrong country, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. And it will not be left alone.

Afghanistan it is tempting because it contains many people of common tribe and culture in the Frontier and Baluchistan. It also offers access to the sea, the chance to realize a greater Afghanistan and a vast increase in power. To Iran it presents a threat on a long border with a large common population of Baluchs and the threat of encirclement by hostile forces from the Arabian Sea to the Turkish border, along with the possibility of strategic domination by the USSR of the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea, the Middle East. To India the prospect of the disintegration of Pakistan offers the chance to consolidate Punjab, to return to British India's borders geographically, along with the elimination of an enemy, control over a wide buffer to the Soviet Union. These are historical and regional concerns.

To China, the Soviet Union and the United States, Pakistan is of the greatest strategic importance. From the days of the wars with the Ottoman Empire, Czarist Russia sought warm-water ports. Pakistan has hundreds of coastal miles on the Arabian Sea, dominating, with Oman, the entrance to the Persian Gulf. Control of Pakistan would directly increase Soviet power over Middle East oil, magnify its influence with India, give it access to the Indian Ocean and to East Africa and greatly contribute to the encirclement of China. With the new, stronger Soviet influence in Afghanistan, destabilization in Pakistan holds enormous meaning.

China, with a common border and open highway from Sinkiang to Karachi, may see Pakistan as a key to containing Soviet influence and holding a protected position throughout the subcontinent and Southeast Asia. With Pakistan controlled by the Soviets, China would be cut off on the west, and India, Burma and Thailand would be more vulnerable to influence by the USSR.

The United States may see in the balance the Middle East and its vast oil reserves, along with greatly altered influence in southern Asia and eastern Africa. People in Pakistan speak of CIA activity in establishing Zia. They name names. It is believable to many. After all, is not Iran—"we helped restore the Shah to his throne," William Colby says—the CIA's proudest achievement?

Whatever the cause, the United States is again in the position of supporting a military dictatorship, harsher in its public pronouncements than any, even claiming religious authority for its harsh rule.

General Zia may have greater difficulty maintaining himself in power than Marcos or General Pinochet or Park or the neighboring Shah. He is unknown. He is inexperienced. He has not been judged effective by international observers. He presides over historic dissension and contemporary turbulence. He rules by the threat of the lash with absolute authority. He postpones elections.

And he may execute Ali Bhutto. The role of the United States should be clear by now. We cannot live other nations' lives for them. We can only live by our own principles and believe that right may make right.

We should stand for life and implore with all our moral suasion a commutation of the death sentence. We should stand for justice and urge freedom, or—if the facts warrant prosecution, which I have not seen—a new and fair trial for Ali Bhutto. We should stand

for democracy and urge popular elections in Pakistan at the earliest date by which all parties and candidates can be fairly presented and voting honestly monitored. We should urge an immediate end to martial law and cruel, inhuman and degrading punishments. We should stand for humanity and send massive economic aid, assuring delivery to those in greatest need—offering food, independence in food production, health care, education, an expanding, independent economy, decent housing and human dignity for all the people of Pakistan. It is to these issues that our imagination, energy and foreign policy should be addressed. ●

#### AN OBSERVATION ON CAPITOL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent attention paid to future plans by the Architect of the Capitol for the U.S. Congress has given each of us cause to ponder the future of this immediate area.

A similar controversy to that in Washington existed in California's capitol area when Jerry Brown became Governor. A recent column by Neal Peirce accurately describes the innovative steps the California State architect, Sim Van der Ryn, took to humanize Sacramento's plans.

I commend this article to all my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 3, 1978]

SACRAMENTO BUILDS, WASHINGTON EMBELLISHES

(By Neal R. Peirce)

SACRAMENTO.—The truly frightening plans of the architect of the U.S. Capitol to construct as many as 16 grandiose new marble mausoleums, otherwise known as Senate and House office buildings, and a refreshing counterpoint in California's capital city.

The Washington plans—so far just alternative proposals—are massive aggrandizing, and likely to cost several billion dollars. Sacramento is looking instead to low-rise, energy-efficient, human-scale buildings, interspersed with housing, restaurants and shops in what its designers hope will be a 24-hour-a-day living environment.

The total cost of Sacramento's proposed six buildings is expected to be \$80 million to \$100 million, most or all of it recouped by terminating expensive leases for government offices in privately owned buildings around Sacramento. California is building at a cost of \$60 a square foot; the heavily marbled Hart Senate Office Building, now under construction in Washington, is costing \$101 a square foot, a figure critics say could rise to \$185. (The future of the Hart Building is currently in some doubt because the House recently voted to deny \$54.8 million to cover its cost overruns.)

The full scope of the federal architect's edifice ambitions was recently brought to light by the National Journal's Richard Cohen. He pierced through the obfuscatory jargon of an official report to reveal building plans that would consume most of the placid grassland between the existing Senate office buildings and Union Station, send a new group of House office buildings sprawling to the south of the Capitol complex and devour part of the Capitol Hill Historic District. That area of charming townhouses was de-

scribed in Capitol Architect George White's report as "an unacceptable neighbor to new House office buildings." He said the townhouses "should be rehabilitated"—a phrase reminiscent of the military's approach to troublesome villages during the Vietnam war.

The architect even would force the U.S. Supreme Court to evacuate Capitol Hill entirely, though he generously noted the Court "probably should be in Washington." The present Court building, it was proposed could become an adjunct of Congress or the Library of Congress. The plan also expansively proposes adding close to 8,000 new congressional parking spaces—presumably free, like the existing 7,676 Capitol Hill spaces, even though public downtown parking costs \$3 to \$4 daily.

Until the 1960s, the Senate and House made do with a total of three office buildings. Now there are five, with the sixth under construction—all necessary, architect White claims, because of national population growth. Sen. John H. Chafee (R-R.I.), a chief critic of Capitol Hill's "Mussolini-style" new structures, calls White's claim hogwash. Chafee notes that the congressional staff has expanded 300% in 20 years (latest total: 18,370), while total U.S. population has grown only 25%.

California state payrolls, like those on Capitol Hill, grew topsy-turvy in the '60s and '70s. But even before Proposition 13, the state had done an about-face on its capital plan. In the early '60s, the state bought and razed structures in 50 square blocks south of the Capitol. Gov. Jerry Brown told me the plan amounted "to kicking out all the people, putting up huge, tall government buildings, creating a bureaucratic monoculture"—even though the proposal emerged from the administration of Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, his father.

Then came Ronald Regan, with his free-enterprise bias. He decided to lease needed new office space, rather than build and so cleared acres became a desert of parking lots.

Jerry Brown, taking office in 1975, moved to create an entirely new capital area plan by appointing a broadly representative advisory committee of government officials, businessmen and neighborhood spokesmen. And he picked a highly unconventional state architect, Sim Van der Ryn, a UC Berkeley professor, counterculture ecologist and founder of the communal Farralones Institute.

Van der Ryn says the new plan is intended to be "sensibly scaled to people, to include a lively diversity of uses, and to work with the environment" of the Sacramento Valley by using lower buildings, and courtyards, trees and narrow spaces to create shade. In between the government structures will be 2,400 units of new housing, as well as restaurants and shops, built and operated by the private sector under long-term leases.

One major street will become a pedestrian mall; use of private autos will be discouraged and reliance on mass transit and bicycles encouraged. The few remaining old structures will be rehabilitated and recycled and efforts will be made to retain housing for low-income people along with newer units for the more affluent. The entire complex will be within 10 minutes' walking time of the Capitol, now undergoing repair to make it earthquake-proof.

The energy-saving theme is illustrated by the first new office building, a climate-sensitive four-story structure to be completed by spring of 1980. Designed by Van der Ryn and a team of young architects and ecologists, it will have an exposed concrete structure acting as a thermal mass, hidden bedrock and a spacious central atrium topped by skylights—all especially designed to store, exchange and distribute heat in winter and cool air in summer. To ward off the summer sun (temperatures here often reach 100 degrees), the plan includes automatically controlled canvas



sunshades along the exterior walls. Backup air conditioning and heating units should rarely be needed. Van der Ryn claims that the \$17 million building—compared to standard structures of the same size—will use 40% less energy and thus save \$28 million over 50 years.

The contrast to the new congressional office buildings, energy gluttons all, could scarcely be more striking.

For a second building, Van der Ryn's office sponsored a competition for energy-efficient designs. He received a startling 41 submissions, many of them highly imaginative—seeming proof of growing interest among architects in active and passive solar systems. The winning design wasn't done by some small, ecology-minded firm, but rather by Benham Blair and Associates, one of the country's largest architectural-engineering conglomerates. It involves two buildings. One will be buried under a landscaped park providing thermal "earth insulation." Thirteen small apartment houses, to be built by a private developer, will dot the same park. The second building will be above ground, hidden behind a giant solar "slab" set at a 45-degree angle.

The sensitive, imaginative impulses of the Sacramento plan may spread in the coming years—expressions of a new ethos in the design of civic buildings and their relation to their physical and human environments. "To the extent our capital plan succeeds," says Gov. Brown, "we will send out a message . . . that urban living makes sense." Architect of the U.S. Capitol: Please note. ●

#### REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS NOTES ARMS CONTROL NEEDS

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, our colleague from Michigan, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, sent around a letter to some of us, and I am taking the liberty of placing a portion of that in the RECORD.

JOHN CONYERS has testified several times before the Budget Committee on the warped priorities that we as a nation have and of the calamity that awaits us if there is not a shift in priorities.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading his letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1978.

I want to share with you and other concerned colleagues a few thoughts about the Special United Nations Session on Disarmament that concluded a month ago in New York.

Chuck Whalen's weekly newsletters on the Session were extremely helpful in furthering understanding of the issues. Paul Simon's excellent analysis of the conference's results provided an important outline of the problems and obstacles that stand in the way of significant break-throughs in halting the arms race. We were well-represented at this first international disarmament conference in 46 years, and Chuck is to be commended for his leadership.

It is difficult, however, not to be left with the sinking feeling that the nations and citizens of the world are headed for catastrophe unless far greater attention is brought to the issue of the arms race and far greater will is summoned to take the actions necessary to reverse it.

A few benchmarks indicate the sweeping changes in the military and technological structure of the world that ought to compel us to deal more urgently and fundamentally with arms control and disarmament.

The United States and the Soviet Union possess more than 50,000 strategic and tactical nuclear weapons twice the number that existed only 8 years ago;

7 nations already possess nuclear weapons; 20 or so will have the capability in another decade;

Third World Nations now spend more than \$70 billion annually on weapons, a 700 percent increase in 20 years;

More than 18 tons of plutonium now exist as the byproduct of nuclear processes (a speck of which is lethal), and an estimated 450 tons will exist by 1990, which we know of no way to dispose of;

The nations of the world currently spend \$400 billion annually on armaments, double the amount of only 8 years ago, and equivalent to the annual income of an estimated 1.8 billion people in the 36 poorest countries.

Two ongoing developments further aggravate, if such is possible, these worldwide trends. One reflects the technological imperative that the distinguished social philosopher Erich Fromm has pointed out numerous times has made man captive to the powerful machines he has built. Newspapers are filled daily with fascinating, almost worshipful, accounts of the new weapons being planned and developed, among them the laser and particle beam weapons that can direct explosive energy at the speed of light to any object on earth, including missiles on the ground and in the air.

The second development involves the attempt on the part of military planners and other officials to win acceptance of the remarkable notion that the new miniaturized nuclear and neutron weapons are the only things that stand in the way of all-out, global nuclear war. Is there any doubt that the contrary is the case, namely, that each new round of weaponry is far more lethal, costly, and destabilizing than the last? Yet we permit ourselves to entertain this notion that our salvation and that of the world rests with the stepped-up and uninterrupted development of every manner of nuclear weapon. With the announcement a few weeks ago that there now exists the capability to convert conventional battlefield weapons into nuclear ones, we have not only crossed the threshold to nuclear war but of equal importance trivialized it to the point that it is ever more likely to be countenanced and implemented.

What explains the incredible discrepancy between the knowledge we now possess of the arms race and the failure of our understanding of its enormous costs and ruinous consequences? In the few days I had the opportunity to spend at the Disarmament Session, it was painfully clear that the discussion taking place within the U.N. chambers was substantially lost on the rest of the world. The meaning of the arms race and nuclear proliferation has not sunk into public consciousness. To be sure, these matters are not easy ones to comprehend, let alone deal with. They involve unthinkable thoughts about a level and scale of devastation for which mankind has no precedents. The glaring inattention of the mass media further contributes to the current state of ignorance and the sense of helplessness.

The effort to educate the public and its leaders, needless to say, cannot slacken. Ways have to be found to communicate effectively to the public the meaning of armaments and nuclear war. Permit me to make a few proposals for further action. Would not a presidential commission or select congressional committee devoted to the examination of the arms race and the monitoring of its costs generate much-needed attention? Would not a regular MCPL seminar series that brings Members together with leaders from other

nations as well as students of disarmament be a useful addition to forums that already exist? We have already witnessed the international concern and, hopefully, we can find ways to internationalize our discussions. ●

#### THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF FRIENDSHIP BAPTIST CHURCH, PASADENA, CALIF.

### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Friendship Baptist Church of Pasadena, Calif., on its 85th anniversary.

While it is clear that in the chronicles of history's major events, occasions such as this are seldom given the attention they deserve, it is equally true that the collective impact of church groups like the Friendship Baptist Church play a fundamental and vital role in shaping the direction of our country and our society by influencing our thoughts and behavior patterns.

In this manner then, it is also clear that the shape and definition of history is influenced. This impact, I believe, becomes even more pronounced in the case of the Friendship Baptist Church when one considers the graciousness and longevity of its own history.

The Friendship Baptist Church survived its formative years. It grew from infancy into a group possessing venerability and the wisdom of maturity. It is appropriate here to give a brief accounting of that growth.

The church was founded on September 2, 1893, in a hall at 12 Kansas Street, which later became known as Green Street. The founding fathers were the Reverends C. H. Anderson and J. M. Fowler. The church's first congregation was a small but determined nine.

Shortly thereafter, under the direction of the Reverend J. H. Kelly, the Friendship Baptist Church purchased land on South Vernon Street for the grand price of \$400, on which they constructed a building for \$850.

In 1925, the congregation, growing rapidly, moved to its new grounds at Dayton and DeLacey Avenues. The cost of the new complex was \$125,000. It is a credit to the deacons of the church, who guided the organization through this expansion period with care and flair, that the Friendship Baptist Church has been designated a historical landmark by the city of Pasadena.

With sincerity, I offer my congratulations to the leaders and members of the church on this very special birthday. I am especially grateful to the pastor, the Reverend S. W. Lewis, for his faith, for his stewardship to his parishioners, and for his outstanding service to this community.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the Friendship Baptist Church for providing 85 years of spiritual guidance and fellowship to its congregation, for giving 85 years of

service to the community of Pasadena, and, most of all, for providing 85 years of loving labor and devotion to God.●

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY  
COMMISSION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the excessive costs, both direct and indirect, that the Consumer Product Safety Commission presents annually to each and every American. Over the past few months, I have undertaken an extensive study of this situation, and have found some very startling figures—and reached some very important conclusions.

In annual appropriations for the Commission alone, the CPSC has cost the American taxpayer over \$200 million over the past 5 years. In addition to this, the Department of Justice has spent over \$650,000 in litigating suits which have arisen out of CPSC-promulgated regulations.

These direct costs, however, are truly minimal when compared with the billions of dollars spent each year by the American consumer in increased costs of goods and services subject to CPSC regulations. Take, for instance, the example of one small firm, the Columbia Match Co. of Cleveland, Ohio. Columbia Match is a small company with only 60 employees. Yet the cost to this small, private firm of complying with recently-promulgated CPSC regulations is estimated at \$98,000.

The purpose of the matchbook regulations? It was CPSC's idea to get all striking plates on matchbooks moved from the front of the matchbook cover to the back. The agency thus unilaterally ruled that all matchbook manufacturers would have to redesign their entire system of production in order to achieve this change. Unfortunately, the agency did not see fit to consider the massive cost of the changeover to the match industry, hundreds of thousands of dollars which, of course, was paid out in increased prices by the very consumers the CPSC is supposed to be protecting.

A cross-section of CPSC-incurred costs more of the same. Other match companies report similar costs—\$73,000 to D. D. Bean of New Hampshire and an incredible \$190,000 to the Ohio Match Co. In the bicycle industry, America's largest bicycle manufacturer, the Schwinn Co., reports that they have spent \$728,200 in complying with CPSC standards. The Bicycle Manufacturers' Association of America estimates that CPSC alone adds 10 percent to the price of every bicycle sold in the United States today.

In the miniature Christmas-tree light industry, the National Ornament and Electric Light (NOEL) Association assessed costs to the industry over the 2-year period before any changes were made in compliance with newly promulgated CPSC standards at \$122,000. In

CXXIV—1775—Part 21

this case, the CPSC used as its basis for new regulations 20 indepth investigations of Christmas-tree light accidents. Of the 20, only 2 of the light sets had been purchased within a year of the incident in question. No age, condition, use or abuse information is contained in any of these reports. Once again, the CPSC acted blindly and unilaterally to regulate an entire industry—at incredible cost the consumer—without any serious study or knowledge of the situation at hand.

The Stanford Research Institute estimates that proposed regulation of the lawnmower industry by CPSC would increase the average price of a lawnmower by up to 35 percent, depending upon the model in question. The institute's study also notes that such regulation, had it been instituted in the 1976 model year, would have cost the American consumer \$470 million in price increases.

A frightening example of the cost of overregulation by the CPSC can be found in the case of Marlin Toy Products, Inc., a small toy firm in Horicon, Wis. This single firm spent a staggering \$1,126,801 in order to comply with CPSC regulations. In addition, the president of Marlin Toy informed my staff that two FBI agents spent a week at his plant investigating the company's "Flutter Ball" and "Birdie Ball" toys.

In the crib manufacture industry, Childcraft Co. reports that the price of their least expensive crib has increased by approximately 46 percent due to CPSC regulations. As the head of one firm told me in a letter, "The most ridiculous aspect of the problem is the mattress flammability standard—the whole thing is based on a lighted cigarette igniting the mattress—I am sure you will agree that very few infants smoke in bed."

These few examples give one pause to reflect upon and reassess the role of the CPSC, to compare the benefits provided in light of the sobering costs incurred. The creation of the Commission was predicated on the theory that the American people are not intelligent enough to distinguish between a product that presents a severe danger and one that is safe. Thus, the whole idea of the agency from the start was to place further limits on our freedom of choice, and to put into practice the notion that a bureaucratic elite knows better than we how to run our own lives.

Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be asked to extend authorization for CPSC appropriations in the amount of \$55 million, \$60 million, and \$65 million for fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1981, respectively. The average of these figures represents a quantum leap of 50 percent in the cost of maintaining this harmful agency. Will this increase in appropriations mean that the American people will be treated to a 50-percent increase in regulation—and the billions of dollars in price increases and hundreds of thousands of lost jobs that will most assuredly follow?

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to take a hard look at what the CPSC is really costing the consumers of our Nation. If we really want to whip inflation, cut the cost of Government, keep our

relatively low unemployment rate, and increase the amount of economic freedom to be had in this country; commencing an in-depth reappraisal of the activities of the Consumer Product and Safety Commission is a perfect place to start.●

GAO REPORTS ON COST OF SUGAR  
PRODUCTION AND PROFITS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, attached is a letter from the GAO in response to my questions concerning the cost of production of sugar and profits in the sugar industry in recent years.

The letter points out that—

The diversity of (cost of production) estimates raises questions as to what is the cost of production in any area;

Some sugar producers have "rebuffed" efforts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to determine costs of production;

Many studies and reports on the cost of production of sugar indicate costs below the 16¢ price objective level set in the sugar bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee; and

While many producers complain now of losses from the production of sugar, they fail to mention the extraordinary windfall profits which occurred throughout the industry in 1974 and 1975.

The GAO data shows that sugar production involves the risk of high and low price cycles. We are now in a low price cycle—a period of lean years. What the industry does not tell us is that just 3 years ago, they were making incredibly fat windfall profits. According to the GAO, the profits of the Hawaii producers amounted to \$428 million in 1974 alone. The profits of the whole industry, according to the U.S. International Trade Commission, were over \$1.5 billion in 1974.

The consumer was given no relief during those sweet days for the producers; now, that production has temporarily turned sour, the taxpayer and consumer are being asked to be sugar daddy for the industry.

The GAO data provides important new information against the Church/de la Garza sugar bills and in support of the bill proposed by the Ways and Means Committee.

The letter follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., September 1, 1978.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Trade, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in response to your letter of August 29, 1978, requesting information on sugar production costs for any domestic sugar producing areas. In the course of our work, we have obtained information from a variety of sources including the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), published sources, and data provided by firms and industry groups.

The cost of producing sugar in Hawaii is estimated at 13.16 cents per pound, raw value, in 1978 based on industry data. This

may be an understatement of cost, however, due to the absence of imputed land values; inadequate depreciation and other factors. Adding an estimate for imputed land costs and for capital investment not covered by depreciation would yield an estimated production cost of 14.3 cents per pound, raw value.

Industry data on production costs in Florida and Louisiana were not available to us. USDA officials told us they had approached Florida and Louisiana producers several years ago about doing a cost study and were rebuffed. We did identify university studies on production costs in each state. A University of Florida researcher, D. L. Brooke, estimates production costs of 15.79 cents per pound, raw value, in Florida for 1977 on a net cash rent for land basis and 16.54 cents on a current market value of land basis. These figures contrast sharply with USDA's estimate of 1977 Florida production costs of 14.22 cents per pound, raw value. A Louisiana State University researcher, Joe R. Campbell, estimates a break-even cost of 14.8 cents per pound, raw value, in Louisiana in 1977. Dr. Campbell has advised us that the Louisiana cost estimate is based on a 500 acre operation, which would maximize use of a mechanical harvester, and would represent the production cost of a reasonably efficient farm. USDA data indicate that only about 14 percent of Louisiana sugarcane farms are 500 acres or more but that they produce about 65 percent of the State's sugar. The Louisiana State figure of 14.8 cents contrasts sharply with USDA's estimate of 1977 Louisiana production costs of 17.913 cents per pound, raw value.

We are aware of no 1978 estimates for Florida and Louisiana other than those made by USDA, which are contained on pages 30-31 of your Subcommittee print on sugar dated August 14, 1978. It is important to note that all the figures are estimates. The University of Florida, Louisiana State University, and USDA estimates are based on projections of data developed in earlier studies, with a variety of base years. USDA notes on page 14 of the August 14 Subcommittee print that differences in cost concepts, computational methodology, and yield assumptions for sugar and other crops are frequent sources of differences in cost estimates. The

diversity of estimates raises questions as to what is the cost of production in any area.

USDA has recently conducted a study of the cost of growing sugarbeets. They advised us that they do not have recent data on the cost of processing sugarbeets. Based on the USDA study, industry supplied data and our computations based on these data, we estimate the cost of producing refined sugar from sugarbeets to be 17.81 cents per pound in 1977/78. This does not include marketing costs estimated by USDA to be about 2.5 cents. These data are based on actual 1977 production costs obtained from sugarbeet processors and USDA estimates of 1978 sugarbeet growing costs. Since sugarbeets are processed directly into refined sugar in the United States, there is no raw sugar stage. There is no accepted method to estimate the equivalent cost of raw beet sugar.

Subsequent to the receipt of your letter, your office requested information on profitability in any of the sugar producing areas. We have very limited data in this regard.

A spokesman for most of the beet sugar companies recently testified on their serious financial problem before the House Committee on Agriculture. The spokesman stated:

\* \* \* each and every one of the nation's beet sugar processing firms for whom I speak is in serious financial straits—indeed jeopardy \* \* \*.

The spokesman pointed out that one company had lost \$6.1 million on revenue of \$152.9 million during its most recent fiscal year and a cooperative failed by \$14 million to meet its contractual obligations with its grower-owners for the 1976 crop. In a case we identified, a recently established cooperative with a relatively new plant has been unable to pay interest on its debt for 2 years, while another processor told us his company has reported financial losses for the last 4 quarters.

In 1974 and 1975, the Hawaiian sugar industry realized sizable profits when prices were at historically high levels. Since then prices have fallen markedly. The 1977 crop would have resulted in losses except for Federal direct support payments.

We have developed estimates on the returns over cost of the Hawaiian sugar industry based on industry supplied cost data and USDA reported data on the value of produc-

tion. We have also added government payments.

HAWAIIAN SUGAR INDUSTRY RETURNS OVER (UNDER) COST  
(In millions of dollars)

Year	Net cost of raw sugar production	Value of production	Returns over (under) cost	Government payments	Returns over (under) cost after Government payments
1972--	\$172.3	\$176.6	\$4.3	\$9.7	\$14.0
1973--	170.5	203.8	33.3	9.5	42.8
1974--	239.4	659.2	419.8	8.6	428.4
1975--	271.2	354.6	83.4	0	83.4
1976--	263.6	245.5	(18.1)	0	(18.1)
1977--	259.5	219.1	(40.4)	48.7	8.3

The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), in its March 1977 report to the President stated that:

"All segments of the sugar industry—growing, milling, processing and refining—enjoyed a dramatic increase in net sales during 1972-74. Net sales for most segments of the industry declined, however, in 1975—a period of declining sugar prices. With the exception of proprietary cane sugar refining, the sugar industry also enjoyed an increase in profits for proprietary firms and an increase in payments to members of cooperatives during 1972-74. Profits and payments like net sales, declined in 1975 for most segments of the industry."

The report went on to state that: "The period 1972-75 was, overall, an era of prosperity for growers, grower-millers, and nongrower-millers of sugar cane situated in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and Hawaii. The year 1974 was exceptionally prosperous. The forecast for the sugar cane industry for the 1976/77 crop year, however, appears bleak. It appears that declining sugar prices, coupled with increasing farming and milling costs, will turn numerous farm and mill operations into marginal or unprofitable operations."

Appendix I is Table 19 from the ITC report, which contains data on profits supplied to the ITC by various elements of the sugar industry for the accounting years 1972-76.

We trust that this information satisfies your request.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,  
Comptroller General of the United States.

APPENDIX I

TABLE 19.—SUGAR: NET PROFIT OR (LOSS) BEFORE INCOME TAXES OR NET PROCEEDS PAID OR PAYABLE TO COOPERATIVE MEMBERS FOR U.S. GROWERS, PROCESSORS, MILLERS AND REFINERS ON THEIR SUGAR OPERATIONS, ACCOUNTING YEARS 1972-76

Item	1972	1973	1974	To Sept. 30 <sup>1</sup> —			Item	1972	1973	1974	To Sept. 30 <sup>1</sup> —		
				1975	1975	1976					1975	1975	1976
Sugar beet growers and beet sugar processors:							Sugarcane millers:						
27 growers (total farm).....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	6 Florida millers.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
10 processors.....	45,534	108,229	395,402	234,419	111,117	37,987	26 Louisiana millers.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total.....	45,534	108,229	395,402	234,419	111,117	37,987	1 Texas miller.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sugarcane growers:							Cane sugar refiners:						
19 Florida growers.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8 refiners.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
23 Louisiana growers.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Florida cooperative refiner.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
14 Hawaiian growers.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	California & Hawaiian Sugar Co.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total.....	7,342	20,533	72,996	75,945	( <sup>3</sup> )	( <sup>4</sup> )	Total.....	169,757	202,535	438,851	367,150	225,943	193,977
							Grand total.....						
							277,820 452,910 1,548,802 1,034,919 377,947 248,231						

<sup>1</sup> The interim 1975 and 1976 accounting periods for each of the reporting concerns range from 1 mo to 12 mo and end no later than Sept. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Data are insignificant of the total for all U.S. sugar beet growers.

<sup>3</sup> Data are for 7 processors.

<sup>4</sup> Not available.

<sup>5</sup> The 14 Hawaiian growers are also millers. Their sugarcane is transferred to their mill at cost.

<sup>6</sup> Commenced operation on Dec. 8, 1973.

<sup>7</sup> Data are for 6 refiners.

Source: Compiled from data submitted to the U.S. International Trade Commission by U.S. growers, processors, millers, and refiners.

## ANOTHER LOOK AT GUN CONTROL

## HON. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 5 weeks remaining before the Congress of the United States adjourns for the year. It is obvious that neither the House of Representatives nor the Senate will take up Federal gun control legislation prior to adjournment. Nonetheless, I would like to share with my colleagues an article which was published in the August 27, 1978, Washington Post. The writer's discussion and analysis of this most controversial issue warrant review by my colleagues and other devotees of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

## BANNING GUNS DOESN'T WORK

(By Don B. Kates Jr.)

Despite almost 100 years of often bitter debate, federal policy and the policies of 44 states continue to allow handguns to any sane adult who has not been convicted of a felony. Over the past 20 years, as some of our progressive citizens have embraced the notion that handgun confiscation would reduce violent crime, the idea of closely restricting handgun possession to police and those with police permits has been stereotyped as "liberal." Yet when the notion of sharply restricting pistol ownership first gained popularity, in the late 19th century, it was under distinctly conservative auspices.

In 1902, South Carolina banned all pistol purchases, the first and only state ever to do so. (This was nine years before New York began requiring what was then an easily acquired police permit.) Tennessee had already enacted the first ban on "Saturday night specials," disarming blacks and the laboring poor while leaving weapons for the Ku Klux Klan and company goons.

In 1906, Mississippi enacted the first mandatory registration law for all firearms. In short order, permit requirements were enacted in North Carolina, Missouri, Michigan and Hawaii.

In 1922, a national campaign of conservative business interests for handgun confiscation was endorsed by the (then) arch-conservative American Bar Association.

Liberals at that time were not necessarily opposed in principle to a ban on handguns, but they considered such a move irrelevant and distracting from a more important issue—the prohibition of alcohol. To Jane Addams, William Jennings Bryan and Eleanor Roosevelt (herself a pistol carrier), liquor was the cause of violent crime. (Before dismissing this out of hand, remember that homicide studies uniformly find liquor a more prevalent factor than handguns in killings.)

Besides, liberals were not likely to support the argument advanced by conservatives for gun confiscation; that certain racial and immigrant groups were so congenitally criminal (and/or politically dangerous) that they could not be trusted with arms. But when liberalism finally embraced handgun confiscation, it was by applying this conservative viewpoint to the entire populace. Now it is all Americans (not just Italians, Jews or blacks) who must be considered so innately violent and unstable that they cannot be trusted with arms. For, we are told, it is not robbers or burglars who commit most murders, but average citizens killing relatives or friends.

It is certainly true that only a little more than 30 percent of murders are committed by robbers, rapists or burglars, while 45 percent are committed among relatives or between lovers. (The rest are a miscellany of contract killings, drug wars and "circumstances unknown.") But it is highly misleading to conclude from this that the murderer is, in any sense, an average gun owner.

For the most part, murderers are disturbed, aberrant individuals with long records of criminal violence that often include several felony convictions. In terms of endangering his fellow citizen, the irresponsible drinker is far more representative of all drinkers than is the irresponsible handgunner of all handgunners. It is not my intention to defend the character of the average American handgun owner against, say, that of the average Swiss whose government not only allows, but requires, him to keep a machine gun at home. Rather, it is to show how unrealistic it is to think that we could radically decrease homicide by radically reducing the number of civilian firearms.

Study after study has shown that even if the average gun owner complied with a ban, the one handgun owner out of 3,000 who murders (much less the one in 500 who steals) is not going to give up his guns. Nor would taking guns away from the murderer make much difference in murder rates, since a sociopath with a long history of murderous assault is not too squeamish to kill with a butcher knife, ice pick, razor or bottle. As for the extraordinary murderers—assassins, terrorists, hit men—proponents of gun bans themselves concede that the law cannot disarm such people any more than it can disarm professional robbers.

## THE CASE OF BRITAIN

The repeated appearance of these facts in studies of violent crime has eroded liberal and intellectual support for banning handguns. There is a growing consensus among even the most liberal students of criminal law and criminology that handgun confiscation is just another plausible theory that doesn't work when tried. An article written in 1968 by Mark K. Benenson, longtime American chairman of Amnesty International, concludes that the arguments for gun bans are based upon selective misleading statistics, simple-minded non sequiturs and basic misconceptions about the nature of murder as well as of other violent crimes.

A 1971 study at England's Cambridge University confounds one of the most widely believed non sequiturs: "Banning handguns must work, because England does and look at its crime rate!" (It is difficult to see how those who believe this can resist the equally simple-minded pro-gun argument that gun possession deters crime: "Everybody ought to have a machine gun in his house because the Swiss and the Israelis do, and look how low their crime rates are!")

The Cambridge report concludes that social and cultural factors (not gun control) account for Britain's low violence rates. It points out that "the use of firearms in crime was very much less" before 1920 when Britain had "no controls of any sort." Corroborating this is the comment of a former head of Scotland Yard that in the mid-1950s there were enough illegal handguns to supply any British criminal who wanted one. But, he continued, the social milieu was such that if a criminal killed anyone, particularly a policeman, his own confederates would turn him in.

When this violence-dampening social milieu began to dissipate between 1960 and 1975, the British homicide rate doubled (as did the American rate), while British robbery rates accelerated even faster than those in America. As the report notes, the vaunted handgun ban proved completely ineffective against rising violence in Britain, although the government frantically intensified en-

forcement and extended controls to long guns as well.

Thus, the Cambridge study—the only in-depth study done of English gun laws—recommends "abolishing or substantially reducing controls" because their administration involves an immense, unproductive expense and diverts police resources from programs that might reduce violent crime.

The latest American study of gun controls was conducted with federal funding at the University of Wisconsin. Advanced computerized techniques allowed a comprehensive analysis of the effect of every form of state handgun restriction, including complete prohibition, on violence in America. Published in 1975, it concludes that "gun-control laws have no individuals or collective effect in reducing the rate of violent crime."

Many previous studies reaching the same conclusion had been discounted by proponents of a federal ban, who argued that existing state bans cannot be effective because handguns are illegally imported from free-sale states. The Wisconsin study compared rates of handgun ownership with rates of violence in various localities, but it could find no correlation. If areas where handgun ownership rates are high have no higher per capita rates of homicide and other violence than areas where such rates are low, the utility of laws designed to lower the rates of handgun ownership seems dubious.

Again, the problem is not the "proliferation of handguns" among the law-abiding citizenry, it is the existence of a tiny fraction of irresponsible and criminal owners whom the law cannot possibly disarm of these or other weapons.

Far from refuting the Wisconsin study, the sheer unenforceability of handgun bans is the main reason why most experts regard them as not worth thinking about. Even in Britain, a country that, before handguns were banned, had less than 1 percent of the per capita handgun ownership we have in the United States, the Cambridge study reports that "50 years of very strict controls has left a vast pool of illegal weapons."

It should be emphasized that liberal defectors from gun confiscation are no more urging people to arm themselves than are those who oppose banning pot or liquor necessarily urging people to indulge in them. They are only saying that national handgun confiscation would bring the federal government into a confrontation with millions of responsible citizens in order to enforce a program that would have no effect upon violence, except the negative one of diverting resources that otherwise might be utilized to some effective purpose. While many criminologists have doubts about the wisdom of citizens trying to defend themselves with handguns, the lack of evidence to justify confiscation requires that this remain a matter of individual choice rather than government fiat.

Nor can advocates of gun bans duck the evidence adverse to their position by posing such questions as: Why should people have handguns; what good do they do; why shouldn't we ban them? In a free country, the burden is not upon the people to show why they should have freedom of choice. It is upon those who wish to restrict that freedom to show good reason for doing so. And when the freedom is as deeply valued by as many as is handgun ownership, the evidence for infringing upon it must be very strong indeed.

## OTHER COSTS IGNORED

If the likely benefits of handgun confiscation have been greatly exaggerated, the financial and constitutional costs have been largely ignored. Consider the various costs of any attempt to enforce confiscation upon a citizenry that believes (whether rightly or not) that they urgently need handguns for

self-defense and that the right to keep them is constitutionally guaranteed. Most confiscationists have never gotten beyond the idea that banning handguns will make them magically disappear somehow.

Because they loathe handguns and consider them useless, the prohibitionists assume that those who disagree will readily turn in their guns once a national confiscation law is passed. But the leaders of the national handgun prohibition movement have become more realistic. They recognize that defiance will, if anything, exceed the defiance of Prohibition and marijuana laws. After all, not even those who viewed drinking or pot smoking as a blow against tyranny thought, as many gun owners do, that violating the law is necessary to the protection of themselves and their families.

Moreover, fear of detection is a lot more likely to keep citizens from constant purchases of liquor or pot than from a single purchase of a handgun, which, properly maintained, will last years.

To counter the expected defiance, the leaders of the national confiscation drive propose that handgun ownership be punished by a nonsuspendable mandatory year in prison. The mandatory feature is necessary, for otherwise prosecutors would not prosecute, and judges would not punish, gun ownership with sufficient severity.

The judge of a special Chicago court trying only gun violations recently explained why he generally levied only small fines: The overwhelming majority of the "criminals" who come before him are respectable, decent citizens who illegally carry guns because the police can't protect them and they have no other way of protecting themselves. He does not even impose probation because this would prevent the defendants, whose guns have been confiscated, from buying new ones, which, the judge believes, they need to live and work where they do.

These views are shared by judges and prosecutors nationwide; studies find that gun-carrying charges are among the most sympathetically dealt with of all felonies. To understand why, consider a typical case which would have come before this Chicago court if the district attorney had not dropped charges. An intruder raped a woman and threw her out of a 15th-floor window. Police arrived too late to arrest him, so they got the victim's roommate for carrying the gun with which she scared him off when he attacked her.

Maybe it is not a good idea for this woman to keep a handgun for self-defense. But do we really want to send her to federal prison for doing so? And is a mandatory year in prison reasonable or just for an ordinary citizen who has done nothing more hurtful than keeping a gun to defend herself—when the minimum mandatory sentence for murder is only seven years and most murderers serve little more?

Moreover, the kind of nationwide resistance movement that a federal handgun ban would provoke could not be broken by imprisoning a few impecunious women in Chicago. Only by severely punishing a large number of respectable citizens of every race and social class would resistors eventually be made to fear the law more than the prospect of living without handguns in a violent society.

At a very conservative estimate, at least half of our present handgun owners would be expected to defy a federal ban. To imprison just 1 percent of these 25 million people would require several times as many cells as the entire federal prison system now has. The combined federal, state, and local jail systems could barely manage. Of course, so massive an enforcement campaign would also require doubling expenditure for police, prosecutors, courts and all the other sectors of criminal justice administration.

The Wisconsin study closes with the pertinent query: "Are we willing to make sociological and economic investments of such a tremendous nature in a social experiment for which there is no empirical support?"

#### CAN IT BE JUSTIFIED?

The argument against a federal handgun ban is much like the argument against marijuana bans. It is by no means clear that marijuana is the harmless substance that its proponents claim. But it would take evidence far stronger than we now have to justify the enormous financial, human, institutional and constitutional costs of continuing to ferret out, try and imprison even a small percentage of the otherwise law-abiding citizens who insist on having pot.

Sophisticated analysis of the criminalization decision takes into account not only the harms alleged to result from public possession of things like pot or guns, but the capacity of the criminal law to reduce those harms and the costs of trying to do so. Unfortunately most of the gun-control debate never gets beyond the abstract merits of guns—a subject on which those who view them with undifferentiated loathing are no more rational than those who love them.

The position of all too many gun-banning liberals is indistinguishable from Archie Bunker's views on legalizing pot and homosexuality: "I don't like it and I don't like those who do—so it ought to be illegal."

The emotionalism with which many liberals (and conservatives as well) react against the handgun reflects not its reality but its symbolism to people who are largely ignorant of that reality. A 1975 national survey found a direct correlation between support for more stringent controls and the inability to answer simple questions about present federal gun laws. In other words, the less the respondent knew about the subject, the more likely he was to support national confiscation.

Liberals advocate severely punishing those who will defy confiscation only because the liberal image of a gun owner is a criminal or right-wing fanatic rather than a poor woman in Chicago defending herself against a rapist or a murderer.

Contrary to this stereotype, most "gun nuts" are peaceful hobbyists whose violence is exclusively of the Walter Mitty type. Gun owners' views are all too often expressed in right-wing terms (which does nothing for the rationality of the debate) because 20 years of liberal vilification has given them nowhere else to look for support. If only liberals knew it, handgun ownership is disproportionately high among the underprivileged for whom liberals traditionally have had most sympathy. As the most recent (1975) national demographic survey reports: "The top subgroups who own a gun only for self-defense include blacks (almost half own one for this reason alone), lowest income group, senior citizens."

The average liberal has no understanding of why people have guns because he has no idea what it is like to live in a ghetto where police have given up on crime control. Minority and disadvantaged citizens are not about to give up their families' protection because middle-class white liberals living and working in high-security buildings and/or well-policed suburbs tell them it's safer that way.

A final cost of national gun confiscation would be the vast accretion of enforcement powers to the police at the expense of individual liberty. The Police Foundation, which ardently endorses confiscation, recently suggested that federal agencies and local police look to how drug laws are enforced as a model of how to enforce firearms laws. Coincidentally, the chief topic of conversation at the 1977 national conference of supporters of federal confiscation was enforcement through house searches of everyone whose sales records indicate may ever have owned a handgun.

In fact, indiscriminate search, complemented by electronic surveillance and vast armies of snoopers and informers, is how handgun restrictions are enforced in countries like Holland and Jamaica, and in states like Missouri and Michigan.

Even in England, as the Cambridge report notes, each new Firearms Act has been accompanied by new, unheard-of powers of search and arrest for the police.

These, then, are the costs of banning handguns: Even attempting an effective ban would involve enormous expenditures (roughly equal to the present cost of enforcing all our other criminal laws combined) to ferret out and jail hundreds of thousands of decent, responsible citizens who believe that they vitally need handguns to protect their families.

If this does not terrorize the rest of the responsible handgun owners into compliance, the effort will have to be expanded until millions are jailed and the annual gun-banning budget closely seconds defense spending. And all of this could be accomplished only by abandoning many restraints our Constitution places upon police activity.

What would we have to show for all this in terms of crime reduction? Terrorists, hit men and other hardened criminals who are not deterred by the penalties for murder, robbery, rape, burglary, etc. are not about to be terrified by the penalties for gun ownership—nor is the more ordinary murderer, the disturbed, aberrant individual who kills out of rage rather than cupidly.

What we should have learned from our experience of Prohibition, and England's with gun banning, is that violence can be radically reduced only through long-term fundamental change in the institutions and mores that produce so many violent people in our society.

It is much easier to use as scapegoats a commonly vilified group (drinkers or gun owners) and convince ourselves that legislation against them is an easy short-term answer. But violence will never be contained or reduced until we give up the gimmicky programs, the scapegoating, the hypocritical hand-wringing, and frankly ask ourselves whether we are willing to make the painful, disturbing, far-reaching institutional and cultural changes that are necessary. ●

#### THE 200TH MEETING OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to take note of the 200th meeting of the National Science Board, the policymaking body of the National Science Foundation, which was held on last August 18.

The chairman and vice chairman are elected by the Board from among its members for 2-year terms. The present chairman is Dr. Norman Hackerman, president, Rice University. The vice chairman is my close friend, Dr. Grover E. Murray, university professor and former president of Texas Tech University Complex, Lubbock, Tex., in the congressional district which I represent.

The National Science Board plays a very vital role in the well-being of our Nation and I want to salute it as it continues its important work. ●

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6669  
NATIONAL CLIMATE PROGRAM  
ACT

**HON. ROBERT S. WALKER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee on H.R. 6669, the National Climate Program Act, has completed its work and reported this bill back to the House of Representatives for final passage.

As a member of the conference committee and as a resident of an agricultural area, I am well aware of the importance of predictable climate patterns to our economy. We hope that this bill will allow us to develop the knowledge and ability to predict long term climate trends.

This bill was the subject of hearings before the Committee on Science and Technology early in the 1st session of the 95th Congress, and was reported by that committee on May 6, 1977. Almost a year ago today, September 9, 1977, the House overwhelmingly passed the bill by a vote of 282-60.

Following hearings in the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Senate passed a differing version of the bill on April 24, 1978. The two bills were substantially different in form, but closely allied in intent.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to duplicate the remarks of my distinguished chairman, Mr. BROWN of California, but I would like to emphasize the fact that we have high hopes for the national climate program. One of the most persuasive arguments for this type of program was brought out in our hearings. We all remember the problems of last winter and the shortages of heating fuels in the Northeast portion of our Nation.

Testimony before our subcommittee indicated that it is scientifically possible to predict such long term climate trends as particularly harsh winters, and that with such a prediction it would have been possible to have stockpiled exceptionally large fuel supplies in the Northeast in advance. Such an action would have substantially reduced the adverse effects of the winter of 1977-78.

In my own section of the country such long term climate predictions might easily lead to substantial changes in the planting schedule of farmers in answer to anticipated climate abnormalities.

One point which I would like to stress is that the Congress has designed the national climate program to be user oriented. We expect that the product of this program will be targeted where it is most needed, the farmer, the contractor, and all those other Americans who are dependent on climate in their livelihoods.

While we have established the Department of Commerce as the lead Federal agency for this program, there is no intention to centralize all Federal activities relating to climate within the Department of Commerce. It is the intent of the Congress that the various mission agencies shall continue existing pro-

grams, but that budgeting and planning be comprehensive. We have no intention to reinvent the wheel, we just want to make sure that there are not a number of wheels spinning uselessly.

Mr. Speaker, now that the gentleman from California has assured me that there is no confusion over the permissive authority the bill contains for payments to members of the advisory committee, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to adopt this conference report.●

**MORE AMERICAN FLIERS THAT  
THE U.S.S.R. HAS NOT ACCOUNTED  
FOR**

**HON. LARRY McDONALD**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there have been many incidents since World War II, in which U.S.S.R. planes have made unprovoked attacks on American planes. What finally happened to the pilots and crews of these planes has been a matter of dispute in many cases. In most instances, however, none of the Americans have returned to tell the tale. The passengers in the South Korean plane were very fortunate recently, in that the world knew what had happened. Some recently declassified State Department messages have shed some new light on an incident that took place over the sea of Japan in 1953. In this incident there were survivors and information was received that Soviet ships picked up additional survivors. The Soviets denied that such ever happened. However, for some years now there have been stories circulating that the Soviets have a special camp in the Far East near Vladivostok where foreigners, Americans included, are held. These messages raise the possibility that some of these men may still be alive. The text of the messages follows:

Department has now received confirmation that US RB-50 aircraft was shot down by one or more Soviet Migs over Sea of Japan on July 29. Soviet vessels were sighted in immediate area of incident where survivors were also seen on life rafts. It appears almost certain that Soviets now have in custody some survivors. US vessel has rescued co-pilot of plane who was found approximately 40 miles off Soviet coast south of Mys Povortny, which is southeast of Vladivostok.

You are requested seek immediate appointment with Vyshinski or other available Foreign Ministry official and to convey to him following:

First, that you have been instructed by your government to protest in strongest terms against shooting down by Soviet aircraft on July 29 of a US Air Force RB-50 plane which was on a routine navigational training mission over Sea of Japan;

Second, that co-pilot of plane, who was rescued by US vessel approximately 40 miles off Soviet coast south of Mys Povortny, has confirmed that his plane with crew of 17 was attacked by one or more Soviet Mig-15 aircraft which brought about crash of plane through shooting its engines and setting aircraft afire;

Third, that information has also been re-

ceived that other survivors have been picked up by Soviet vessels in vicinity of crash;

Fourth, that you have also been instructed by your Government to request immediate report from Soviet authorities RE condition of these survivors and what arrangements are being made for their early repatriation.

Please report outcome your demarche urgently. Department withholding publicity pending receipt your report.

From: Moscow  
To: Secretary of State

I have been instructed by my government to protest in the strongest terms against the shooting down by Soviet aircraft on July 29, of a United States Air Force RB-50 airplane which was on a routine navigational training mission over the Sea of Japan.

The co-pilot of the American airplane, who was rescued by a United States vessel approximately 40 miles off the Soviet coast south of Cape Povortny, has confirmed that his plane with a crew of 17 was attacked by one or more Soviet Mig-15 aircraft which brought about the crash of the American plane by shooting into its engines and setting the plane afire.

Information has also been received that other survivors have been picked up by Soviet vessels in the vicinity of the crash. My government has instructed me to request an immediate report from the Soviet authorities regarding the condition of these survivors and what arrangements are being made for their early repatriation.

From: Moscow  
To: Secretary of State

Molotov received me in his old office at Kremlin and I took up with him question of survivors of B-50 along lines set forth in DEPTTEL 74. Molotov did not attempt to argue any other aspect of B-50 incident but listened carefully to my outline of the additional information in possession of US Government which led us to believe that there were survivors other than co-pilot and then inquired whether Embassy had not yet received that second Soviet note on the plane which dealt with this question. (When I said no, he said it was on the way. He repeated the statement that Soviet Government had no information whatsoever concerning plane or any member of its crew and that according to verified information plane was last seen headed out to sea.

I told Molotov we understood that such was the preliminary report received by Soviet Government but that I was making a serious request from U.S. Government that in circumstances a further investigation in light information I had given him was justified. I repeatedly requested him to have further investigation made. With equal persistence Molotov maintained his position that a thorough investigation had been made and that there was no basis for conducting a further search. He repeated each time that had Soviet Government had any information concerning that plane or (repeat or) survivors it would "of course" have immediately communicated this to U.S. Government.

I outlined at some length possibility that some of these survivors were picked up by Soviet trawler or perhaps had been able to swim to shore and that therefore a further investigation in simple interests of humanity was justified. Molotov refused to commit himself to any such investigation but in the end said that "if any further information should be received by Soviet Government it would of course be transmitted to U.S. Government".

I don't however take this to mean any implied commitment on his part since it was in

BOHLEN.

reply to a question from me as to possibility further information being received by Soviet Government from local authorities.

At one point Molotov made a reference to the "surprise" of Soviet Government when in regard to another plane incident, the IL-12, U.S. Government stated it was shot down in Korea whereas Soviet Government found wreckage of plane, bodies of passengers and crew in Chinese territory at point indicated Soviet note. He added that they had photographs of the wreckage. He however did not pursue the subject when I told him that that was another subject and that I was only dealing with possibility of survivors of B-50.

I left with Molotov memorandum setting forth information I had given him orally with request for further investigation. I did this primarily to see if he was willing to accept document which he did without objection.

Throughout interview Molotov struck me as being very much on defensive in this matter and refrained from any disagreeable or provocative comments concerning this incident which he once described as "an encounter". At one point in discussion he quoted Russian proverb re unreliability of "eye-witnesses" which may reveal Soviet concern over evidence of rescued co-pilot.

In view of position he took consistently that complete and thorough investigation had already been made and there were no grounds for further search, it is not probable we will receive any satisfaction from Soviet Government on survivors. However, on outside chance intervention of Molotov might somehow produce results on this question, I believe we might, if possible, withhold publicity on fact of this personal call and confine publicity to formal exchange of notes. Press correspondents here are not aware of fact of my visit and unless Soviets break it there is no reason why it cannot be held secret from this end. If because of public interest in this matter it is necessary to release fact of visit, would appreciate guidance from Department as to how it is to be handled.

Will cable note referred to by Molotov as soon as received.

BOHLEN.●

#### TAWES AWARD FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

### HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the congressional district I represent is one in which environmental concerns are of extreme importance. The Chesapeake Bay and the network of rivers and streams are critical to the quality of life enjoyed by our people.

We have many private organizations that devote much time, energy, and money to environmental interests, and we should never cease to applaud and encourage their efforts. Environmental protection should be a concern of every citizen.

However, we sometimes fail to note the superb work being done by Maryland public agencies and public employees for the protection of our marine environment. Fortunately, this oversight has been remedied by the creation of the annual "Tawes Award for a Clean Environment" for government workers who make unique or substantial contributions

to the health of the State's marine environment.

The first awards were recently presented by former Gov. J. Millard Tawes, who was the first secretary of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources before he entered retirement several years ago. Sponsoring the awards program are the Department and private organizations such as the Maryland Petroleum Association and the Maryland Oil Jobbers Council.

The top award was presented to Robert F. Connor, of Baltimore, an employee of the Maryland Port Administration. The runner-up awards were presented to:

Paul G. Bingham, Jr., of Arnold, Department of Natural Resources;

William S. Burgess, of Annapolis, Department of Natural Resources;

Thomas A. Cooksey, of the Prince Georges County Bureau of Fire Prevention;

George L. Herth, Jr., of Queenstown, Department of Natural Resources;

Richard D. Klein, of Forest Hill, Department of Natural Resources, and

John J. Smiechowski, of Crownsville, Department of Natural Resources.●

#### INSULIN PRODUCTION THROUGH RECOMBINANT DNA RESEARCH

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I was informed today by Eli Lilly & Co. an Indianapolis, Ind., based pharmaceutical manufacturer, that a team of scientists from Genentech, Inc., and City of Hope National Medical Center in California has successfully produced human insulin from bacteria in a laboratory experiment. Lilly, a pioneer in the development of the first commercial insulin following its discovery in the 1920's by two University of Toronto scientists, has entered into an agreement with Genentech to begin long-range development aimed at the eventual commercial production of human insulin. Although this research achievement is extremely significant, there still needs to be extensive development of technology, long-term studies in animals and humans, and regulatory approval before this insulin will be commercially available.

At present, insulin is produced by extracting the hormone from the pancreas glands of cattle and swine. Genentech's process reportedly involves the insertion of synthetic genes into a microorganism called *E. coli*, which is then grown in a fermentation process. The foundation for this work was laid by the early studies of researchers in the field of recombinant DNA at the University of California—San Francisco. Insulin production by this process is believed to have a chemical structure identical to human insulin. This achievement represents an important potential clinical application of recombinant DNA research.

I was delighted to learn of this partic-

ular scientific achievement. The potential medical benefit to those millions of Americans and countless other diabetics around the world is great indeed. While it will be several years before this research breakthrough can be translated into a marketable product, the critical first step has been taken. This achievement is just one further example of the pioneering research typical of American science and industry. I know my colleagues join me in saluting all those responsible for this milestone scientific and humanitarian accomplishment.●

#### NEED TO GALVANIZE ARMS CONTROL SUPPORT

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Homer A. Jack, the Secretary-General of the World Conference on Religion and Peace, delivered a sermon recently at the Community Church of New York on the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament.

Among other questions, he touches on the need for creating the political will in the United States to move ahead on arms control and the difficulties of structuring and galvanizing that will.

I hope my colleagues will take the time to read his observations.

INSIDE THE U.N. SPECIAL SESSION ON DISARMAMENT: SURVIVING BEYOND 1984

(By Homer A. Jack)

The world has witnessed, and the U.N. has just finished—yesterday morning at 2:30 a.m.—what U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim early predicted would be the "largest, most representative gathering ever convened to consider the question of disarmament." The Special Session was also one of the largest, best-kept secrets. The chances are that many of you never heard of this event, so vital to your future, occurring during the past six weeks in our New York backyard, here at U.N. Headquarters along the East River.

As a non-governmental observer from the World Conference on Religion and Peace and as Chairman of the Non-Governmental Organization Committee on Disarmament, I had the privilege of participating in this Special Session. In the sermon this morning I will take you inside this world event which so much will affect your future, and mine, as well as the lives and future of your children and grandchildren. The U.N. session affirmed: "Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."

I will begin by discussing why the U.N. convened a Special Session devoted to disarmament. Then I will describe the Special Session itself. I will also evaluate the success of the Special Session for our very future. Finally, I must discuss the posture of the U.S. Government toward the Special Session and what this posture means for us who are, I hope, concerned American citizens. This will not be a sermon devoted solely to religion, theology, philosophy, psychology, science, or politics, yet disarmament is a universal subject encompassing these and other disciplines. You who are not part of this morning's con-

gregation here in Community Church can easily flick the dial from WQXR, but your very existence to the year 1979 or 1984 or even 2000 is vitally involved. We human beings have the choice to deny unpleasant possibilities, but we as responsible citizens also have the opportunity to try to turn unpleasant possibilities into creative probabilities. We are not captives of fate—even in the nuclear arms race.

#### WHY AND HOW?

In 1969 the U.N. General Assembly decided to call the decade of the 1970s the Disarmament Decade in an effort to prod the world community toward "effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." Several very limited disarmament agreements were reached in the late 1960s and early 1970s, but "effective" nuclear measures continued to elude the grasp of the world community.

In 1971 the Soviet Union urged that a World Disarmament Conference be convened, and a majority of nations agreed. However, 1971 was the year that Peking took a seat in the U.N. China bitterly fought this Soviet proposal, as did the U.S. less strongly. As a result the proposal to convene a World Disarmament Conference was deferred annually, since it was agreed that there could be no conference without the active participation of all five nuclear weapons States.

Not willing to accept easily the escalating nuclear arms race, the Non-Aligned States at the U.N.—some 84 which are not military allies of either the U.S. or the U.S.S.R.—devised the clever scheme of convening a Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly devoted to disarmament instead of a World Disarmament Conference. Since both China and the U.S. are members of the General Assembly, they would attend a Special Session. The Non-Aligned initiative resulted in December 1976 in the adoption by consensus of a resolution of the General Assembly convening a Special Session in mid-1978.

The purposes of the Special Session became multiple: to curb the arms race, to bring France and China into the disarmament dialogue and negotiations, to make the world more aware of the arms race and the need for disarmament, to exert sustained pressure on the super-powers for drastic nuclear disarmament, to break the blockade in disarmament negotiations, and to make the U.N. more central in disarmament affairs and thus give the Non-Aligned and other non-nuclear States a greater role in disarmament affairs.

Early in 1977 a group of 54 nations was appointed to the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session. It met here in New York during five sessions over 18 months. The Preparatory Committee carefully considered the political parameters of this world event, producing about 2,000 pages of documents. The Special Session on disarmament in 1978 was to be the capstone of other U.N. conferences on global issues during the 1970s, beginning with the Environment Conference at Stockholm in 1972 and including world meetings on population, food, women's rights, habitat, and the new international economic order.

#### MAY 23-JULY 1

The Special Session began on 23 May under the presidency of a distinguished Yugoslav diplomat, Lazar Mojsov, who was also president of the 32nd regular session of the U.N. General Assembly last autumn and two additional special sessions on financing the U.N. force in Lebanon and on Namibia earlier in 1978. The first three weeks of the Session were devoted to what is called the general debate. A total of 126 nations spoke on disarmament issues before the plenary. Heads of State or Government from such nations as the U.K., France, Germany, and India assessed the international situation, tried to

pinpoint reasons for past disarmament failures, and made specific and often new disarmament proposals. The general debate was followed by speakers from 25 Non-Governmental Organizations and six research institutes. This was a breakthrough in the U.N. system, at least in the field of disarmament. In the end, Einstein, Schweitzer, and Gandhi did not appear—despite the reading earlier in this church service—although several Nobel Peace Laureates did attend, including Philip Noel Baker of London and Sean MacBride of Dublin.

Beginning on June first, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Special Session began to complete what is called the final document. This was initially drafted during two sessions of the Preparatory Committee beginning in January. It was presented to the Special Session with what were called a "forest of square brackets"—meaning words or sentences proposed but not accepted because of political reservations—in the form of brackets—from one or more countries. The task of the Ad Hoc Committee was to produce a meaningful final document free of brackets and with consensus—no objections. Any one country, however large or small, could in effect exert a veto on any word, phrase, sentence, or paragraph.

The art of bracketmanship—taking out brackets, not putting them in—was supervised by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas of Argentina. He was aided substantially by another Latin American diplomat, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico. Meeting in working groups, drafting committees, contact groups, and other circles, at the end often 20 hours a day, the Committee accomplished a miracle and submitted a document without brackets in the early morning hours last Tuesday—after the plenary allowed the Session to close up to 48 hours late.

The final document in 129 paragraphs contains a short preamble and four major sections: introduction, declaration on disarmament, program of action on disarmament, and machinery. The preamble contains several clauses. The first expresses alarm "by the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race." A second clause expressed the conviction that "disarmament and arms limitation, particularly in the nuclear field, are essential for the prevention of the danger of nuclear war." This is not the subjective rhetoric of some itinerant peacenik, but the considered, unanimous judgment of the entire world community of nations.

The first major section of the final document is the declaration on disarmament. This contains a review and appraisal of the present situation. There is much rhetoric, but also much common sense, which is not necessarily conventional wisdom in the pentagons in Washington or Moscow. For example, there is the phrase: "enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence of doctrines of strategic superiority." Again, this was unanimously supported.

A second sub-section of the declaration discusses goals and priorities. Highest priority is given to "effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war." A third and final sub-section of the declaration consists of a list of fundamental principles for disarmament negotiations. Many are too technical to repeat here. A new principle suggests "unilateral measures of arms limitation or reduction."

The heart of the final document is a long program of action. This repeats the long-time goal of the world community for general and complete disarmament. It then gives four categories of priorities in dis-

armament negotiations: nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons including those with indiscriminate effects, and reductions of armed forces. Again, the detailed paragraphs and items are too long, and complex, to repeat here. It is, however, a comprehensive catalogue of disarmament. Some more controversial items—such as the Soviet insistence on the abolition of the neutron bomb—were omitted. The effort of the Non-Aligned, and especially India, to stop nuclear weapons testing, pending the completion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, was only faintly reflected in this consensus affirmation: "various views were expressed by non-nuclear-weapon States that, pending the conclusion of this (comprehensive test-ban) treaty, the world community would be encouraged if all the nuclear-weapon States refrained from testing nuclear weapons. In this connection, some nuclear-weapon States expressed different views." We understand that these "different views" included the Soviet Union and France. However, the U.S. in the closing hours of the session told why it was opposed to a moratorium on testing and China is known also to be opposed to the elimination at this time of nuclear testing. This demonstrates the complexity of inserting even the smallest specific disarmament step into the program of action.

The final section of the final document deals with machinery for disarmament deliberations, meaning the involvement of all nations, and disarmament negotiations, the latter implying a smaller but representative group of nations actually making treaties. The Special Session revived the U.N. Disarmament Commission, as a new deliberative body composed of all Member States of the U.N. The Session also created a new negotiating forum, the Committee on Disarmament. This will be the successor to the Committee of the Conference on Disarmament (CCD) which has been meeting at Geneva since 1962. The new body, to meet no later than January, will contain up to 40 Member States, including seats available for all five nuclear powers.

#### SUCCESS?

Was the Special Session a success? One could list many positive aspects of this world event. The Special Session was a success simply because it was held. It was indeed the fulfillment of the prediction of the Secretary-General as "the largest, most representative gathering ever convened to consider the question of disarmament." The Special Session produced a unanimous document—and for 149 Member States to produce anything by consensus is in itself a successful political feat. The document contained an excellent declaration on disarmament, not a lowest common denominator full of ambiguities. The document also contained an adequate—if not excellent—program of action, which can be a guide for world disarmament action for at least the next decade. The Special Session established a new disarmament negotiating forum, the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, in which France will inevitably take a seat no later than January and which will be ready for China, any time the latter wishes to participate. The Special Session established new or firmer linkages between disarmament and other global issues, each with its own governmental and public constituencies: development, environment, and international security. The Special Session enhanced the formal role of NGOs in disarmament affairs. The Special Session produced a bundle of new disarmament proposals, most of which were too new for immediate acceptance but will be carefully examined in the immediate period ahead. The Special Session demonstrated the continued utility and indeed indispensability of the U.N. system. The Special Session authorized several new studies on disarmament which could



lead to action. The Special Session agreed to convene a Second Special Session on disarmament, probably in 1981.

There were two further achievements, less obvious, but more far-reaching in their potential. The Special Session put the U.N. more central in disarmament affairs. One result of this was to question, if not yet to eliminate, the monopoly—the Chinese call it hegemony—of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in disarmament affairs. Also the Special Session more than any recent international event, underlined the absolute necessity for stronger national disarmament movements and an international disarmament movement.

With this string of more than a dozen successes, were there any disappointments? The deepest is that, despite the Special Session, the quantitative and qualitative nuclear arms race continues unabated, and the several arms races involving conventional weapons also continue. Thus the threshold of hypocrisy was great: high rhetoric, modest performance. Nobody predicted that a disarmament treaty would be negotiated or even initialed at the Special Session. But many observers, including myself, 18 months ago thought that the Special Session would somehow lessen the arms race. This was not to occur. Indeed, few changes were perceived, or registered, in the basic disarmament positions of all 149 Member States of the U.N., although some new ratifications of treaties were announced.

No treaty banning underground nuclear tests (CTB) or limiting strategic arms (SALT II) was announced by the super-powers, despite rather bright hopes of six months ago. Little sustained pressure was engendered during the Session on the super-powers by the non-nuclear States for immediate and drastic cuts in their strategic nuclear stockpiles. Indeed, because of the method of consensus, the program of action contained no pressure on the super-powers, such as contained in some recent U.N. disarmament resolutions—where voting was allowed—demanding, for example, a moratorium of nuclear testing. Little evidence was demonstrated that the Third World wants to lessen its conventional arms; it is content to point a finger, perhaps justifiably, at the so-called Second and First worlds to lessen their nuclear stockpiles. No new disarmament caucus or bloc was established at the U.N. during the First Special Session as the Group of 77 on economic issues was formed during the First U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Special Session produced no sustained interest of much of the world's media; despite the presence of 20 Heads of State or Government, the event hardly remained in the headlines. Only war or violence catch the sustained attention of even the most responsible of the media. Nobody got hurt or killed at the Special Session; it was a media non-event, yet the Special Session tried to head off the extinction of the totality of mankind.

The final determination of the success or failure of the Special Session is difficult and complex as the subject of disarmament is difficult and complex. One political litmus test is to compare the original purposes of the Special Session with the results. The Special Session did not curb the arms race, as some of us expected. The Special Session did not exert sustained pressure on the super-powers for drastic nuclear disarmament. The Special Session did not break the blockade in disarmament negotiations. However, it did bring France and China into disarmament affairs. The Special Session did make the world more aware of both the arms race and the need for disarmament. It did make the U.N. more central in disarmament affairs and is giving the non-nuclear States a greater role in this field.

Was the Special Session a success, a failure, or what? The Special Session was neither

a huge success nor a dismal failure. The Special Session is a beginning, the start of a long process. The Special Session represents hopes deferred in the U.N. system, while the arms race accelerates in the world outside.

Those who worked hard on the Special Session feel now that it was a success; they were haunted with the possibility of failure. Those on the outside who looked to the Special Session to save the world from the scourge of nuclear war, they must still be hounded with possible failure.

#### THE U.S. DIMENSION

Let us, finally, turn to the relation of the Special Session to the U.S. Government. We U.S. citizens watching the Special Session were saddened by the clumsy performance of the Carter Administration. Of the major military powers, only the U.S. and China made no policy proposals during the 18 months of the Preparatory Committee. The Administration ineptly tried to prepare American opinion for the Special Session. A proposal for a Citizens' Advisory Committee, endorsed by Hubert Humphrey on his deathbed, never was approved. The President in a surprise move did not deliver the U.S. speech in the general debate, but managed in the same period to speak both to the NATO Summit and the U.S. Naval Academy. Few U.S. initiatives were proposed during the six-week session at the very time that the U.S. was escalating its over-reactions to the Soviet and Cuban presence in Africa. About the only wise action taken by the Administration was to put together a broad, able, versatile delegation to the Special Session, including not only such lawmakers as Senator George McGovern and Congressman Paul Simon, but public members, such as Paul Newman, Marjorie Benton, Harold Willens, Josephine Pomerance, Katherine Camp, and George Kistiakowsky.

The disenchanted American observer could easily blame the Carter Administration, the Pentagon, or the military-industrial-labor-science complex for this inadequate U.S. stance—one sadly but carefully observed by the Non-Aligned States. The major blame for U.S. action and inaction probably rests on the shoulders of us American citizens. There is no active American constituency for disarmament today. President Carter's actions accurately reflect this tragic truth, although he has done little if anything to alter this situation, except to place his hopes on a whirlwind SALT II ratification campaign at the appropriate political moment.

One of the most important lessons of the Special Session for some of us who were privileged to observe the historic event is to begin to help build an American disarmament movement as part of a world disarmament movement.

No American movement can easily be constructed. The U.S. so far appears to have been favored by God and history and thus appropriate movements have descended upon the American people when the time was ripe and the problem serious. However, we cannot automatically expect to be so favored again, especially on this international issue. We must try, however, to look backwards and examine at least three successful U.S. social movements in our time: the stopping of atmospheric nuclear tests in the early 1960s, the civil rights movement later in the 1960s, and that against the Vietnam War. We remember organizational cooperation and some chaos, charismatic leadership and petty jealousy, legislative action and grass-roots organizing, high-level negotiations and street action. We recall an implicit specialization of organizational functions. We recollect a pluralism of strategy, if not tight coordination, and—above all—efforts to reach "new publics."

While the civil rights and even the Vietnam War movements were basically domes-

tic, all three had an international dimension. Especially with disarmament, there must be an effective international disarmament movement. One does not exist today which has balance and no ideological domination.

The U.N. Special Session on disarmament was a fragile beginning, a respite. There are lessons from the Special Session for each one of us. The arms race, deterrence, the \$120 billion Pentagon budget—these can only end in war, sooner than later. War might come by calculation or miscalculation, by accident or terrorism in 1979, by George Orwell's magic year of 1984, certainly by the end of our century. We can only prevent war by significant disarmament. Yet resistance to curbing the arms race is multiple, formidable.

We Americans, especially attentive Americans who have tried to participate in social movements in the recent past, must begin to gear into an incipient American disarmament movement. We must begin where we are—church, synagogue, temple, labor union, PTA, League of Women Voters. We must insist on talking about the Pentagon budget, about a new Proposition 14 devoted to limiting federal taxes for the Pentagon, about economic conversion of war industries, about the largely artificial threats of Cuba or the Soviet Union or any other power to our American security. We must insist the stockpiles of weapons, outside Washington or Moscow or Peking—these are the threats to our security as human beings. We must show that the decay of our cities—all cities everywhere—is a result of the use of scarce funds for weapons, not for buildings or roads. We must show that inflation in our society is the result of the waste of resources—as is unemployment. We must take disarmament from the diplomats to the people—and then place it in the hands of the diplomats again, but with new political will. That is the lesson of the U.N. Special Session to some of us Americans. ●

#### SOVIET DISSIDENT IZRAIL ZALMANSON FREED

#### HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was very much heartened by the news that Izrail Zalmanson, an imprisoned Soviet dissident and my "adopted prisoner of conscience," has been released by the Soviet Government and allowed to join his sister in Israel. This week, Mr. Zalmanson will be visiting the Philadelphia area under the auspices of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Philadelphia.

I am sure that all of the Members of the Congress join me in welcoming Mr. Zalmanson to the United States. And I especially want to commend the Jewish Community Relations Council for its tireless devotion to the cause of human freedom and its attention to the plight of Soviet Jewry.

The nations of the world voluntarily have agreed to the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter and have signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In addition, many of the nations of Europe—including the Soviet Union—are a party to the Helsinki accords and thereby have pledged to maintain freedom of emigration. During the

past few years it has become increasingly apparent to the American people that the Soviet Government is not adhering to the spirit of these international documents. This has resulted in understandable scepticism about our entering into new agreements with the Soviet Government. What good is an agreement that is not lived up to?

Let us hope that the release of Izrail Zalmanson is a good sign. By adhering to the spirit of the human rights declarations it signed, the Soviet Government will pave the way for new agreements with the United States on issues of the highest mutual interest. Global problems like hunger and arms proliferation demand the joint attention of the world's two greatest powers, but in meeting these problems the United States must never lose sight of the human element of our foreign policy, and we must never compromise on the fundamental issue of human dignity. ●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL J. "MIKE"  
ROYER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of Roseville and all of northern California lost one of its finest citizens last month when Michael J. "Mike" Royer passed away. During his lifetime, he gave fully and freely of his time and energies for the betterment of his community and its individual citizens. He was always full of exuberance and good will. He worked hard and diligently not only on his business enterprises, but also on his many community projects.

Mike belonged to several citizens and fraternal organizations and helped to guide them in their efforts to be of service to the community. Much of what has been accomplished in Roseville in recent years has been assisted by the efforts of Mike Royer.

As a native of his community, Mike knew it well. He was not born to fame, but through diligence and personality soon became well known. The love which he shared with his friends and fellow citizens was returned many times over. His recognition as a leader of the community came through unselfish devotion and tireless efforts toward improving life in Roseville. He was at his peak when he was tragically stricken.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss Mike Royer in Roseville. We want his wife Kay to know that the words and deeds of Mike will long serve as an outstanding example to us all. He will not soon be forgotten.

So that my colleagues in the House can get a better understanding of how highly respected Mike was in his community, I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point a very fine editorial from our hometown paper, the Roseville Press-Tribune:

COMMUNITY CONCERN ROYER TRADEMARK

Michael J. "Mike" Royer Jr. was a man of integrity, responsibility and concern for his community.

A native of Roseville, he had moved to Grass Valley in 1939 and returned to Roseville in 1953 to enter business and later pursue his elaborate banking career, which included the presidency of Citizens Bank for nearly six years.

During his life and business career he also found time to dedicate himself to people and his community.

During his 14 years on the Roseville Hospital board of directors he helped the medical facility expand to its present 222 beds.

He served six years on the Roseville Planning Commission to help formulate the future growth of the city.

"Mike" was an original member of the city's off-street parking commission which helped establish Roseville's current policies on parking requirements for new construction.

He helped the business community expand through his membership eight years on the Roseville Area Chamber of Commerce board of directors.

He participated in community functions as a past president and member of the Roseville (Host) Lions Club, the Elks, Masonic Temple and Shrine Club.

"Mike" loved the people of his city, and they loved him. He will always be remembered that way by those who knew him. ●

DANGER OF "RECREATIONAL"  
DRUGS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from one of my constituents, a former student of mine at Old Dominion University. With his permission, I am taking this opportunity of sharing his comments with my colleagues; I think that the concerns which he has expressed are shared by many people.

604 BALFOUR COURT,

Virginia Beach, Va., July 31, 1978.

Hon. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST,  
281 Independence Boulevard,  
Virginia Beach, Va.

With all of the problems that we are faced with in this great Nation, why is it that we have to put up with the horrible examples that are being set in our Nation's Capital?

How are we to trust the decisions being made by our leaders when many of them come from minds that are unnaturally distorted by so called "recreational drugs?"

How long are we expected to stand for the ever increasing effect of taxation when we find that our tax dollars are going to pay the salaries of coke sniffers and pot heads?

How are we to expect our children to obey laws that they may not agree with when the examples of our leaders nullify any of the examples that we try to set?

I ask these questions of myself and I know the answers. . . . I cannot. I ask these questions of you and would like to hear your answers. I have watched this situation grow like a cancer in our neighborhoods, in our schools, and now in our government and can no longer stand by silently saying "to each his own."

I can identify with the pressures that are

involved with high level jobs, but I cannot buy the use of drugs, legal or illegal, as a means of coping. Nature has provided too many ways to find relief from these pressures. They are there, they are easy to find, and they are mostly for free. Drugs are a cop-out. If our leaders cannot cope with the pressures then they do not belong where they are.

If I am in the majority in the way I feel then I hope that others will express themselves and that we can work together to reverse this trend. If I am in the minority, then I am afraid.

E. RICK BOWLER, III. ●

THE MIRACLE OF REGENERATION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following article speaks for itself.

THE MIRACLE OF REGENERATION: CAN HUMAN LIMBS GROW BACK?

(By Susan Schiefelbein)

Physicians may one day treat patients who have shattered limbs, crippled joints, and injured spines in a way that man never before dared to dream of: regrowing the damaged part—whole, perfect, and undiseased.

For centuries, man has watched in wonder as the salamander regenerated its severed limbs, never imagining that complicated human parts could grow back in such a way. The halt and the lame could be made whole, it seemed, only by the healing waters of Bethesda or the touch of a god incarnate. But in recent years, scientists have grown back a frog's leg from elbow to toes and a rat's leg from shoulder to the top half of the elbow—with cartilage and bone, muscle, nerves, and veins, all in awesome anatomical precision. One of the pioneers in the field, Dr. Robert Becker—chief of orthopedic surgery at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Syracuse, New York—has already applied the newly found healing mechanism to broken human bones, successfully knitting fractures that previously had failed to heal even after extensive surgical procedures. He and his colleagues have now reached the point where they can confidently predict that regeneration of human parts can and will be achieved, possibly in the next few decades.

A brave new world? Not a bit. The magic of regeneration has been with us all along, hidden in the wondrous complexity of every organism's bodyworks. These scientists are not performing miracles; they are witnessing them.

Their challenge, then, has been not so much to re-create a limb as to discover how some animals do so naturally. The chronicle of their quest reads like a detective story; for clue by clue, Becker and his colleagues have been unraveling a medical mystery that began with creation.

The tale begins with a few known biological principles about regeneration that were to serve as the departure point for their search. The way regenerative healing works has been observed, if not explained, for hundreds of years; the process still seems so magical that even the most clinical of researchers must shake his head in amazement as he watches the microscopic metamorphosis unfold. The body of every animal, from the flatworm on up the evolutionary scale, possesses primitive, undifferentiated cells that could best be described as being like raw clay. When a creature that can regenerate loses a limb,

these cells migrate to the injury, forming a mass called a blastema. Some of the mature, specialized cells at the site of the injury differentiate, reverting to primitive form, and add further to the blastema. The blastema then respecialize, transforming itself into whatever types of cells are needed to replace the missing part—bone cells, cartilage cells, and so forth. Somehow, the blastema absorbs information about what to produce along the way, so that at the appropriate moment, it creates an elbow joint or a tibia or a fibula, a left leg or a right one.

The first formal paper on regeneration was written by the great Italian physiologist Luigi Spallanzani and appeared in 1768. Spallanzani's experiments uncovered the first two important clues: The younger the animal, the greater its capacity for regeneration; and the lower an animal is on the evolutionary scale, the greater its capacity for regeneration. This latter finding was especially interesting, for it provided a clue in itself. The lower orders that regenerate are biologically just as complicated as man; their parts are just as difficult to replace. The main difference is—and this was later to become a significant clue—that animals in the lower orders have comparatively more nerves in their extremities.

A third clue was buried in the writings of the late 1700s: Every time a creature is injured, an electrical charge is generated at the site of the injury. This phenomenon is called the current of injury, and it is proportionate to the severity of the wound.

It was not until some 180 years later that scientists again began to delve into the mystery of regeneration. In 1945, the biologist Meryl Rose (a retired professor of anatomy at Tulane University College of Medicine who is currently affiliated with Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratories) amputated the forelegs of some frogs below the elbows. Thinking he could perhaps promote growth by preventing the injuries from scarring over, he bathed the stumps of the frogs' limbs in a strong salt solution. The result was startling: About half of each amputated limb regenerated, developing new bone and muscle and in some cases even showing the beginnings of digital growth. Thus Rose became the first to prove that an animal which cannot regenerate naturally can be made to do so artificially.

The next year, a Russian named Vladimirovic Polezhaev amputated frogs' legs in a similar fashion and then irritated the stumps by repeatedly jabbing them with needles. The result? Astonishingly, he regenerated about the same amount of growth that Rose had with the salt solution. It was possible that the salt not only had prevented scarring but, like the needle punctures, had actually exacerbated the injuries and thereby stimulated growth. Now there was another clue: Regeneration may somehow be connected to the severity of injury.

In the early Fifties, Marcus Singer, presently a professor of anatomy at Case Western Reserve University, in Cleveland, became the next to uncover important evidence. He transferred nerves from a frog's healthy hind legs to the stump of its foreleg; his frog also regenerated about the same amount of growth that Rose's had. Singer's contribution to the collection of clues is an almost mathematical formulation: The nerve tissue required for regeneration must constitute at least 30 percent of the total tissue at the site of the injury.

Then in 1958, a Russian named A. V. Zhirmunskii discovered that the current of injury is proportionate not just to the severity of the injury but also to the amount of nerve tissue in the area.

Becker's turn at medical detection also came in 1958. He assembled his evidence as a good detective would assemble his suspects: Injury is related to regeneration; nerve tis-

sue is related to regeneration; and both injury and nerve tissue are related to the current of injury. Could the current of injury, Becker reasoned, thus be related to regeneration?

He measured the current of injury in a salamander's regenerating leg and in a frog's scarring stump. Sure enough, his findings seemed to support his hunch. On the day the legs were amputated, both creatures generated the same current of injury—a positive voltage. But there the similarity ended: As the frog's stump scarred over, the current of injury in its leg declined to zero; but the current of injury in the salamander's leg switched from a positive to a negative polarity and only then began to decline, reaching zero when regeneration was complete.

Becker had definitely discovered a connection between the current of injury and regeneration. In a sense, however, his discovery complicated rather than clarified the mystery. The way the current of injury worked in those limbs was simply not concurrent with the way nerves are supposed to produce electricity.

Nerve fibers have traditionally been thought to respond to stimulation in only one way: Sodium penetrates into the nerve cell and potassium leaks out, creating a chemical reaction that generates a charge called an action potential. Whatever the stimulus—a gentle touch or an injury—the action potential is exactly the same. Moreover, each nerve fiber can create only one of these potentials at a time. Becker compares the system to that of a digital computer, which transmits single impulses in rapid succession.

Herein lay Becker's problem: How could the action potential—a constant—account for the switch from positive to negative polarity that he had seen in the salamander's current of injury? How could the action potential account for the fact that the current of injury lasted many days after the stimulated nerve cells should have either died or repaired themselves and ceased their impulses? How could the action potential, which responds in the same way to every stimulus, account for the fact that creatures feel intensities of pain?

Becker guessed that in addition to its digital-computer impulses, the central nervous system can carry steady currents and potentials—in the way an analogue computer can. He further theorized that the body's analogue computer system has an input signal—could it be pain?—that triggers an output signal which switches on the healing function.

To verify his theory, Becker measured the electrical potentials of different points on the skin of humans and other animals. He found an electrical field that roughly parallels the nervous system. A disturbance in that field—such as an injury—might stimulate cells to begin repairs.

Becker's theory ran counter even to basic textbook explanations of the nervous system, and medical men let him know it. "That cells are capable of sensing and responding to levels of electrical current is hardly universally accepted," he wrote in one medical journal. But he stuck to his convictions; and today, more than a decade later, doctors are coming to accept his hypothesis. "They no longer march out of my lectures," he says. "The response has changed from complete rejection through amused disbelief to—at present—almost enthusiastic acceptance."

And no wonder. The experiments that Becker based on his unorthodox vision of the nervous system produced remarkable results. First, in 1964, Becker began to examine the spontaneous regeneration of human bone. Given the fact that bone is not well innervated, the theories about electrical stimulation would not apply—unless bone could generate its own electricity. Becker knew that

bone accommodates automatically to mechanical stress. When he measured the currents around a stressed bone, he discovered that it generated a positive change on the stretched side (which dissolved some bone) and a negative charge on the other side (which built up bone and provided the necessary added support). Then Becker administered a negative charge to a mouse's broken leg bone to see if he could artificially stimulate bone growth. He did.

In 1964, Steven Smith, then a student of Meryl Rose and now an associate professor in the department of anatomy at the University of Kentucky, studied Becker's findings and got the idea of implanting a simple electrode right into the muscle tissue of the stump of a frog's leg. He soldered together a piece of platinum wire, which has a positive charge, and a piece of silver wire, which has a negative charge, and embedded the metal into the animal tissue—with the negative end at the stump—thus improvising a crude battery. It worked. He regenerated about as much growth as the Rose, Polezhaev, and Singer experiments had the decade before.

Breakthrough followed breakthrough. Becker examined his healing frog bones under a microscope and saw that the blastema around the regenerating bone was coming from a blood clot that had formed there. (A frog's red blood cells are prime candidates for blastema, for—unlike the red blood cells of mammals—they have nuclei and thus can easily divide and redifferentiate.) His next step? He had a student expose frog blood to various levels of electrical current in order to find out exactly how much of a charge is needed to turn blood cells into blastema. Days passed, then months. The student administered smaller and smaller currents to the blood (high ones either did nothing or began to cook the cells), but he saw no evidence of change. Finally, the week before the student was supposed to quit and return to his classes, he found that blood cells revert to blastema at a few billionths of an ampere.

In 1973, armed with the knowledge of how much current produces a blastema, Becker decided to brave the step from regenerating amphibians to regenerating mammals. He amputated a rat's foreleg below the shoulder and implanted the platinum-silver electrode device at the stump. Again, success—this time, the most exciting ever. The animal regenerated nerves and tissue and even formed the humerus, the upper-arm bone, complete with the rounded end that fits into the elbow joint. Other parts of the elbow joint began to take shape, including cartilage and two bony structures that Becker surmised were the forerunners of the radius and ulna bones of the lower leg. Everything about the new growth was precisely as it had been in the original limb. And all this growth took place in just three days.

But then the growth ended; for the electrode remained implanted in the shoulder tissue, while the end of the stump, where regeneration was taking place, had grown beyond the reach of its vital current.

The rat's growth, though incomplete, was nevertheless significant, particularly in one respect. The fact that the rat, whose red blood cells have no nuclei, could form a blastema—probably from bone marrow—indicated that in all probability humans could do so as well.

About this time, in London, two newborn infants lost their fingers, and the fingers regenerated naturally. The explanation, in Becker's view, probably lies with Spallanzani's early finding that the younger the creature, the better its ability to regenerate. But what was most significant about the babies' growth was that it indicated that the human body contains within it the capacity for regeneration.

Later in 1973, Smith devised an electrode that would travel with the regenerating

stump. Again he amputated a frog's leg below the elbow. With the new device, the frog's entire leg grew back.

The year 1973 marked a third triumph as well: Becker began using his findings about the body's electricity in experiments on human bone. A patient of his who had fractured his ankle two years earlier suffered from a mild diabetic condition that was interfering with the bone's ability to regenerate. The ankle had failed to mend despite two corrective operations; and the bone on both sides of the break had deteriorated. Under normal circumstances, Becker would have had to amputate the leg. Instead, he implanted an electrode into the fracture and administered the same current that he found had divided the frog's red blood cells. He waited three months, the time an ankle fracture would normally take to heal, and the fracture regenerated. A sample of the new bone showed it to be normal in every respect.

The next year, during the course of routine experiments, Becker stumbled on another clue that finally shed considerable light on his nervous system theory. With the intention of impeding growth, he and his staff broke the tibia in a rat's leg and then cut the nerve that led to the broken limb, assuming that without a nerve supply the rat's bone would heal poorly, if at all. But the fracture healed well; the only drawback was that it took twice the normal time. Perhaps the severed end of the nerve needed time to degenerate, they thought. So they cut the nerve six days before breaking the bone. To their astonishment, the bone healed in the normal amount of time, as if the nerve had never been cut at all.

What was going on? They opened up the leg, only to discover that the nerve fiber had not healed. What had healed was the nerve's sheath of Schwann cells—one of a dozen types of cells that make up the "perineural group"—traditionally thought to serve no purpose other than the insulation of the nerve fiber. The perineural cells in the brain were known to carry a steady current—for what reason, no one knew. It now seemed apparent that Schwann cells also carry a steady current. This was proof enough for Becker that the analogue computer system he had theorized was indeed contained in the perineural cells—cells that sheathe the entire central nervous system.

The perineural discovery is by no means the end of the tale. Experiments must still be conducted to determine if electrical regeneration is entirely safe. Could applications of electricity to the peripheral nervous system, for example, induce some sort of behavioral disorder? Or damage our cognitive powers? Every human body contains dormant cancer cells. Could an implanted electrode shock them into fatal multiplication?

Nevertheless, much of the mystery has been solved. Only the last chapter—the most exciting one—has yet to be written. It may well describe the modern world as a Shaner-La where damaged human parts are simply cut off and grown back properly. Our future may lie not with the bionic man but with the natural man.

The replacement of arthritic hip joints with Teflon parts, for example, is now a costly and not altogether satisfactory operation. The Teflon wears out. If the device is implanted in a young person, it may have to be replaced some four or five times in the course of his life. And with each hip operation, there is the risk of infection, which can be a deadly prospect. The alternative—growing a natural hip—would be safer and cheaper.

We may also someday regenerate a damaged heart. Becker has discovered that salamanders replace some 50 percent of their cardiac muscles by regeneration. And Polezhaev has cut away the scar tissue on the hearts of dogs that had suffered severe heart

attacks; all of the hearts regenerated and less than 5 percent of the dogs died. We may even replace parts defective at birth, given that damaged genes do not garble the instructions given to the blastema.

Becker himself is hesitant to herald regeneration as an immediate cure for amputees. The replacement of severed parts, he says, is still pretty far off. Why not aim for more immediate uses that would be beneficial to greater numbers of people? Severing the spinal cord in man produces paraplegia because man's spinal cord does not regenerate. Becker, however, thinks that since salamanders regenerate their spinal cords, man's spinal cord could perhaps be electrically stimulated to do the same thing. It would take only a year to see whether electrical stimulation works without complications in a paraplegic dog or monkey. And if such stimulation works safely on them, it could be safely applied to humans.

The outstanding disappointment of the entire regeneration tale is that no one is conducting that experiment with paraplegic animals. Why? Money. Becker's own \$100,000 grant, from the Veterans Administration, just covers staff salaries. Experiments are costly; keeping paraplegic animals in particular is frightfully expensive.

Still, it must not be forgotten that the financial problem—serious though it is—is the only laggard in regeneration's exhilarating race toward the future. It is the promise of regeneration—not the problems—on which we must focus attention. Hundreds of questions wait to be answered.

Animals that regenerate don't get cancer. If a tumor is implanted in a lizard's body, which does not regenerate, it grows to fatal proportions. But if it is implanted in the tail, which does regenerate, the tumor disappears. If we learn how to turn on regeneration (controlled growth), can we learn to turn off cancer (uncontrolled growth)?

Hormones play an important role in regeneration. A chopped-up adrenal gland when implanted in a frog will generate some growth. Moreover, if the adrenal gland is removed from a lizard, the creature will lose its ability to regenerate its tail. If the hormone prolactin is then injected, the lizard will regain its regenerative potential. It has also been hypothesized that hormones secreted during stress can cause cancer. Prolactin is secreted during stress. Is there a connection? Do carcinogens impose a stress on the body, which then triggers a hormonal release that oversensitizes the body to its own electrical forces, thus sparking wild division of cells?

If a negative charge builds up bone and a positive charge dissolves bone, could positive charges have an effect on malignancies?

If pain is the input signal needed by the brain to trigger healing, does anesthesia—the muffling of the pain signal—impede healing?

When power lines are stretched across the sea, amplifiers are put in at regular points to boost the current along. The body's electric system may run the same way, equipped with special spots along the analogue nervous system that boost the signals as they are carried to or from the brain. Becker has found that half of the traditional acupuncture points correspond to the spots in the nervous system that seem to be amplifiers of electricity. Could acupuncture simply involve the insertion of a metal needle into one of the amplifiers, short-circuiting the pain signal so that it never reaches the brain?

Does the body's sensitivity to electricity explain why reversals in the earth's magnetic field are related to the extinction of certain animals?

When one electrical field is imposed on another, the currents are altered. When one human being approaches another, do their biological electric systems overlap? Is this a

scientific explanation for the "psychic" mystery of ESP?

The characteristics of the analogue nervous system are such that it should be influenced by external electrical fields. Becker has already found experimental evidence that would indicate that electrical fields such as those produced by power transmission lines produce stress in animals—with consequent physical effects that are shocking indeed to the layman. What is the relation between this unseen electrical pollution and human stress?

The possibilities seem infinite. Each is like a silver key. Which one will open the door to a new world? ●

#### CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting amendments, and accompanying explanations, to the civil service reform bill expected to be considered by the House of Representatives tomorrow.

Expansion of Office of Personnel Management to Three Members

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 11280 OFFERED BY  
MR. STEERS

Page 144 strike out line 16 and all that follows down through line 19 on page 145 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 1102. Appointment of members of the Office of Personnel Management

"The Office of Personnel Management is composed of three Commissioners appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, not more than two of whom may be adherents of the same political party. No Commissioner of the Office of Personnel Management may hold another office or position in the Government of the United States."

"§ 1103. Term of office; filling vacancies; removal; quorum

"(a) The term of office of each Commissioner of the Office of Personnel Management is four years.

"(b) Any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the end of a term of office of his predecessors serves for the remainder of that term.

"(c) Any Commissioner appointed for a four-year term may be re-appointed to any following term.

"(d) Any Commissioner may be removed by the President only upon notice and hearing and only for misconduct, inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(e) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the Office of Personnel Management shall act upon majority vote of those members present, and any two members present shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Board.

"§ 1104. Chairman; Vice Chairman

"(a) The President shall from time to time designate one of the Commissioners of the Office of Personnel Management as the Chairman of the Office of Personnel Management. The Chairman is the chief executive and administrative officer of the Office of Personnel Management.

"(b) The President shall from time to time designate one of the members of the Office of Personnel Management as Vice Chairman of the Office of Personnel Management. During the absence or disability of the

Chairman, or when the office of Chairman is vacant, the Vice Chairman shall perform the functions vested in the Chairman.

"§ 1105. Functions of the office.

"The following functions are vested in the Commissioners of the Office of Personnel Management, and shall be performed by the Commissioners, or by such employees of the Office as the Commissioners designate:"

Page 146, lines 23, 24, and 25; page 147, line 25; and page 148, line 1 strike out "Director" and insert in lieu thereof "Commissioner".

Redesignate the following provision (and references thereto) accordingly.

#### EXPLANATION

While I believe the Civil Service should be reformed I have serious reservations about whether this measure, H.R. 11280, is the appropriate vehicle.

I am most concerned about the concentration of personnel authority in the hands of one individual, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. In my opinion this would politicize the Federal service and destroy the merit system which has served the American people well for nearly 100 years.

Placing governmentwide personnel authority in one Director takes the decisionmaking process out of the public's eye. The Director would merely have to make a proposal affecting governmentwide personnel systems to himself, debate it by himself, and make a unilateral decision whether to implement the proposal. Thus, there is no check on arbitrary and capricious actions by a Director.

My amendment would preserve the impartial administration of the Civil Service system. While it would not alter the split of the Civil Service Commission's responsibilities between the Office of Personnel Management and Merit System Protection Board, it would vest the powers of the Office of Personnel Management in three Commissioners. By so doing, it will provide for checks and balances against misuse of authority.

As a Commission, the decisionmaking process will be opened to the public and all decisions would require a majority vote. Moreover, it is a bipartisan Commission, therefore, it will act as a check against an incumbent President using the authority of the Office of Personnel Management for personal political reasons.

While no system is "fall safe," as the Watergate era demonstrated, I believe the public would be better served by an open system which decentralizes authority instead of the system proposed in this bill.

#### [Computation of Certain Annuities]

#### AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11280 AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. STEERS

Page 200, line 73 after "308." insert "(a)".  
Page 200, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(b) (1) Section 8339(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) The annuity of an employee retiring under this subchapter with less than 20 years, but at least 5 years of service as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination thereof, is computed under subsection (a) of this section, except that the annuity of such employee is computed with respect to the service of such employee as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination thereof, by multiplying 2½ percent of his average pay by the years of that service."

(2) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to individuals who become entitled to receive an annuity on or after the effective date of this Act.

#### [Computation of Certain Annuities]

#### AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 11280 AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. STEERS

Page 200, line 73 after "308." insert "(a)".  
Page 200, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(b) (1) Section 8339(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) The annuity of an employee retiring under this subchapter with less than 20 years, but at least 5 years of service as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination thereof, is computed under subsection (a) of this section, except that the annuity of such employee is computed with respect to the service of such employee as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination thereof, by multiplying 2½ percent of his average pay by the years of that service."

(2) Section 8339(h) of such title is amended by striking out "section 8336(d)" and inserting "section 8336(d) (1)."

(3) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to individuals who become entitled to receive an annuity on or after the effective date of this Act.

#### [Pay Rates]

#### Amendment: H.R. 11280

OFFERED BY MR. STEERS

Page 148 strike out lines 12 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) (1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(67) Director of the Office of Personnel Management".

(2) Section 5315 of such title is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(122) Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management."

(3) Section 5316 of such title is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(144) Associate Directors of the Office of Personnel Management (5)."

Page 165 strike out line 24 and all that follows down through line 12 on Page 166 and insert the following:

(C) (1) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(123) Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board".

(2) Section 5316 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(145) Members, Merit Systems Protection Board.

"(146) Special Counsel of the Merit Systems Protection Board."

(3) (A) Paragraph (17) of section 5314 of such title is hereby repealed.

#### EXPLANATION

The purpose of this amendment is to provide Federal Law enforcement and firefighting personnel with less than 20 years service, but at least five, a special 2½ percent retirement computation formula in recognition of the special hazardous duty service in which they perform. Current Law (P.L. 93-530) already extends this credit to those with 20 or more years of service, but failed to provide similar credit to those who serve less than 20 years.

This amendment would correct this inequity by extending the special, hazardous duty retirement rate to all Federal law enforcement and firefighting personnel who retire with between 5 and 20 years of service. A similar amendment has been accepted by the Senate.

(B) Paragraph (66) of section 5315 of such title is hereby repealed.

(C) Paragraph (99) of section 5316 of such title is hereby repealed.

Page 300, line 6, strike out "Senate" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Senate, and shall be paid at an annual rate of basic pay equal to the maximum annual rate of basic pay currently paid, from time to time, under the General Schedule."

Page 347, strike out lines 5 through 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(147) Members, Federal Labor Relations Authority (2)."

#### EXPLANATION

The purpose of this amendment is to lower the level of compensation of officers and members of the Office of Personnel Management, Merit System Protection Board and the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

Both H.R. 11280 and Reorganization Plan Number 2 call for the creation of a number of new top-level appointed positions in the civil service system; increasing the number of top level management positions in the system from 3 to 11. Of these positions, the lowest salary level—for those of the five Associate Directors of the MSPB, Vice Chairman of the MSPB, Member of the MSPB, and Special Counsel of the MSPB—is fixed at the rate of compensation of Executive level IV, or \$50,000 each. In addition, the Director of the OPM is compensated at the rate of Executive level II, \$57,500; both the OPM Deputy Director and the Special Counsel of the MSPB are compensated at Executive level III are, \$52,500. These positions will add \$417,500 to the salary outlays for top level appointees.

In addition, the creation of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, will add three new highly paid positions: The Chairman, at Executive level II, \$52,500 and two Members, at Executive level IV, \$50,000.

In light of the President's recent proposal to put a cap on Federal pay, it is appropriate that we follow his suit and reduce the levels of compensation for these new positions. ●

#### NOISY AIRCRAFT BILL: THE OPPOSITION GROWS NOISIER

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as the implications of the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act become clear to everyone, the opposition to title III, the so-called Noisy Aircraft Revenue and Credit Act, has grown noisier and more outspoken. In an editorial, entitled "Airline Sound and Fury," the New York Times on August 9 lambasted the noisy aircraft provisions as meaningless and setting a dangerous precedent for other "messy" industries. The editorial follows:

#### AIRLINE SOUND AND FURY

A few months ago it appeared that the quid pro quo for airline deregulation legislation would be Federal money to help the airlines meet new aircraft noise standards. Only by supporting noise control subsidies could the Administration muster the votes in the House to open air routes to new competitors and allow carriers to set their own fares. Congressional ardor for noise control funds has, how-

ever, cooled somewhat with reports of fat airline profits, and the deregulation effort is now apparently strong enough to stand on its own.

That is welcome. Airline deregulation is a fine first step towards reducing the inflationary role of government in private markets. The connection between deregulation and noise control has always been political, not logical. It is now up to the House to look hard at the dubious case for noise control subsidies. The subsidy program now contemplated would have very little impact on the airlines' ability to finance quiet aircraft. But it would set an unfortunate precedent for other industries to look first to the Federal Government for cash to clean up pollution.

The key provision of the House plan would divert a quarter of the revenues from the current 8 percent domestic ticket tax now going to the airport construction trust fund and use it to pay for quieter aircraft engines. No additional tax would be needed to make up the revenue loss to the trust fund; it now runs a substantial surplus. The airlines say they must have the Federal money because their bill for the new equipment will be enormous in coming years, and their ability to raise private capital will be limited by their large existing debts and poor profit record.

Some critics of the proposals dispute the industry's claims, citing its fine profits in recent months. But there is really no need to decide here who is right, since the program is unlikely to change airline financing for better or worse. Industry opinion notwithstanding, the competitive market in which the airlines operate would prevent them from using the subsidy to increase total revenues. It might temporarily increase revenues. But competition among the carriers—competition informally encouraged by the Government, and soon to be required by law—should insure that passengers get the tax money back. Any excess profits will be returned in the form of somewhat lower fares than could otherwise be expected.

The subsidy, then, is no subsidy at all: The effect would be virtually the same if the ticket tax were simply reduced from 8 percent to 6 percent and competition continued to determine ticket prices. That, ironically, is just what alternative legislation proposed by Congressman Charles Vanik—and bitterly opposed by the airlines—would do.

Since it wouldn't really change anything, cynics argue that Congress might as well make the airlines happy by approving the bill. But this route has its dangers. The program generates the appearance, if not the reality, of a Government bailout for one industry's special environmental program. And, as such, it could pave the way psychologically for special pleadings by other industries. The aircraft noise subsidy program is, in itself, neither good nor bad: It is meaningless. Competition among the carriers should nullify its economic impact. But that is certainly not sufficient reason to commit the Federal Government symbolically to a policy of cleaning up other peoples' messes.

I hope that my colleagues take these arguments into account when the closed rule for title III comes to the floor early next week. I ask you to vote against the previous question on the closed rule so that an open rule may be considered. This would allow amendments that would reduce the airline passenger tax and prevent the airlines from getting an investment tax credit on the Treasury giveaway.

We cannot afford to let a closed rule open the doors of the Treasury so that the airlines can airlift \$3 billion from the Federal airport and airway trust fund.●

## HOPE TO A DIVIDED LEBANON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of the Members to the question and answer interview in this afternoon's Washington Star, featuring the Honorable Charles Malik, one of the world's most respected statesmen. Dr. Malik, former foreign minister of Lebanon who became the first Arab President of the United Nations General Assembly, expresses his concern with the fate of Lebanon's fragmentation and the threat to its Christian community.

In view of the overwhelming adoption by the House of my amendment to suspend aid to Syria for the fiscal year 1979, and the interest in a similar amendment pending in the other body, I insert the Q. & A., column so that the Members might appreciate the grave problems that beset Lebanon:

EX-LEBANESE AIDE DESCRIBES HOPES FOR HIS DIVIDED LAND

Question: What is the problem in Lebanon that has seen the country's central authority virtually evaporate in the last two years?

Malik: The problem of Lebanon is the breakdown of practically all its institutions: governmental, military, civil, economic, educational and judicial. Lebanon has been undergoing a tremendous upheaval for three years as a result of many internal and external factors. The question, therefore, that faces the Lebanese people today is how to reconstitute themselves in such a manner as to have a stable, strong, effective government and at the same time how to preserve their human rights and fundamental freedoms which they deeply cherish.

Q: How do you explain the fragmentation of the Christian community itself, the feuds within the Christian community and the feuds between the Christian community and the Palestinians?

A. Lebanon is a mosaic of diverse communities and cultures and interests. In a mosaic like this, when the central quality weakens, the difference among the components in the mosaic would naturally become more accentuated, with the result that hitherto hidden or covered up rivalries and competitions and differing ambitions would come to the surface and make themselves more felt. And that is more or less what's happened in Lebanon in recent years. The feuds among the Christians are all internal and a result of rivalries among themselves as to leadership and position in the country. I do not think you'd find any difference among all the feuding Christian factions of Lebanon about whether they would want Lebanon to lose its independence or its freedom or to become enslaved or to become assimilated into any other kind of society than its own proper society.

Q. How have external factors affected the situation?

A: External factors have accentuated the situation: the presence of massive armed Palestinians in the country; the interests of many Middle Eastern countries in Lebanon itself, either to settle old accounts or accounts among themselves on Lebanese soil, and the pouring in of lots of money to help certain elements in the country fight other elements in the country.

Q: Are people like Pierre Gemayel (a leader of the Christian community) looking for an integrated Lebanon? Or are they looking for a feudatory of their own without in-

terference from any external authority, including Lebanese?

A: Your question is clearly a loaded question. The direct answer to it is that the people to whom you refer and by whom you call by certain derogatory names are very honest people. They will accept nothing short of a unified Lebanon. They are not looking for what you call feudatory interests. They are looking only for the interests of the Lebanese people as a whole. They do not accept any diminution in the fundamental freedoms and rights and open character of Lebanese society. It's for the preservation of these fundamental values in Lebanon that they are fighting and for nothing else.

Q: How do you view the work of the Syrian peacekeeping forces so far in Lebanon? Do you think they have helped or hurt the situation?

A: They did a very good job at the beginning. They stopped the carnage of the Lebanese people and especially the Lebanese Christians who were very fond of them and they fraternized with them. Also some of the people, some of the leaders to whom you referred did go to Damascus and see President (Hafez) Assad several times and they always came back and told us they found him a very honorable, understanding, well-intentioned leader who wants only good for Lebanon and who will not tolerate any injustice inflicted upon the Lebanese people. I heard that from these leaders many times and I fully believe them.

Q: Has the situation with Syria changed recently?

A: Something happened about eight or nine months ago which appears to have changed the policy of Syria. I cannot attribute that change to a change in the mind of President Assad because I do not know. Last month the Syrian forces which are the overwhelming majority of the Arab peacekeeping forces, shelled, bombed and virtually destroyed the three or four most important Christian suburbs of Beirut. You hear at times pretexts given for that strange change such as they were provoked into it, they were shot at by others. No conceivable pretext can justify that wholesale bombing, shelling and firing and burning and many incidents of looting. About 300,000 peaceful Christian civilians had to flee to the mountains and live as refugees in their own country.

Q: Let's turn to the Israeli policy on Lebanon, which was characterized by reprisal raids recently, then an invasion and then withdrawal. They maintain a strong position and strong ties to the Christian community in Lebanon. What do you make of Israeli policy as it affects Lebanon, a united Lebanon?

A: So far as I know there have been no Israeli raids except on Palestinian camps. And again as far as I know these raids almost always occur as reprisals for attacks publicly done by Palestinian elements. They did invade a considerable part of south Lebanon. And as far as I know they have withdrawn now completely from that part and United Nations forces, by decision of the Security Council, were sent to the south to replace the Israelis.

Q: Isn't it true that what has taken the place of the Israelis in the south are the armed Christian groups who will not permit a UN peacekeeping force from entering the south?

A: I was not present at the United Nations debate nor did I take any part in behind-the-scenes negotiations. But I read in the papers and heard on the radio that one of the conditions Israel insisted on was that the UN would not allow the Palestinians to go back to the south of Lebanon. I also hear that the United Nations forces have not been able to prevent Palestinians from going into the south of Lebanon. I have some figures that literally thousands of them have gone back and are now going back

with the knowledge of some United Nations forces and are receiving lots of arms.

Q: Obviously the problem in Lebanon inflicts the most pain on the Lebanese people with the chaos and the collapse of society and the danger to life itself. But it's not a problem only for Lebanon, because a weak and divided Lebanon invites foreign involvement and that in turn can lead to a war which can draw in the great powers. In view of that, what do you think should be done by the great powers or by anybody in the area now?

A: My view is that we should first of all have very clear in our minds what kind of values may be destroyed if the problem of Lebanon is allowed to take its own course without proper help, sympathetic help, from outside. First, the free and open and liberal and pluralist society of Lebanon could be destroyed. And this free and plural society is practically the only society of its kind in the whole earth. The second value that is likely to be destroyed is the only remaining free, secure and deeply rooted Christian community, and even more than that, a community whose traditions go back uninterrupted for 2,000 years. This would endanger our being overwhelmed and becoming extinct or at least being reduced to a second-class community. These two fundamental values are the values which are at stake in the agony of Lebanon today.

Q: What do you think specifically a concert of states can do?

A: I think there are very urgent things, intermediate things and long-range things. The most urgent thing is for the international community—including the United States—to use its good offices to make sure that the present lull, the present cease-fire holds for good. The second thing is an honorable withdrawal of the Syrian forces from the Christian area. Third, something must be done to facilitate the return of the 300,000 Christian refugees and make sure their homes are still livable and they can still live a decent life in them. Fourth, some consideration on all kinds of levels should be given to how long the Syrian army could stay in Lebanon. When consideration is given to that aspect of the situation then, of course, arises the problem of what alternative you ought to have to replace the Syrian peacekeeping force if the Lebanese army in the meantime has not been strengthened to take care of the security of the country by itself. I'm not prepared at all to say there's no solution. On the contrary, one may make a number of suggestions about how it may be solved, provided there is initial renewal to solve the problem.

Q: What about the presence of the Palestinians on Lebanese soil?

A: The question of 50,000 or 60,000 heavily armed Palestinians is priority five or six. It is inconceivable that there's going to be peace in Lebanon of any tolerable kind with the presence on Lebanese soil of about 100,000 armed forces, Syrian and Palestinian. That problem has to be faced and we cannot simply put it aside and say that all will go well by sheer good will and rhetoric. Nor will all go well by force, namely by intimidation and all this destruction of the basic freedoms of the Lebanese which they cherish more than life itself.

Q: What other problems need to be solved?

A: You have economic reconstruction. You have communal political reconstruction. You have psychological problems to be faced to heal the rifts between the diverse segments of the population. You have the problem of Lebanon's relations with its neighbors, the Syrians, whom we do not want to be an enemy at all, and with the rest of the Arab world. You have the problem also of the relations of Lebanon with the rest of the world. ●

### SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1978

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the question of freedom is unsolved in many aspects. Man deserves the freedom to live in a free society. Man's material well being is sick without spiritual well being.

No people in our world's history have a greater claim to love of freedom than the Czechs. For in this land, the dynamic forces of free thought, intellectual attainment, and economic development have long flourished. This is so because the Czechs have, as a people, honored freedom and human dignity.

The only fault with the Czechs and Slovaks is they are far too few in number, and occupy a space of our globe too small to command great power.

And since this relatively small number of people lies in the path of one or another great superpower, the superpowers seem to have no qualm about stepping on Czechoslovakia's territory.

This is certainly the case with the infamous Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

On the 10th anniversary of this tragic turn of events, it is worthwhile to note this Soviet action illustrates the horrors of communism.

Marxism, as practiced by the Soviet Union, at least, means no free speech and no free thoughts. Because it is the nature of Czechs to speak and think freely, Soviet Marxism had to send tanks and soldiers to stamp out, not guns or weapons, but free expression and reform.

We should not forget this.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are many, many Czechs. They are not refugees from the 1968 horror, or the 1948 horror, nor the 1939 horror, but the uprisings of 1848.

Seeking political freedoms, these 19th century immigrants came into Texas to carve a new life while maintaining their love of freedom. This they have done, and I know that I speak with them in condemning the Soviet "Day of Shame" of 1968.

The Czechs of my district—honorable, hard-working, respected citizens—have a great love for the "old country" of Moravia and Bohemia. They are pained to observe that the present Czechoslovakia is under the dominance of the Soviets by armed pressure and force. Today, they still carry on the customs of the old country. They do not want to make matters worse on the present citizens of Czechoslovakia, but they yearn for a return of democracy to their previous country. During all these years, they are quietly and painfully regretful that there is little freedom in the old country. All this was brought on by the invasion of the Soviets. I am convinced there is a deep-rooted resentment over this invasion. Someday it will erupt again. Someday the old democracy will come again. And the sooner the better. ●

### AIRPORT NOISE AND YOUR HEALTH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, numerous studies have demonstrated the harmful effects of constant exposure to aircraft noise. Investigations in Los Angeles, Japan, and England have linked constant exposure to jet noise to a rise in nervous breakdowns and birth defects.

While in my home district during our just completed recess, the results of a new University of California study were released. It reveals alarming evidence that links exposure to aircraft noise to higher death rates. Prof. William Meecham, the director of the study, compared mortality statistics for two areas similar in population, ethnic make-up and economic levels. The results indicated a death rate 19 percent higher in airport neighborhoods. Professor Meecham stated that the statistical odds against such differences occurring by sheer accident are 1,000 to 1.

As we near consideration of legislation which addresses the growing problem of aircraft noise, the Airport and Aircraft Noise Reduction Act, it seems most appropriate to share with you a recent Los Angeles Times news article which contains the details of Professor Meecham's study:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 25, 1978]  
STUDY LINKS AIRPORT NOISE, INCREASE IN DEATH RATES—MORTALITY FIGURES UP 19 PERCENT FOR THOSE LIVING BENEATH LANDING PATTERNS AT L.A. AIRPORT

(By Richard C. Paddock)

A UCLA study of two communities near Los Angeles International Airport revealed a link between the constant noise of jet aircraft and higher death rates, it was disclosed Thursday.

The study, conducted by William Meecham, a professor of engineering specializing in aeroacoustics, showed that the death rate in neighborhoods directly beneath the landing pattern of jet aircraft and within three miles of the airport was 19 percent higher than among residents six miles from the airport.

"The evidence seems to clearly indicate a substantial increase in mortality rates for areas nearest the airport," Meecham said in a preliminary report on his investigation.

"It lends added weight to the results of earlier studies in Los Angeles, England and Japan linking constant exposure to jet noise to a rise in nervous breakdowns and birth defects," he said.

Another UCLA study released last February showed that children born to parents living under the airport landing pattern are much more likely to suffer birth defects such as harelips, cleft palates, anencephaly (missing brain) and spina bifida (spinal chord defect).

That study showed that in a test area next to Los Angeles International Airport—the same test area of Meecham's study—the rate of abnormal births was 61 percent higher among blacks, and 37 percent higher among whites, than in the rest of Los Angeles County from 1970 to 1972.

F. Nowell Jones, a UCLA psychology professor, and Judy Tauscher of UCLA's school of public health, who conducted that study,

speculated that the cause of the higher birth defect rate was stress suffered by pregnant women repeatedly exposed to the noise of jet aircraft. Another study conducted in 1974 showed that noise can produce stress by causing disturbances in sleep patterns.

According to Meecham's two-year study, residents living in 1971 and 1972 within three miles of the Los Angeles airport suffered more deaths due to stroke, heart-disease and cirrhosis of the liver than residents of an area six miles from the airport.

Meecham will present a full report to local citizens groups, aviation industry experts and public officials at a September UCLA extension conference open to the public.

For the study, Meecham and graduate student Nell Shaw compared mortality statistics for two areas similar in population, ethnic makeup and economic levels.

In the area closest to the airport, a section of Lennox and Englewood bounded by Aviation Blvd., Arbor Vitae St., Vermont Ave., and Imperial Highway, the sound level was measured at 90 decibels and higher.

About six miles from the airport, in the Carson-Gardena area bounded by Crenshaw Blvd., Rosecrans Ave., Central Ave., Victoria St., 190th St. and the San Diego Freeway, the noise level ranged from 45 to 50 decibels.

Since decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale, noise of 90 decibels is 10,000 times greater than 50 decibels.

Prolonged exposure to noise of 90 decibels already is considered by experts to be hazardous to mental and physical health, according to Meecham's report.

In the area nearer the airport, the researchers found that 890 residents died during the two-year period compared to 670 in the more distant area. Adjusting for some differences in population, Meecham said, the death rate is 9 percent higher in the area directly under the jet landing pattern.

"By standard statistical measures, the odds against such differences occurring by sheer accident are 1,000 to 1," Meecham said.

Deaths from cirrhosis of the liver—generally linked to alcoholism—were 140 percent greater, in the noisier neighborhood than in the quieter one.

Deaths from stroke and heart disease were 39 percent greater in the area closer to the airport, Meecham said.

On Sept. 21 and 22, Meecham will conduct a conference at UCLA entitled "Aircraft Noise and the Community." Officials from the Federal Aviation Administration, the California Office of Noise Abatement and the Environmental Protection Agency will participate along with representatives from the aviation industry and citizens groups from Santa Monica, Brentwood, and Pacific Palisades.

"Previous conferences have been largely directed toward government agencies and industry experts," Meecham said "This program attempts to bring citizens groups and individuals into the discussion."●

the bill that would ostensibly "reform" the civil service system. Mr. Marvin Stone, the writer in question, urges that Congress send the President's task force back to the drawing board. I quite agree.

The article follows:

**A GOOD TRY—NOT GOOD ENOUGH**  
(By Marvin Stone)

President Carter's plan to reform the civil service has generated widespread confusion. Administration arguments for the proposal have provided neither clarity nor reassurance.

Expressed the simplest way, the plan is to bring the bureaucracy under tighter rein by splitting the Civil Service Commission into two agencies, one for hiring and one for employee protection; to set up a corps of 9,200 super-executives, and to make it easier to fire people.

The splitting of the Commission is already in law, since Congress did not veto it. The rest requires approval, and it now is on its way through the House and Senate. This vehicle carries hazardous cargo.

Drumming up some support has been easy, because the images of the greedy bureaucrat and the lazy clerk are well established in the public mind. These slackers, be they few or many, have got to shape up or ship out. But does this mean we should accept a remedy that would cost the security of honest and industrious workers and open the way to a politically dominated service? The American people have a right to a civil service that can do its work undisturbed by political campaigns or partisan manipulation.

No one alleges that Jimmy Carter lusts after power. But his reforms would enable any future political dictator to reach down through the levels and take the whole organization captive. Members of the Senior Executive Service would work close to the administration. In turn 72,500 intermediate managers, the GS-13s, 14s and 15s, bereft of automatic raises, would depend largely on SES review for their rewards. And the lower grades, finding appeal more difficult than at present, would have to please the middle managers in whatever shades of political control the managers transmit.

Safeguards are prescribed, indeed. If a lower-echelon employe believed he had been fired through a "prohibited practice," he could take his plea to the Merit Systems Protection Board (appointed by the President), where the handling of his case would be determined to an extent by the special counsel (appointed by the President). There he would have trouble proving, for instance, that a charge of being obstructive or unproductive or hard to work with resulted from a rejection of political pressure. He could appeal further to one or another federal court, where the cost might well be prohibitive.

Members of the House Civil Service Committee moved the burden of proof in appeals from the employe back to the management—an improvement, but not enough to overcome the deficiencies of the proposed system. They knocked out the administration's bid to hire from among the first seven applicants instead of the first three as now, a proposed shift that would have oddly belied the drive for efficiency—but would have made it easier to take care of a politically preferable job seeker.

As for the amendment in the House to weaken the Hatch Act, that's poison.

Finally, the committee adopted Representative Gladys Spellman's amendment to confine the Senior Executive Service to a two-year tryout. Two years might indicate whether the system would work administratively, but could not begin to test creeping corruption.

We agree that civil service must be reformed. As pointed out by Representative

Quayle of Indiana, the federal bureaucracy has grown to consume 22 percent of the gross national product. Its numbers have ballooned by 462 percent in the last 48 years, while the population has increased only 71 percent. Anyone who has worked close to this monstrous bureaucracy has seen individuals who loaf the day out, or whole units with nothing to do.

There has got to be a way to stop the outrageous waste, but the current plan is not the answer. It is risky beyond repair. Congress should send the President's task force back to the drawing board.●

**THE LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE  
AND DEEP SEABED MINING LEGISLATION**

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional adviser to the U.S. Delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference, I recently attended the Conference's current resumed seventh session in New York at the United Nations.

This resumed session commenced on August 21, 1978 and is scheduled to conclude on September 15, 1978. During this period the delegations from 150 nations are endeavoring to secure an equitable and comprehensive sea law treaty.

While progress on key issues had been made when the Conference convened in Geneva this past spring, several major topics continue to prove contentious. One such issue is deep seabed mining: the management and recovery of resources found on the sea floor and subsoil thereof, and the coordination of such activities undertaken by an international organization and individual states.

During the current session in New York, on August 28, 1978, both Ambassador Satya N. Nandan of Fiji, chairman of the group of 77, a group of 119 developing countries at the conference, and Ambassador Elliot Richardson, head of the U.S. delegation to the Conference, discussed deep seabed mining within the context of unilateral legislation pertaining to this activity being considered by individual States. The House, on July 26, 1978, passed such legislation, H.R. 3350, while the Senate has not as yet acted on this bill.

So that my colleagues may benefit from the observations of Ambassador Nandan and Ambassador Richardson on the relationship between such legislation and the Conference's efforts to conclude an agreement on seabed mining, I insert the remarks of both Ambassador Nandan and Ambassador Richardson at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SATYA N. NANDAN

Mr. President, as the Chairman of the Group of 77, a group of 119 developing countries at this Conference, I would like to refer to a matter which though apparently extraneous to the Conference must be of grave concern for all who wish to see this Conference successfully concluded. The matter I wish to refer to is the move for unilateral

**U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT OPPOSES CARTER CIVIL SERVICE PROPOSALS**

**HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members of the House of Representatives, I am providing a copy of an editorial in the August 28, 1978, edition of U.S. News & World Report. The points made by the editorial writer are indeed cogent as we consider H.R. 11280,



legislation relating to the exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed, being enacted or contemplated in several industrialized countries.

Such a move, coming at a time when this Conference has virtually concluded 90 percent of its difficult and intricate work for a global treaty affecting the ocean space as a whole, must be of concern to all who seek to regulate the future relations in the oceans in an orderly and peaceful manner through a universally agreed treaty. Those involved in these negotiations must know that this Conference has been making a steady progress towards a comprehensive treaty which will deal with a broad spectrum of international law of the sea from territorial jurisdiction of States to deep seabed mining beyond national jurisdiction. A task of such magnitude which involves a multitude of national interests and often conflicting national and international interests cannot be negotiated overnight. Nor can the negotiations for a multilateral treaty encompassing such a vast area of international law be compared with the relatively simpler processes of national legislations. If our progress appears to be slow it is to ensure that our agreements are universally respected and durable.

It is in this perspective that I wish to express here the view of the Group of 77 on the question of unilateral legislations affecting the resources in the area of seabed beyond national jurisdiction.

The Group considers such legislation as being contrary to the Declaration of Principles contained in General Assembly Resolution 2749 (XXV) and the declaration for a moratorium on seabed exploration and exploitation contained in General Assembly Resolution 2574 D (XXIV).

In the Declaration of Principles, the international community has solemnly proclaimed the deep seabed area as well as its resources as the Common Heritage of Mankind and as such it is not subject to appropriation or claim or exercise of sovereignty or sovereign rights. It has further declared that—

"All activities regarding the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the area and other related activities shall be governed by the international regime to be established."

The Moratorium Resolution is categorical in its declaration that pending the establishment of the international regime, States are bound to refrain from all activities of exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed and no claim to any part of it or its resources shall be recognized.

It is the position of the Group of 77 that such unilateral legislation relating to the resources beyond national jurisdiction have no validity in international law and activities conducted thereunder cannot be purported to acquire any legal status.

It is incomprehensible that at a time when the Conference is at an advanced stage in negotiating an internationally agreed regime for the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the deep seabed, States engaged in those negotiations should contemplate unilateral actions which would threaten to jeopardize the pursuit of the negotiations and indeed the successful conclusion of the Conference itself. These States must be aware of the consequences of their actions.

Mr. President, there can be no substitute to a universally agreed treaty for a rational and equitable development of the resources of the deep seabed area in the interest of the world community as a whole. Any other solution is not only selfish but short-sighted and may lead to irreparable consequences.

All of us have more important interests at stake at this Conference than only the manganese nodules and we should be careful not

to jeopardize the overall agreement through hasty and short-sighted actions.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON

Mr. President:

I have listened with respect to the views expressed by the distinguished representative of Fiji on behalf of the Group of 77, and I do not wish to precipitate a lengthy debate on the subject of the deep seabed mining legislation. However, in my view and in the view of the other countries whose enterprises are now in the process of developing the means of recovering hard minerals from the deep seabed, the concept of the common heritage of mankind, which we supported in 1970 and to which we still subscribe, has never meant that these resources must remain unexploited in the absence of an internationally agreed seabeds regime. I would have thought this point would have been made clear by our concurrent opposition to the moratorium resolution, which was not adopted by consensus.

In our view, states and their nationals have the legal right to use the mineral resources of the deep seabed beyond national jurisdiction. This is a freedom of the high seas which has not been abridged either by any treaty or by customary international law. Although we are all engaged in the process of developing a treaty, this process has proved long and difficult, and its successful conclusion is not yet at hand.

I understand why the Group of 77 would prefer that we agree to defer any mining until an agreed treaty can be concluded, but I trust the Group will also understand why we cannot responsibly do that in face of the world's long-range need for the minerals and the more immediate need to proceed with the research and development that will in turn lead to the beginning of commercial mining. Far from jeopardizing the Conference, seabed mining legislation should facilitate the early conclusion of a generally acceptable Law of the Sea Treaty by dispelling any impression that the governments of the countries preparing to engage in such mining can be induced to acquiesce in an otherwise unacceptable treaty because that is the only way to obtain the minerals.

Mr. President, so far as the US is concerned, the goal of my Government remains the earliest possible conclusion of a generally acceptable Law of the Sea Treaty, and I believe the legislation now before the Congress to be entirely compatible with the principles on which the eventual treaty will be founded:

It recognizes that the resources of the seabed are the common heritage of mankind.

It requires that revenues be set aside for developing countries.

It requires stringent standards for the protection of the marine environment.

It does not assert any right of sovereignty or sovereign rights over seabed mine-sites.

It will be superseded whenever a law of the sea treaty takes effect with regard to the United States.

It does not declare or imply any intention that American seabed mining companies should remain outside the jurisdiction of an International Seabed Authority under such a treaty.

Finally, Mr. President, under the legislation that has just emerged from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, no permits for commercial recovery of hard mineral resources could in any case be issued for several years. This will allow ample time for our negotiations to conclude, thus assuring that seabed resources will be developed only under the international regime we are striving to achieve.

Thank you, Mr. President. ●

## THE DESTRUCTION OF THE MLAWA JEWISH COMMUNITY

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, World War II was one of the most saddening periods of history for Jewish people around the world. The cruel atrocities committed upon the Jewish people will always remain an unforgettable part of history.

The Jewish people have endured this holocaust and have emerged still a strong and vibrant people. However, there remain many who may not be fully aware of what was actually taking place in countless Jewish villages across Germany and in other nations during World War II.

One such village was a small town called Mlawá. The injustices which took place in this Jewish community are a painful reminder of what was taking place in other Jewish communities across Europe. Mr. Allen A. Warsen, from Oak Park, Mich., is the founder and honorary president of the Jewish Historical Society of Michigan. He is also a book reviewer for the Detroit Jewish News and has reviewed a great deal of holocaust literature. He has translated and published a booklet entitled "The Destruction of the Mlawá Jewish Community," which describes the atrocities that the innocent citizens of Mlawá suffered through during World War II. Mr. Warsen has sent me a copy of this booklet, and I would like to share this account with my colleagues:

### THE DESTRUCTION OF THE MLAWA JEWISH COMMUNITY

The town of Mlawá is situated at the former border of Prussia. There, where two cultures came together, generations of Jews were raised.

The enterprising Jews, whose commercial activities reached as far as Königsberg, and whose life and existence resembled a ship on the great waterways of the world, at home, laid the foundations of Torah learning, and immersed themselves in the practice of Jewish traditions.

Even the ordinary Mlawá Jews, who all week long were busy earning a living, could not be surpassed in their devotion to Queen Sabbath and in the observance of Jewish religious precepts.

As I write these lines, a picture-album titled "The Build-up of the East," published in Munich in 1941, lies before me. In the section on Jews there are a few pictures of Jewish-Polish types. Surprisingly, these are photographs of Mlawá Jews: fathers and grandfathers whose eyes reflect great Jewish hearts.

In the printed text of the album, the perverted Germans promised "to take care of the Polish Jews," but failed to mention that they already "had taken care of them."

It is generally believed that in Mlawá, the Germans carried out the first "Aussiedlung" (evacuation) of Polish Jews. They committed this crime even before Treblinka and Majdanek were created.

Why? For what sins did the Mlawá Jews deserve to be banished from their homes? Was it because they brought enlightenment and knowledge wherever they came? Or was it for the moral force exerted by Joseph Opatoshu, Mlawá's great Jew? Or was it because the Jews developed in Mlawá a worldly

culture at a time the peasants there were still backward and primitive?

The Mlawa Jewish community belonged to the most cultured Jewish communities in Poland. Though small, it produced generations of intellectuals and creative men who strengthened culturally Jewish communities throughout the world.

It is noteworthy that Mlawa produced two great authors: Joseph Opatoshu and Yakir Warszawski. [It was also the birthplace of the world renowned Socialist Victor Alter, martyred with Henryk Ehrlich by the Russian terroristic Bolsheviks.]

This outstanding Jewish community the monstrous Germans destroyed shortly after their invasion of Mlawa.

On December 5th, 1940, the Germans with the assistance of Polish hooligans forcefully ejected from their homes three thousand three hundred Jews and drove them to Dzialdowo, a town near Mlawa.

In Dzialdowo, in a prepared concentration camp, the monsters tested on the kidnapped Jews techniques of torture and degradation that they later applied to all Polish Jews. They built bonfires to try the most efficient method of burning Jews. To accelerate their inhuman experiments, the monsters with whips and sticks rushed their victims into the burning flames and sadistically watched them roast.

While the burning of Jews was still in progress, other monsters murdered their victims by running them over with trucks.

In that manner the aged rabbi of the Mlawa Jewish community met his death. Before the sadists murdered him, they forced him to put on his "tallith" (prayer shawl) and "tepphillin" (phylacteries) and pray for Hitler's health. Afterwards, the criminals crushed him with a truck.

From Dzialdowo officers of the "superior race" came to the camp to display their superior bestial instincts. It is simply impossible to express in human language the refined tortures the sadists inflicted on their victims.

Incomprehensible and indescribable were the sufferings the women endured. They were forced naked with their breasts to roll in human feces. This was not an invention of primitive men, but of high ranking degenerate officers, junkers, and "noblemen of swinish Teutonic blood."

The same perverts forced Jewish girls to perform lesbian acts and married men to rape married women.

The Walpurga Night lasted without interruption twenty four hours.

As a result of the tormenting experiences, eleven individuals lost their minds. Their madness satisfied the animal urges of the degenerate tormenters.

At night, the mentally ill were subdued by the Nazi prisoners. But one sick person freed himself and ran out of the camp. He was killed by an Arian truck.

Some of the most distressing scenes took place during mealtime. No one was allowed to have a plate or sardine container. The "food" was poured either into the lap of a garment or a shoe. The recipient was forced to run with the food to his assigned place. Otherwise, the savages forced him to spill his portion.

The Dzialdowo inferno lasted eleven days. From there the Nazi victims were transported in freight cars to the so called "Jewish reservation" in Mezritch (Miedzyrzec).

There hell began anew.

Israel Goldstein, a Jew from Ripin, hardened by the brutal treatment he had received, the deportations and experiences in Treblinka, had difficulty relating the horrors to which the Nazi victims were subjected while they were leaving the freight cars and marching to the synagogue in Mezritch. The synagogue, it should be pointed out, served as the "Jewish reservation."

Shortly after their arrival in Mezritch, a

typhus epidemic broke out in the synagogue, that claimed tens of victims daily. At night the lice-covered corpses were removed in sacks to prevent the epidemic from spreading. For the same reason, food was delivered to the victims of Nazi oppression through the synagogue windows. However, the Black Death permeated through the synagogue walls, and the curses and laments of the sick and doomed could be heard far and wide.

Yet, between death and hopelessness, someone composed a primitive song portraying the sufferings and humiliations of the Mlawa Jews.

Where did that man get the strength to create those rhymes and melody? Even God would not know! Since he, too, had abandoned the Mlawa Jews.

The song, Israel Goldstein informed me, became the hymn of suffering and hope of the tortured and sick. It rapidly reached the Mezritch ghetto where young and old sang it hundreds of times.

It is astonishing that in their darkest hours Mlawa Jews, including the sick, refused to despair. In the midst of their most horrifying and humiliating experiences, they did not lose hope that someday a new world would arise and "The time will come We will again be free."

(These are the concluding lines of the song.)

The Mlawa Jews who did not die in the "Jewish reservation" perished together with those of Mezritch in Treblinka. Also the Jews who remained in Mlawa as slave laborers either were exterminated there, or were gassed in the ovens of Chelmino and Oswiecim.

"I imagined," said Israel Goldstein, "if I returned to Mlawa, I'd find there an historic marker memorializing the slaughtered Jewish community. Hadn't the Jews lived there for generations? Hadn't they created there and made Mlawa into a town? Furthermore, hadn't the Poles inherited all Jewish possessions?"

To my great sorrow, I encountered there a great tragedy. A shameful act was perpetrated by local Polish hooligans."

Remarkably, the handful of Mlawa Jewish Holocaust survivors returned to Mlawa to erect a monument in memory of the destroyed Jewish community. First, they exhumed the remains of the fallen martyrs. Then, they placed the remains in a common brotherly grave. Lastly, they erected on the grave a tombstone commemorating the destroyed community.

The gravestone remained intact a few weeks. Then one night a gang of murderous Poles crushed it to pieces.

"As I was holding fragments of the crushed gravestone in my hands," related Goldstein, "I felt as if I was holding broken bones of the Treblinka martyrs."

This hideous crime marked the end of the illustrious history of the Jewish Community of Mlawa. ●

#### ROLLBACK MEDICARE DEDUCTIBLES AND COINSURANCE PAYMENTS

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there is a story that is told about a man who owned just one pair of boots. He could not afford to buy a pair of boots very often, but owning a pair of boots gave him what he needed. It saved him the embarrassment of being seen in public without a pair of boots. When he walked to town, he put on the boots only after he reached the city limits. You see saving wear on

those boots meant that he could keep up appearances, and keeping up appearances meant more to him than the protection of his feet.

In this country there are many older people on fixed meager incomes who understand very well why the man who owned just one pair of boots did not put them on until he could be seen in public. They are living their lives as though a denial of poverty were woven into the very fabric of their being. We are told that about 16 percent of those age 65 or over only have income below the threshold of poverty. Yet it is doubtful that half of those at or below the threshold of poverty either admit or feel that they are poor.

Much of what I say is more than just speculation. It is confirmed by what I have heard in hours and hours of testimony as chairman of the Committee on Aging. One of our witnesses, Daphne Krause of the Minneapolis Age & Opportunity Center, in telling us how older people skimp on medical services to keep up appearances, said:

As we do grow older, and if our health deteriorates, and we find that our limited income and resources cannot cover the costs above Medicare for medical care we need, we delay getting medical help until our situation is serious, then we painfully draw on our precious savings, knowing they are irreplaceable. Under our "medi-supportive" concept (at the Minneapolis Age & Opportunity Center), which I will explain, we are serving over 8,000 people. We had become aware that many of our clients were not receiving needed medical care. The consequences were sickening, as you will hear. Many ended up in nursing homes too soon or died needlessly. Seniors will go without every time, rather than run up bills they can't pay.

The Abbott nurses and MAO counselors were screening 100 patients a day, having to make the agonizing choice between the sick and the sick, as to who would see a doctor. One client walked in with a handkerchief over a cancerous hole in the cheek; another with an aneurysm as big as a grapefruit. Another had a heart attack 5 days before and decided not to get help until they heard about us.

Ms. Krause is not talking about a time before the coming of Medicare. The people she is talking about had Medicare. They just could not afford Medicare deductibles and coinsurance. As the cost of hospital services soar, the Medicare hospital deductible has gone up too. In fact the formula under which the hospital deductible is raised each year is directly related to increases in the inpatient hospital per diem rate. Everyone knows that the rise in medical costs outpace most other consumer items. This means that the rise in the hospital deductible has been more than proportionate to the increase in wages and consumer items.

After being admitted to a hospital, a Medicare insured must now pay \$144 during the initial stages of hospitalization before Medicare takes over. Medicare then pays the reasonable costs of hospitalization through the 60th day. After the 60th day, and up to the 91st day, the Medicare insured is required to pay \$36 of the cost incurred for each day of hospitalization. After the 90th day the Medicare insured may elect to draw upon the 60 day lifetime reserve. If this election is made, the Medicare insured

must pay \$72 of the cost of each day of hospitalization after the 90th day.

Under Part B of medicare—(Supplementary Medical Insurance Benefits)—which covers outpatient services, the insured must pay out of pocket the first \$60 of medical items and services, after the \$60 deductible has been satisfied, the insured is entitled to reimbursement for 80 percent of the reasonable charges for necessary medical services.

For those of us who are employed, and drawing good wages, these medicare deductibles and coinsurance payments would not be an obstacle to medical treatment. Consider, however, the circumstances of most medicare insureds. Other than their social security retirement benefits, they do not have much income, and for them these deductibles and coinsurance payments all too often mean doing without groceries in order to receive medical treatment.

To bring medicare deductibles and coinsurance payments within the reach of senior citizens again, I introduced a bill today which will, if enacted, lower to \$20 the current hospital deductible of \$144, rollback to \$5 per day the hospitalization coinsurance payment of \$36 per day that applies between the 61st and 90th days, and to \$10 the daily hospitalization coinsurance payment of \$72 per day that applies to the 60 day lifetime reserve.

Rather than taking the additional cost of the proposed amendments from payroll taxes, the bill proposes to pay the cost of lower deductibles and coinsurance payments from general revenues. This method of financing the amendments would avoid any increase in social security payroll taxes which have already been criticized for being too high and too regressive. Financing a part of the medical insurance trust funds from general revenues is not without precedent. About half of the cost of the supplementary medical insurance program is now paid from general revenues.

This country should be willing to commit itself to removing all impediments to providing medical necessities for those age 65 and over. Whenever I think of the testimony of witnesses who came before the Select Committee On Aging, and told us about older people who in quiet desperation were allowing life to slip away because medicare deductibles and coinsurance payments are too high, I know that a rollback in medicare deductibles and coinsurance payments can wait no longer. ●

HONORING ELIZABETH AGNES  
PIGOTT

HON. PHILLIP BURTON  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, September 6, 1978

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 22, 1978, the American Irish Alliance of San Francisco will honor one of the truly good and generous women of San Francisco, Mrs. Elizabeth Agnes Pigott. Elizabeth Pigott's life of "good works" has earned for her a special place in the hearts of all who know

her and have shared the warmth of her friendship.

Born Elizabeth Agnes O'Hara in Domahaire County Leitrum, Ireland, she immigrated to the United States in 1912. She spent 6 years in Rochester, N.Y., before settling in San Francisco in 1918.

It was in San Francisco that same year that she met and married Patrick James Pigott at St. Peter's Church. They lived at 23d and Kansas Streets in the, then predominantly Irish, Potrero district. In 1933, the Pigotts moved to 2865 Harrison Street, closer to St. Peter's Church where they were very active. The balance of the 57 years of married life which they shared was spent at Harrison Street until Patrick Pigott's death in 1975.

Elizabeth Pigott is a woman who is concerned for others and that concern prompted her to action. Upon her arrival in San Francisco, Elizabeth Pigott joined the Father Yorke Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Connaught Ladies Auxiliary. With these beginnings, she has developed a reputation of charitable work and espousal of worthy causes which has made her preeminent in San Francisco's American Irish community.

Her name and her Harrison Street address have become household words in St. Peter's Parish and in the Irish community. The basement of her home served as a meeting place for young Irish men and women new to this city. Many of today's San Francisco Irish families had their start with the meetings of these young people at dances held there. For the Harrison Street basement was the scene of many dances and fundraising activities which sponsored the work of Irish priests and nuns working in the foreign missions or which helped local families who were down on their luck or who had sickness in the family. The Harrison Street basement was a little bit of Ireland transplanted to the San Francisco Mission district and from it Elizabeth Pigott ministered to the needs of those about her.

The San Francisco Irish community can claim with great pride that Elizabeth Pigott is their "first lady." For indeed, she is a great and good lady. She is a tireless worker who radiated, by her cheerfulness and happy disposition, the joy of helping and being concerned for others.

The basement on Harrison Street is now quiet but it has been said by leaders in the Irish community that it was the forerunner of the United Irish Cultural Center where she will be honored.

Elizabeth Pigott is one of those rare good people who has enriched the lives of all with whom she had come in contact. I share these thoughts with my colleagues in the House to honor her, knowing full well that her greatest honor and satisfaction comes from knowing that she has lived the Biblical injunction to "feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, and comfort the afflicted." ●

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of the Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees,

subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

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

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

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 7, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### SEPTEMBER 8

9:00 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 876, to provide relief to the residents in the Vermejo Conservancy District, New Mexico, and on miscellaneous land conveyance bills.  
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on S. 2970, proposed Truck Safety Act.  
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.  
Finance  
To continue markup of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic  
Priorities and Economy in Government  
Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the economic and budgetary effects of the proposed shipbuilding claims settlements on shipbuilding and Navy procurement.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging  
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of P.L. 95-256, to increase from 65 to 70 years of age limit for retirement under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.  
5110 Dirksen Building

##### SEPTEMBER 11

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Nancy Hays Teeters, of Indiana, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.  
5302 Dirksen Building

Finance  
To continue markup of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building

##### SEPTEMBER 12

9:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedures  
Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 2011, proposed Regulatory Reduction and Congressional Control Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources Business  
meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.  
Finance  
To continue markup of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building

- Foreign Relations  
To hold a business meeting on pending calendar business.  
4221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs  
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3284, to establish a minimum price preference for domestic goods, and to insure that the Federal Government does not purchase unfairly traded goods.  
3302 Dirksen Building
- 11:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for FY 79 from representatives of the American Legion.  
318 Russell Building
- 5:00 p.m.  
Finance  
Public Assistance Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3470, proposed State and Local Welfare Reform and Fiscal Relief Act.  
2221 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 13
- 9:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedures Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 2011, proposed Regulatory Reduction and Congressional Control Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Finance  
To continue markup of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building
- Government Affairs  
Permanent Investigations Subcommittee  
To resume hearings with regard to the widespread nature of arson-for-profit, including evidence of the role of organized crime.  
3302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 14
- 10:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on S. 1699, proposed Diesel Fuel and Gasoline Conservation Act.  
235 Russell Building
- Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings on S. 3283, proposed State Energy Management and Planning Act.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- Finance  
To continue markup of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs  
Permanent Investigations Subcommittee  
To continue hearings with regard to the widespread nature of arson-for-profit, including evidence of the role of organized crime.  
3302 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on the FBI Charter and its overall policy.  
2228 Dirksen Building
- 1:30 p.m.  
Conferees  
On H.R. 7577, extending through FY 1981 certain programs administered under the Economic Opportunity Act.  
357 Russell Building  
SEPTEMBER 15
- 10:00 a.m.  
Finance
- To continue mark up of H.R. 13511, to reduce income taxes.  
2221 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 18
- 10:00 a.m.  
Governmental Affairs  
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee  
To resume hearings to examine alleged abuses in the GSA's contracting and procurement divisions.  
3302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 19
- 9:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Constitution Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on S. 1845, to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prohibiting the use of polygraph type equipment for certain purposes.  
6226 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Human Resources  
Labor Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3060, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act.  
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To mark up proposed legislation to provide for the maintenance of reserves for certain financial institutions, to require the imposition of charges for certain services by Federal Reserve banks, and to authorize the payment of interest on reserves held in Federal Reserve banks.  
5302 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources  
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on S. 3392, to accelerate the use of solar energy as a source of electricity.  
3110 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 20
- 9:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Administrative Practice and Procedures Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on S. 2011, proposed Regulatory Reduction and Congressional Control Act.  
2228 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting on pending calendar business.  
3110 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources  
Labor Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on S. 3060, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act.  
4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue mark up of proposed legislation to provide for the maintenance of reserves for certain financial institutions, to require the imposition of charges for certain services by Federal Reserve banks, and to authorize the payment of interest on reserves held in Federal Reserve banks.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 21
- 9:00 a.m.  
Judiciary  
Constitution Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on S. 1845, to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prohibiting the use of polygraph type equipment for certain purposes.  
5110 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.  
Select Small Business  
To resume hearings to explore problems concerning capital formation of small independent enterprises.  
424 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings on the use of export controls and export credits for foreign policy purposes.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 22
- 9:30 a.m.  
Human Resources  
Labor Subcommittee  
To resume hearings on S. 3060, proposed National Workers' Compensation Standards Act.  
4232 Dirksen Building
- Select Small Business  
To resume hearings to explore problems concerning capital formation of small independent enterprises.  
424 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue hearings on the use of export controls and export credits for foreign policy purposes.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 26
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings on problems of small business defense contractors.  
5302 Dirksen Building
- Environment and Public Works  
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to receive testimony on nuclear reactor safety systems from NRC Chairman Hendrie.  
4200 Dirksen Building
- Finance  
Public Assistance Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on H.R. 10848 and H.R. 12972, to modify the disability aspects of the Supplemental Security Income program.  
2221 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 27
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings on financing of future energy needs.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
SEPTEMBER 28
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue oversight hearings on financing of future energy needs.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
OCTOBER 3
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold oversight hearings on the Council on Wage and Price Stability.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
OCTOBER 4
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue oversight hearings on the Council on Wage and Price Stability.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
OCTOBER 5
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on international housing programs.  
5302 Dirksen Building  
OCTOBER 6
- 10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings on international housing programs.  
5302 Dirksen Building