

cessed until Thursday, February 23, 1978, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 22, 1978:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Manuel A. Sanchez, Jr., of New York, to be Superintendent of the U.S. Assay Office at New York, N.Y., vice Nicholas Costanzo, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

P. R. Smith, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Robert Halde- man Meyer, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named captain of the Coast Guard Reserve to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Coast Guard Reserve in the grade of rear admiral:

Aubrey H. Jones, ~~XXXX-XX-XXXX~~.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Howard E. Greer, U.S. Navy (age 56) for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

The following-named officer, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility in the grade of vice admiral within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment while so serving as follows:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Kinnaird R. McKee, U.S. Navy.

The following-named captains of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Melvin Museles
John R. Lukas
Stephen Barchet

SUPPLY CORPS

William J. Ryan
Andrew A. Giordano
Joseph L. Flores

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Paul R. Gates

DENTAL CORPS

John B. Holmes

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Gen. Samuel Jaskilka, U.S. Marine Corps, (age 58), for appointment to the grade of general on the retired list, upon his retirement on 1 July 1978.

Lt. Gen. Joseph C. Fegan, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, (age 57), for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

The following-named brigadier general of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general under the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5902:

Jack M. Frisbie

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SECTION 8 ASSISTANCE FOR MOBILE HOMEOWNERS

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, the homeownership task force of the Housing Subcommittee recently held a number of field hearings to find out why the cost of housing has risen as it has and to explore possible solutions to the rising cost of housing that Federal, State, and local governments can and should pursue. The task force, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague Les AuCoin, concentrated on five areas—the impact of Federal regulations on housing costs, the benefits of different types of mortgage instruments tailored to homebuyers' needs, the effects of housing speculation on home prices, the impact of construction and land costs, and building innovations which reduce the cost of housing.

Current estimates reveal that in southern California only 15 percent of the families can afford to buy a home. Other studies indicate that by 1990 the average cost of a home may be as high as \$90,000. That is a national average. Already in Orange County, Calif., average home prices exceed \$88,000. In December, the average cost of a new home in Orange County was \$123,870. Last year alone, prices of existing homes in southern California increased by 27 percent. In the last 2 years, this increase has been as high as 50 percent. Home maintenance costs have doubled and property taxes have risen by 131 percent over the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of homeownership affects millions of low-income families and elderly citizens. Many of these people are now turning to mobile homes which are less expensive to buy and maintain. But those who have purchased mobile homes in order to escape escalating costs of conventional housing

are finding that rentals for space on which to park their mobile homes is pricing them out of an affordable alternative. Currently, mobile homeowners who must rent space are not eligible for any form of rental assistance. In the city of Seal Beach in my 34th District of California, the rising cost of rental space is placing a severe burden on many senior citizens. Rental space, which now ranges from \$50 to \$150 per month is expected to double.

Needless to say, the impact of this increase would be devastating. Therefore, I am introducing legislation to extend section 8 rental assistance to low-income families who own a mobile home and use it as their principal place of residence. In addition this legislation provides that SSI recipients who obtain housing assistance under any State program will not be subject to reductions in SSI benefits. These are necessary changes to existing law which will enhance housing affordability.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for owners of mobile homes who rent the real property on which their mobile homes are located, and for other purposes
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may make assistance payments under this section for the purpose of aiding any lower-income family in making rental payments with respect to real property on which is located a mobile home owned by such family and utilized by such family as its principal place of residence.

"(2) The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, issue regulations with respect to the maximum monthly rent which an owner of real property is entitled to receive for real property with respect to which assistance payments are made under this subsection, the amount of the monthly assistance payment which may be made under this subsection with respect to such property, and

the other terms and the duration of contracts entered into under this subsection."

Sec. 2. Section 2(h) of the Housing Authorization Act of 1976 is amended by inserting "or under any State program which provides housing assistance" after "Housing Act of 1949".

ELOQUENT COMMENTARY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Nelson Sabin of Virginia Beach, which is one of the most eloquent commentaries on the issues which are of deep concern to the people of the United States ever to come across my desk.

With Mr. Sabin's permission, I am taking this opportunity to place his words in the Record. I hope that all of my colleagues will take the time to read this letter and pay it careful heed; there is a very clear message for us all.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

FEBRUARY 13, 1978.

E. WILLIAM WHITEHURST
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. WHITEHURST: For several months I have been making notes and in my mind composing a letter to you, the material became so voluminous and repetitive and I'm sure, familiar to you I have discarded it.

As an illustration of my deep disappointment and frustration with those who are responsible for the administration within our federal government, I submit the enclosed clipping from today's Virginian Pilot. It speaks for itself.

More and more Congress passes laws as a result of and in favor of special interest groups. Citizens generally are unable to gauge the worth or possible (probable) effects of proposed legislation because of little, if any, information about such legislation. Even you in Congress do not fully understand some of the legislation voted on. This is only the first part. After legislation becomes law the bureaucracy of the federal administration starts massaging and bending it to fit

their philosophy or perception and struggle for power and/or survival. Some of the people in these areas wouldn't recognize a good piece of legislation if it sneaked up behind and bit them!

I am tired of the beating citizens are taking from the federal bureaucracy and this includes the judicial (system). I have the feeling frequently that our country is accelerated far down the road toward a deficit socialist form of government. The ever growing redistribution of income, the significant drop in (individual) productivity, the insistence on counter discrimination in many areas, the insistence for equality of results rather than equality of opportunity, the uneven application of the publically stated, high minded foreign policy and an ever growing disdain for the intelligence, desires and true needs of the taxpayer and citizen. Instead of a new Department of Education, which we need like we need another Adolph Hitler, why isn't a Department of Waste established. Maybe they could then organize the waste in government, and, waste a little less.

I realize our nation along with most of the world is undergoing changes at quite a rapid pace, and that we have at least thirty years before we can possibly reach a period of relative stability but we will not make it unless we move intelligence and true dedication to the real national good and interests is taken at the federal level; and the citizens confidence and enthusiasm regenerated.

I have been re-reading some of the material from my university political science studies, De Tocqueville for one. As you know this man perceived the weaknesses in the democratic process in his time, they have not changed.

We have bureaus, commissions, and agencies of government to protect us from everything except bureaus, commissions and agencies of government. You in congress are the real protectors. If you do not reach the point where you cannot protect us from bad laws, bad administration we have no one.

I thank you for your efforts.

Your truly,

NELSON SABIN.

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL BILL

HON. JERRY HUCKABY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to restrict the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from issuing a license for the disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in a selected facility, if the average population density within a 50 mile radius of such a repository site exceeds 15 persons per square mile.

I feel that there exists a real and urgent need for such legislation to insure the health and safety of people living in areas being considered for the storage of nuclear waste materials. My bill would require that the population density be a top priority consideration in determining the feasibility of a nuclear waste repository. Essentially, it would prohibit the designation of a burial site if the surrounding population within 50 miles of the facility exceeds 15 persons per square mile. Enacting this safety measure will encourage the Department of Energy to conduct their studies and

experiments in sparsely populated areas, if these areas are geologically and hydrologically suitable for nuclear waste storage.

I also believe that the States should participate in the decision of whether to construct and operate a nuclear waste facility within their boundaries. Therefore, the Governors of such States shall have the authority to consent to the issuance of a permit for such purposes.

For the past 32 years the United States has been producing highly radioactive nuclear waste. The search for safe disposal of these wastes has been, in my opinion, a series of trial and error experiments. Some waste management methods used or proposed have been simply temporary stopgap methods, others were thought at the time they were initiated to be a more lasting solution. Sea dumping, temporary tank storage, shallow concrete burial, landfill, surface storage, glass solidification have been tried and so far, none of these methods has achieved any remarkable success in containing dangerous waste.

The Federal Government has attempted to develop the means for disposal at least five times in the past. All five attempts have been abandoned before they were completed, generally because they encountered unanticipated problems. The five attempts were: First, injection of liquid waste into porous media; second, disposal of liquid waste in solution mine salt cavity; third, vaults in bedrock formations beneath the Savannah River Plant; fourth, a repository to accept military waste in Lyons, Kans.; and fifth, relocation of the tentative site in a bedded salt formation in New Mexico when it encountered an unexpected geological contortion.

In June 1976, the California Legislature passed several bills in response to the public debate over nuclear power. One of these bills requires that a demonstrated technology or means for permanent, terminal disposal of high-level nuclear waste must exist. Until this test is met, California law prohibits certification of any new nuclear powerplants.

The current Federal program was initiated in earnest in February 1976. It originally involved reconnaissance of potentially suitable formations in 36 States. However, the current program has been reduced to focusing largely on finding two sites in a salt formation, evaluating the Nevada test site as a repository, and evaluating a basalt formation under the Hanford Reservation as a repository.

I am particularly concerned about this issue because two salt domes located in north Louisiana are currently under review by the Department of Energy as possible burial sites. Based on a thorough review of the scientific and technical work to date, the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission concluded that the Nevada test site, Hanford, Wash., and Carlsbad, N. Mex. sites "contain undesirable features which may ultimately disqualify those sites." Consequently, I fear that the two Louisiana salt domes are becoming increasingly attractive as potential repositories. I believe I have more than adequately demonstrated the history of

handling radioactive materials as being less than proficient and safe for humanity.

What would be the result if highly radioactive waste were placed in salt domes in north Louisiana and leakage occurred because of one or more of many reasons, such as: underground water melting an area of salt; melting of the salt by intense heat of the waste; leakage through an old or new drill hole for oil and gas; a fracture in the salt dome from an Earth shock by distant earthquake or nuclear explosion—military or accidental; unstable degeneration of radioactive material stored in glass form? The result would be contamination of the underground water that travels to a very wide area. We could expect contamination of area water making it unfit to drink or to support any plant or animal life. Mason Willrich, director of international studies for the Rockefeller Foundation, and formerly a visiting professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a report prepared for ERDA, stated that a major radioactive waste problem exists and escape of material into air and water would "constitute a radiological hazard for hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of years."

I strongly support nuclear development as a much-needed resource to guarantee the continuation of our country's energy supply. I am also aware that the disposal of nuclear wastes is an immediate and national concern. However, the health and safety of Americans should come first. I conclude that experiments in search of a safe disposal method, due to the enormous risk factor, should be carried out in an unpopulated, desolated area in which there is not abundant vegetation, animal life, natural energy resources of oil and gas, water network, and human habitation.

It is important that Congress deal promptly with this serious problem and I urge speedy and favorable consideration of this measure.

SALT NAIVETE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Oxnard Press-Courier concerning the current SALT negotiations. The editorial quite correctly points out the folly of relying on Soviet "goodwill" or "trust" in concluding a SALT agreement. The editorial follows:

[From the Press-Courier, Feb 3, 1978]

SALT NAIVETE

American negotiators at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Geneva apparently lack the stomach for tough haggling with the Russians. How else to explain the U.S. backing off from one of the thorniest issues at the talks—deployment of the new Soviet Backfire bomber against the United States?

Debate at SALT proceedings, while important, often revolves around technical mat-

ters, which the average person understandably finds dull. But there was nothing dull or technical involved in the matter of the Backfire bomber.

Soviet negotiators have refused to accept restrictions on their bomber as part of a new arms package. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency headed by Paul C. Warnke caved in and convinced Washington to remove it from the Geneva talks altogether.

The result is that the United States simply has decided to ask Soviet leader Leonid I. Brezhnev for a letter promising not to deploy the bomber against the United States. One wonders why Washington does not broaden the request by asking Brezhnev to promise not to deploy his nuclear missiles against the United States as well.

By trusting Brezhnev all the way on this matter the need to continue the debate in Geneva would be over. The naive Carter administration is displaying by relying on mere promise instead of the more binding safeguard of a treaty certainly calls into question the whole SALT enterprise.

An agreement between the two superpowers to restrict their arms race and put a limit on their strategic weapons remains essential for the future tranquility of the world. But no agreement is preferable to one that leaves the United States at a military disadvantage while entrusting the survival of Americans to a letter from Brezhnev.

JOHN H. ARMBRUSTER

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the people of St. Louis are mourning this week the death of John H. Armbruster, a business and civic leader whose remarkable career spanned more than 50 years.

In an age of specialists, John Armbruster was a generalist whose encyclopedic interests ranged from charitable service to higher education to his business leadership as founder and president of Community Federal Savings and Loan Association of St. Louis.

Mr. Armbruster died last week at the age of 82 en route to Tulsa, Okla., for a meeting of the board of trustees of Jaycees International, of which he was a secretary and founder.

In addition to the Jaycees, Mr. Armbruster was especially active in the Boy Scouts of America, the YMCA, the Athletic Boys Club, and the Salvation Army. He headed the Salvation Army's Tree of Lights Campaign in 1972. He was a past president of the Backstoppers, an organization that provides support to the families of firemen and policemen who die or are disabled in the line of duty.

He received many awards for his works with youth groups and for his many charitable efforts. He was a trustee of William Woods College in Fulton, Mo.

John Armbruster was equally successful in his business career. He was operating his own real estate firm in 1932 when new Federal regulations began encouraging the founding of savings and loan associations to help revive the economy shattered by the depression.

Mr. Armbruster founded Community Federal Savings and Loan Association in

1934 with assets of \$5,000. Today, it is the 27th largest in the Nation, totaling nearly \$1.4 billion and 250,000 accounts. He was a director of the National Savings and Loan League, which he had served as secretary and vice president.

Thousands of St. Louisans who had the privilege of knowing John join his family in mourning his death.

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIA

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, the people who live in Estonia, and the many thousands of people whose heritage is derived from this Baltic Republic, will be celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Estonia.

That Declaration of Independence in 1918 was immediately followed by the War of Liberation with the Soviet Red Army, which lasted from November 28, 1918, to February 2, 1920. At that time, peace treaties were signed in which the Soviet Union renounced forever any claims to the territory of Estonia. Unfortunately, on August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union decided to ignore the provisions of those treaties when Stalin and Hitler agreed to divide Eastern Europe. The Baltic States were forced to agree to the establishment of Soviet military and naval bases on their territories. Only 9 months later, the three Baltic Republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, were unilaterally declared Soviet republics and annexed to the Soviet Union.

Needless to say, the people of these three nations no longer enjoyed the basic human rights; 75,000 Estonians were forced to flee to nations all over the free world. With the signing of the Helsinki Agreement, the Estonians would possibly have a chance to, at least, regain the basic human rights that all people in the world should enjoy. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union has not exhibited its cooperation with the provisions of that agreement, and the citizens of Estonia are forced to live in an atmosphere of injustices.

Since 1940 the Estonian people have exhibited courage and dedication to their homeland. Even those Estonians that currently reside outside of Estonia consistently stand up and speak loudly for the rights of their friends and relatives still in Estonia. On this 60th anniversary celebration, we honor that courage and show our pride and insure the continuation of our support.

With this in mind, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 117, which I hope, will assist the Estonian people in their struggle. Primarily, this resolution informs the President of the will of Congress with regard to the fair and just treatment of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. It asks the President to urge the United Nations to take action in

requesting the Soviet Union to return the rights of self-determination to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It also calls for the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States.

For the past 38 years the Estonian people have lived under unwanted Soviet domination. On this 60th anniversary of their original Declaration of Independence, we salute them on their lasting courage and we must also pledge to support these people in the future so these years of suffering will end as soon as possible and a life of independence and freedom will begin again.

ESSEX COUNTY COLLEGE BLACK HISTORY FESTIVAL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this week in my district, we are enjoying an event that is uniquely American. Essex County College in Newark is hosting its second annual black history festival, a celebration that gives proper recognition to black Americans from the Newark area and all over the country for their contribution to American society, past and present.

Living in Newark all my life, I have had a vantage point to observe the rich cultural diversity which gives America its strength. To be sure, each ethnic group has made its own special contributions to American society, but black people have known all the struggles, frustrations, hopes, and victories which best symbolize American life.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in his 1963 letter from a Birmingham jail, reminded his brothers and sisters:

Abused and scorned though we may be, our destiny is tied up with America's destiny.

As Essex County College celebrates its second annual black history week, I say:

America's destiny is indeed tied up with the destiny of its black people.

The Essex County College festival, with its theme, Outstanding Blacks, Past and Present, serves as a valuable reminder of the importance of black ethnics to America.

The program is especially meaningful to those in the Newark area because it honors four local citizens who embody Dr. King's commitment to community advancement through social consciousness. Golden Johnson, Donald Payne, Dr. Reynold Burch, and Gustav Heninburg are all active Essex County citizens who have played important roles in building a sense of pride in our community and leading in the progress we have made.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that Essex County College has established the annual black history festivals, and I believe they will become a tradition in New Jersey's 10th District. I salute these efforts to bring greater attention to black heritage in America.

MIDEAST ARMS SALES: CONGRESS
MUST DISAPPROVE

Hon. John E. "Jack" Cunningham

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the administration has submitted to the Congress a three-cornered package of arms sales to Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. It is my belief that the House must take early steps to disapprove of these sales.

In this package, Israel gets less than they asked for and need, while, in my opinion, the Saudis and Egyptians come out with a disproportionate share of the pie.

Like most Members, Mr. Speaker, I watched hopefully the exchange of visits and the commencement of negotiations between Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat. In reviewing these arms sales, I ask myself how they will assist in bringing the peace we all want to the Middle East?

The argument in favor of the Egyptian portion of the arms deal is that selling 50 F-5E's will substantially assist that country to hold its own. Certainly, the activities of the Libyan Government on the eastern border of Egypt should not be overlooked. Neither should the Soviet-inspired, Cuban-led expedition in the Horn of Africa be minimized in importance. However, it is hard for me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Egyptians need this level of sophisticated weaponry to deal with threats to their own national sovereignty from Libya or to the peace of the region by the Cuban-Ethiopian adventure against Somalia.

Saudi Arabia, under the administration proposal, would be able to purchase 60 ultrasophisticated F-15 aircraft. While it is easy to appreciate the need to remain friendly with this staunchly pro-Western country, I hesitate to conclude that external threats to Saudi Arabia are such to justify the need for such a high level of weapons technology to be transferred to that nation.

For myself, Mr. Speaker, I would be willing at a minimum to sell to Israel the 75 F-16's and the 15 F-15's as proposed in the sale. I realize that this is less than has been requested by the Israeli Government, however, such a sale should be made to show American good faith with a country which is continually threatened by its neighbors and by the Soviet Union with national annihilation.

However, the administration has made its proposal as a "take one, take all" package. Therefore, for Congress to disapprove of the Egyptian and Saudi components, it is also essential to veto the Israeli portion as well.

My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) has inserted in the RECORD the statement of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee regarding the proposed arms package. This excellent and balanced statement and

independent research convince me that we must act swiftly to reject the administration's arms offers.

MOST DECENT MAN IN POLITICS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, like many others, I felt myself inadequate to expressing the deep reverence I felt for Senator Hubert Humphrey.

I well recall, as a practicing lawyer in a small California town, when I read, with increasing respect, the lengthy debates between Senator Humphrey and his colleagues in the debates preceding passage of the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. At that time I was skeptical and distrustful or both politics and politicians. The quality of Senator Humphrey's remarks, and the depth of his understanding of an incredibly broad range of complex national issues, played a material part in my own ultimate decision to leave private life and campaign for public office.

A constituent of mine, Prof. Peter Grothe, was moved to write a small piece relating to his own relationship and respect for Senator Humphrey. Professor Grothe's words are worthy of permanent recording in this journal of that institution which Senator Humphrey did so much to enlighten and preserve.

MOST DECENT MAN IN POLITICS

(By Peter Grothe)

There is a rule of thumb in Washington that the closer staff aides get to a well-known politician, the more they realize his weaknesses. The opposite was true of Hubert Humphrey: The closer we got to Humphrey, the more we realized the greatness of the man.

He was described by Vice President Walter Mondale as "the most decent man in American public life," and no one who worked for him would disagree. The striking thing about most of his acts of kindness is that they were done with no thought of political payoff in mind and that they went virtually unreported.

A characteristic example came during one of the tenses days of Humphrey's life. It was the day at the Democratic Convention at Atlantic City in 1964 when Humphrey was nervously waiting in his hotel suite for the phone call which would inform him whether the unpredictable President Johnson had, in fact, named him to be his vice presidential running mate.

During the wait, Humphrey heard that an acquaintance of his had died. He called the widow and spent ten minutes consoling her. "Forget what's happening here. If there is anything I can do to help you, don't hesitate to let me know."

The elderly widow in Bemidji, Minnesota, counted for nothing politically. Despite the fact that he was waiting to hear whether he might become the vice presidential candidate, he called her, because, being Hubert Humphrey, he could not do otherwise.

Those who have worked in the Senate know that there is a group of Senators who are especially respected by their colleagues. There is another small group who are beloved by their colleagues. A small handful are both

respected and loved. Senator Humphrey was preeminent in this group.

The unprecedented seven-minute standing ovation when he returned to the Senate after his last cancer operation was eloquent testimony to that. The only comparable scene in this century was a dying Lou Gehrig bidding farewell to a packed Yankee Stadium.

One of the reasons for that respect was that he had the most creative legislative mind of this century. Half of the most notable legislative achievements of the Kennedy-Johnson years were originally Humphrey ideas. The Humphrey Peace Corps proposal offers a good example.

The Senator had asked me in the spring of 1960 to put together a draft Peace Corps bill and take it to the foreign aid agency (then called ICA) in order to get the reaction of top officials there. Five of the six officials had the same reaction: "It's a lovely-sounding idea, but it will never work."

I returned to Humphrey with the discouraging prognosis, and the reaction was typical of Humphrey. He pounded his fist in his palm and exclaimed:

"That's the trouble with those bureaucrats in the Eisenhower Administration! Their attitude is, 'Don't rock the boat, don't try anything new, no new starts!' All they see are the problems. They mount the problems so high (he put his hands over his head) that they don't see the challenges, they don't see the opportunities. I want to grasp the opportunity! Let's go ahead and introduce the bill."

Another reason he was so respected was that he had a political genius for getting things done on Capitol Hill. Perhaps the best (unreported) lesson on how to get a bill through Congress was given by Humphrey to Sargent Shriver after the Kennedy-in-law was appointed to head the fledgling Peace Corps. Shriver was a talented leader but had had little experience with Congress. Humphrey said with more than his normal quotient of exuberance:

"Sarge, forget about talking to women's clubs in Detroit! They don't get your Peace Corps bill passed. We in the Congress do. Don't you sit down to another meal between now and the time your Peace Corps bill comes up for a vote unless there is a senator or a congressman sitting by your elbow.

"Remember that there are 100 of us prima donnas in the Senate who stand around and debate and talk about how the government ought to run, and we envy you guys, because you are running the government, and we would like to be! So make each Senator feel like you care about his views."

Then, Humphrey went through each member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and told Shriver how to approach him. The end of the story is that Shriver carried on a great romance act with Congress, seeing over 400 senators and congressmen, and, with Humphrey managing the bill in the Senate, it passed overwhelmingly.

Something that struck those of us who worked for him was that there was very little difference between the public Humphrey and the private Humphrey. In public, he projected an image of a man who was kind, incurably optimistic, compassionate, enthusiastic, humanitarian, emotional, and energetic. He was the same in private. He was a man utterly open and without pretense.

The public figure to whom Humphrey felt the closest was Adlai Stevenson. Stevenson once gave a eulogy to another great statesman which might well apply also to Humphrey:

"With his loss, our sources of public dialogue and inspiration run thinner. There is a lonesome place against the sky."

There is, indeed, a lonesome place against the sky.

LOCAL RADIO SERVICE ESSENTIAL
TO SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL
AREAS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss something very important to one-quarter of the American people. Most Americans live in big cities or in the surrounding suburbs. Thus, when most of you spend a weekend in your district, and drive home after an evening meeting with your constituents, you can tune in to a local radio station to help keep you awake when the hour gets late.

However, almost one-quarter of the American people do not have a local nighttime radio station. Instead, they must listen to a station hundreds of miles away. If local weather conditions make certain roads impassable, if there is danger from flooding, if schools are closed or community activities rescheduled, almost 50 million Americans have no way to find out about it until the sun comes up the next morning and their local radio station resumes broadcasting.

It is not that these local stations choose to go off the air each evening. Most desperately want to continue broadcasting and would consider it an important adjunct to the public service they now provide. Many have the resources—economic and technical—to stay on the air each evening. All they lack is permission from the Federal Communications Commission.

The FCC rules governing this date back to the beginning days of radio. In those days of few radio stations, in order to provide listeners with at least some access to programs no matter where they lived or how far distant the station, only one station in the entire Nation was assigned to each of the clear channel frequencies. At the time there were plenty of channels available. For example, WNBC in New York is the only station in the continental United States assigned to 660 kilohertz during the nighttime hours. Of course, it cannot be heard much beyond a 100-mile or so radius of the city during the daytime or beyond 700 miles at night. Certainly no one living on the West coast can pick it up. There is no reason why other stations should not be allowed to broadcast at night on that frequency so long as their power is limited to their local service area. This is a typical situation on most of the 1-A and 1-B clear channel frequencies. While class 1-B frequencies permit some multiple assignments, no interference is permitted even in areas where the primary station's signal is so weak that it can be heard only 50 percent of the time. Americans will not listen to such a weak signal as they once might have.

As a result of these outdated rules, over 46 million people in almost 1,500 separate listening areas of the country lose a major source of public informa-

tion and entertainment each evening when the Sun goes down. Worse yet, more than 700 of these listening areas comprising thousands of towns have no other source of local news and information—no FM stations, no television stations, nothing. The millions of people who live in these small communities are literally cut off from the rest of the world each evening. They have no way to know what is happening around them, although ironically they can usually tune into a distant station and learn about a snowstorm in Chicago or a traffic jam on the George Washington Bridge in New York City. Their own local weather and traffic conditions will remain a mystery to them until the next morning when their radio station is permitted to return to the air.

The Nation's airwaves belong to all Americans, but a significant minority are not permitted fair use of them. Instead, for millions of Americans local airwaves lie silent each night, unused by anyone. That is an unconscionable waste of a precious national resource.

Mr. Speaker, I am most assuredly not an engineer. But I am convinced that a nation that can bounce radio signals off distant stars and send messages millions of light-years to galaxies where other life forms might be listening ought to be able to find some way to let these small local radio stations send their signal a few miles out into the surrounding county each evening. If such nighttime service were permitted, it would not in any way interfere with the signal heard by listeners in the major metropolitan areas. All it would do is expand the availability of meaningful local nighttime radio service for the millions of people who are currently denied it. That seems like a worthy objective to me.

Seventy-eight of my colleagues agree. To this end, we have introduced House Resolution 637 calling upon the Federal Communications Commission to do two things.

First, it directs the FCC to maximize local meaningful primary nighttime radio broadcast service, particularly in our Nation's vast rural areas. The resolution does not try to tell the Commission how this is to be done, because there are several ways to accomplish this worthy objective.

Second, the resolution directs the Commission not to permit operation of a radio station with power in excess of 50,000 watts, the current legal maximum permitted power. Obviously, you cannot increase locally originated radio service in rural areas if, at the same time, you increase the power of the stations in the major metropolitan areas to the point where their signal would interfere with the signal of the smaller stations.

These two principles are reasonable, indeed, modest. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications, Mr. VAN DERLIN, in a speech to the National Association of Broadcasters, suggested a more far-reaching proposal to augment existing radio service with 450 new short-range, low-power, narrow bandwidth radio stations. Such would be an ambitious undertaking and I compli-

ment him for his farsightedness and his determination not to be cowered by the naysayers in the broadcasting industry who maintain that any change from what we presently have will lead to a fall from grace.

There are, as I have mentioned, other ways to solve the problem of lack of meaningful local nighttime radio service in small towns and rural areas. The important thing is to get action to solve the problem in the near future. I have seen the Federal Communications Commission drag proceedings on for years, even decades. In fact, that has happened to this very issue. It is precisely the reason why 46 million Americans today have no local nighttime radio service. That situation cannot be allowed to persist indefinitely. It is time to find some way to allow the 46 million Americans currently without meaningful local nighttime radio service to share and enjoy the radio spectrum equally with their friends in the cities.

Text of resolution follows:

H. RES. 637

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission—

(1) in any proceeding respecting the provision of class I-A and I-B radio service, should maximize local meaningful primary nighttime radio broadcast service, particularly in this Nation's vast rural areas, and

(2) notwithstanding H. Res. 714, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, adopted on July 2, 1962, should not permit operation of a standard broadcast station with power in excess of fifty thousand watts.

SPONSORS OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 637

Bill Alexander (Ark.)
John M. Ashbrook (Ohio)
L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (Fla.)
Berkley Bedell (Iowa)
Michael T. Blouin (Iowa)
David R. Bowen (Miss.)
Bill D. Burlison (Mo.)
Goodloe E. Byron (Md.)
John J. Cavanaugh (Nebr.)
Elford A. Cederberg (Mich.)
Tom Corcoran (Ill.)
David L. Cornwell (Ind.)
Lawrence Coughlin (Pa.)
Mendel J. Davis (S.C.)
Butler Derrick (S.C.)
Robert F. Drinan (Mass.)
John J. Duncan (Tenn.)
Robert W. Edgar (Penn.)
Allen E. Ertel (Pa.)
Billy Lee Evans (Ga.)
Paul Findley (Ill.)
Daniel J. Flood (Pa.)
L. H. Fountain (N.C.)
Wyche Fowler, Jr. (Ga.)
Sam Gibbons (Fla.)
Benjamin A. Gilman (N.Y.)
Bo Ginn (Ga.)
Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (Calif.)
Tennyson Guyer (Ohio)
Tom Hagedorn (Minn.)
Margaret M. Heckler (Mass.)
James J. Howard (N.J.)
William J. Hughes (N.J.)
Ed Jenkins (Ga.)
John W. Jenrette, Jr. (S.C.)
Walter B. Jones (N.C.)
Abraham Kazen, Jr. (Tex.)
Jack F. Kemp (N.Y.)
Joseph A. Le Fante (N.J.)
Larry McDonald (Ga.)
Edward R. Madigan (Ill.)
Andrew Maguire (N.J.)
James C. Mann (S.C.)
Robert McClory (Ill.)

Robert C. McEwen (N.Y.)
 Robert H. Michel (Ill.)
 Abner J. Mikva (Ill.)
 Clarence E. Miller (Ohio)
 G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (Miss.)
 Carlos J. Moorhead (Calif.)
 Ausⁱⁿ J. Murphy (Pa.)
 John T. Myers (Ind.)
 Stephen L. Neal (N.C.)
 Robert N. C. Nix (Pa.)
 James L. Oberstar (Minn.)
 Edward J. Patten (N.J.)
 Jerry M. Patterson (Calif.)
 Donald J. Pease (Ohio)
 Mel Price (Ill.)
 Tom Rallsback (Ill.)
 John J. Rhodes (Ariz.)
 Matthew J. Rinaldo (N.J.)
 Robert A. Roe (N.J.)
 Harold Runnels (N. Mex.)
 Richard T. Schulze (Pa.)
 Keith G. Sebellius (Kans.)
 George E. Shipley (Ill.)
 Paul Simon (Ill.)
 Floyd Spence (S.C.)
 J. William Stanton (Ohio)
 Dave Stockman (Mich.)
 Olin E. Teague (Tex.)
 David C. Treen (La.)
 Paul E. Tsongas (Mass.)
 Robert S. Walker (Pa.)
 Charles Whitley (N.C.)
 Chalmers P. Wylie (Ohio)
 Robert A. Young (Mo.)

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1978

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was just 60 years ago that the Lithuanian people regained their independence from the Soviet Union.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the National Council of Lithuania, acting on the "recognized principle of self-determination of nations," proclaimed the re-establishment of the independent state of Lithuania on a democratic basis.

The continuity of the Lithuanian state, dating back to the Kingdom of Lithuania in the 13th century, was interrupted by the Russian annexation of the greater part of that country during the period from 1792 to 1918.

Self-determination is a prime concern of the Lithuanian people today. The loss of the country's independence to the Soviet Russian invaders in 1940 meant the extinction of basic human rights. The Lithuanian people are intensely aware that to regain those rights they must re-establish the exercise of their right to self-determination.

This feeling on the part of the Lithuanian people is powerfully expressed in their underground press, proportionally the most active in the entire Soviet domain and an excellent mirror of the Lithuanian political consciousness. The Lithuanian Helsinki Group has also put forward cogent arguments for the restoration of self-determination to the Lithuanian people.

In this respect, there has been a conspicuous gap in the Belgrade Conference to review the implementation of the Hel-

sinki agreements. While the case of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries has been briefly aired in Belgrade, the Western powers have so far refrained from mentioning the inalienable right to self-determination, one of the most essential human rights. Paradoxically, the Soviet Union feels no compunction about trumpeting that term on any occasion and posing as a defender of small nations' independence.

The New York Times, in its issue of January 24, 1978, maintained that the Belgrade Conference should be an "exercise in diplomacy." But "diplomacy" sometimes deteriorates to a silence that is both immoral and impractical.

It is to be hoped that the Western Powers, at the Belgrade Conference, will speak out on self-determination. If they fail to do so, they will not only deny a vital aspect of their own legacy, but will also commit a blunder in practical politics.

OCCASION OF THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, on the historic occasion of the 60th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, I would like to appeal to world public opinion to support the struggle of the Estonian people for the principles of freedom and self-determination in their homeland. Estonian-Americans, contributors to the greatness of our Nation and guardians of their own rich cultural heritage, are understandably concerned for the future of their ancestral home.

The Estonian nation has long endured the great human and material losses brought about by centuries of foreign domination and exploitation. However, Estonia enjoyed 20 years of peace, progress and freedom as a democratic republic, prior to Soviet annexation in 1940. In spite of this and other acts of aggression, including forced deportation to remote labor camps, the Estonians have retained to this day a strong sense of national unity and cultural distinction.

However, Estonians are not privileged to enjoy the full fruits of their highly developed and efficient economy, since much of it is channeled into the Russian and other republics. The relatively high standard of living prevalent in Estonia is in sharp contrast to their lack of basic human and national rights. The growing majority of Russian nationals in the larger Estonian cities threatens to reduce forms of Estonian self-government and menaces the ethnic balance of the Republic.

On this the 60th anniversary of their independence day, let us not forget the proud people of Estonia. At a time when so much is sacrificed for a return to détente, let us not tolerate or encourage

material exchange with the Soviet Union at the expense of our ideals of self-determination and political freedom. Let us show our dedication to an established American tradition of championing the human rights of the oppressed by supporting the restoration of the independence and the national rights of Estonia.

JET SALES AND MIDEAST PEACE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern in this body and across the country about the timing and the contents of the administration's \$4.8 billion package of aircraft sales to the Middle East.

Under this proposal, Saudi Arabia would receive 60 F-15 fighter-bombers, Egypt would get 50 F-5E fighter-bombers, and Israel 75 F-16 fighter-bombers and 15 additional F-15's (it already has purchased 25).

It is alarming to note that Saudi Arabia, which is paying \$2.9 billion in cash for its own and Egypt's planes, is the only one of the three countries to get all the aircraft it requested. Egypt reportedly, had asked for between 60 and 120 F-5's. Israel, which unlike the two Arab States had longstanding commitments for the aircraft it wishes to purchase, will be getting only about half the aircraft it sought.

In my opinion, the sale of these advanced aircraft to Egypt and Saudi Arabia would be serious mistakes at this time and should be withdrawn immediately by the administration.

The timing of all three sales could hardly have been worse. They have every appearance of a heavyhanded intervention in delicate peace negotiations at a critical time and in a way that can only encourage a hardening of positions on both sides.

While there may be occasional friendly disputes over particulars between the United States and Israel, every American President since Harry Truman has affirmed our fundamental commitment to Israel's survival. This commitment has been repeated by President Carter. We should be careful, therefore, to use our military sales policy for the promotion of mutual security, rather than as a destabilizing influence in this volatile region.

The decision to provide Egypt with lethal, offensive weapons—supersonic F-5's—for the first time is premature at best. The peace process has just begun and this is the wrong time for the United States to alter so significantly its arms sales policy toward that country and begin a military supply relationship.

It is not as though Egypt has a great need for these planes, because it does not. Egypt already is getting advanced

fighter aircraft from Britain and France and is having her fleet of Mig 21's (comparable to the F-5) refurbished by Lockheed and General Electric. As a result, her defense in no way hinges on this sale. I believe we can do the most good for Egypt and for the peace process not by supplying arms but by providing badly needed economic assistance for her alling economy. The United States is giving Egypt this year about \$1 billion in economic assistance. I have supported this policy in the past and hope to be able to do so in the future because I believe it is the best path to peace.

Saudi Arabia needs 60 F-15's like the Middle East needs another war. This is the most advanced fighter aircraft in the world, and selling it to Saudi Arabia threatens to change substantially the balance of power in that volatile part of the world.

Israel's survival has always depended upon using the qualitative advantage of its pilots and equipment to overcome its quantitative deficiencies. The F-15 is such a superior aircraft that in the hands of capable enemy pilots it would threaten to neutralize all or most of the offensive power of the Israeli Air Force, which has been that country's most effective weapon. Thus, F-11's in enemy hands are a mortal threat to Israel, not simply a marginal danger. The only way to avoid this danger is to make sure that F-15's are never flown against Israel. However, that is something the United States cannot guarantee. History shows the Saudis will cooperate in any Arab attack on Israel. Saudi participation in the past has been limited by a lack of offensive weapons and fear of Israeli retaliation. Acquisition of F-15's and other modern weapons now being supplied by the United States make those factors less important.

The United States has a long-standing commitment to sell Israel these aircraft. A promise to provide Israel the F-16 was actually written into the Sinai II disengagement agreement, and Israel has begun receiving the first shipment of previously purchased F-15's. In other words, the aircraft sales to Israel are a continuation of established policy, in contrast to the sales to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, which represent new policy directions.

There is no sound reason why these three sales should be treated as a package. Each should be scrutinized by the Congress on its own merits. I believe we should honor our commitment to Israel and go ahead with the sale of F-15 and F-16 jets. The sale of 50 F-5E's to Egypt is, I believe, premature, and we should explore the possibility of delaying such a decision until more concrete progress is made in peace negotiations. Saudi Arabia, I am convinced, has neither the need nor the ability to absorb 60 F-15's and as soon as the administration sends the Congress formal notification of its intention to go through with the transfer, I intend to introduce a resolution of disapproval to block the Saudi sale. I am confident there is strong support for such a move in both the House and the Senate.

THE GREAT CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 21, 1978 edition of the Washington Star on the great Cleveland Orchestra. The article, which echoes feeling expressed by reviewers the world over, is one more reason why we from northern Ohio feel Cleveland is the best location in the Nation.

CLASSICAL: A CLEVELAND FORMULA THAT ADDS UP

(By Irving Lowens)

Lorin Maazel and the Cleveland Orchestra were at the Kennedy Center Sunday afternoon and last night with a pair of concerts featuring two topnotch Russian performers as soloists.

Both concerts were built using the same formula—a curtain-raiser to warm the orchestra up, then a vehicle to display the artistry of the featured artist, and after the intermission, a piece in which both conductor and orchestra could shine.

On Sunday, the curtain-raiser was the overture to Glinka's "Russian and Ludmilla," which Maazel took at a fast and furious pace.

Then came the Soviet pianist, Lazar Berman, as soloist in what must be the most popular piano concerto of our times, the B flat minor Concerto by Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky.

Most of the time, performances of the Tchaikovsky develop into horse races between the pianist and the conductor, and for that reason, Sunday's reading turned out to be something of a surprise.

Berman took the concerto at an astonishingly leisurely pace; rather than galloping through it, he loped through it, taking time out to linger over some effects rarely heard when the pianist takes the piece at top speed.

At Berman's tempo, the Tchaikovsky Concerto was full of all kinds of surprises, and things one never hears in the score come through with astonishing clarity. You could almost call it a completely new composition.

At the moment, American piano aficionados are engaged in a rather heated mini-controversy about Berman. One side insists that he is one of the greatest pianists of our time; the other insists that he is merely a loud and insensitive banger and string-breaker.

On the basis of Sunday's Tchaikovsky and the recordings I have heard, I would be tempted to agree with the pro-Berman faction. Certainly, he put on a spectacular show of virtuosity (tempo aside, for the moment), and the overplayed concerto was brushed completely free of cobwebs.

Berman's stage demeanor at the conclusion of his performance was as modest and retiring as Rostropovich's is ebullient and flamboyant. He gives the impression of genuine modesty, and seems truly surprised at the wild enthusiasm his playing invariably evokes from audiences.

The post-intermission showpiece on Sunday was Stravinsky's "Sacre du Printemps," a work which sounds almost as advanced in 1978 as it did when it was first performed 65 years ago. Maazel led the orchestra through a fantastically precise performance—and conducted (as he always does) without a score. Except for a rather shaky bassoon

solo in the introduction, the orchestra approximated perfection, giving its conductor everything he asked for—and Maazel asked for a lot.

Despite Washington's reputation for musical sophistication, more than the usual number of seat holders were in something of a hurry to depart once "Le Sacre" was under way, once again demonstrating the danger of programming anything except a popular, tuneful favorite at the end of a concert, even in these enlightened times.

Last night, Maazel rang up the curtain with a sonorous reading of that ancient popsicle, the symphonic poem, "Finlandia," by Jean Sibelius. The reading was fraught with melodrama.

Then violinist Viktor Tretyakov took the center of the stage. At the age of 20, Tretyakov was the first-prize winner of the third Tchaikovsky competition held in 1966 in Moscow, and a dozen years later, he must surely be classed as one of the best of the younger Soviet artists.

Tretyakov chose the treacherous Sibelius Violin Concerto as his vehicle, and made its horrendous difficulties completely disappear. His playing has an intensity and a purity that is most attractive, and he has fiery temperament and fantastic virtuosity to spare. He does not have an exceptionally big tone, however, and Maazel was very careful to keep the balance between the orchestra and the soloist on an even keel.

Last night's showpiece for the conductor and the orchestra was the Dvorak Symphony No. 8 in G major, for my money a work superior in construction and thematic material to the over-performed Symphony No. 9 "From the New World."

There continues to be a great deal of confusion about the numbering of Dvorak's symphonies. The G major used to be known as No. 4 and the "New World" as No. 5 since that was the order in which they were published. However, Dvorak composed four symphonies before he got around to publishing the fifth, which appeared in print as No. 1. Nowadays, all the Dvorak symphonies have been published and almost everybody accepts the new numbering which takes into account the existence of the four symphonies which did not achieve publication during the composer's lifetime.

Maazel's reading of the Dvorak was very attractive in its freedom, if rather quickly and fussy in small details. But the Clevelanders sounded wonderful, and demonstrated why they are ranked among the best in the country—and that means among the best in the world.

The Sunday afternoon concert was sold out, with only standing room available; last night, surprisingly enough, a few seats were available. If the size of the audience were to be measured by the quality of the performance, the Cleveland is one orchestra that should never play to an empty seat.

PRESIDENTIAL CLASSROOM FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding young lady from the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, Kelly A. Caldarelli of Long Beach, who is here in Washington this week to participate in the 1978 Presidential Classroom for Young Americans.

I always enjoy discussing the operations of our Federal Government with the Presidential Classroom students and commend these young Americans for their interest and attitude toward our Nation's destiny.

IMPOSE ECONOMIC PENALTIES ON NATIONS ABETTING TERRORISTS

HON. JIM LLOYD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. LLOYD of California. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Government Affairs Committee has been holding hearings on an important bill aimed at insulating our Nation from terrorist activities, and imposing economic penalties on nations abetting terrorists. I have sponsored a similar bill in the House which now has over 35 cosponsors.

We need legislation before another Munich slaughter or skyjacking leading to Entebbe. This bill has the support of those who are on the frontline during terrorist actions. Portions of testimony before the Senate committee by John O'Donnell, president of the Air Line Pilots Association, follows:

There is not a government in the world which does not face the real possibility of extortion or even overthrow by terrorism. Terrorism spreads far beyond the bounds of a particular incident to threaten the very structure and authority of government in its ability to govern and to institute both foreign and domestic policies. Terrorism evokes a real image of anarchy and rule by threat. This creates a problem of international magnitude, for while incidents or campaigns of terrorism are often parochial in intent, they can and do cause repercussions far beyond the target nation's borders.

In addition to the purely political ramifications of such acts, one must also examine the quantum escalation in the destructive power of weapons now freely available on the world's arms markets. Weapons currently in use by terrorist groups make battalions out of a handful of fanatics. The large amounts of nuclear material unaccounted for and the basic knowledge of physics required to build a crude nuclear bomb could combine to make an army of one individual, who could plunge this world into the unspeakable horrors of nuclear destruction.

The question may be asked, what has all this to do with commercial aviation? To take the United States, for example, we can refer to the efficacy of the security measures now in force. Our aircraft and airports are protected by security so they are less vulnerable to attack. Those aircraft, however, are obliged to fly into areas which can be classified as insecure. But then, it may be asked, what is the purpose of attacking a U.S. air carrier aircraft?

The reason is simple: it is one of the most attractive targets for terrorism for it has the following features:

1. It is highly identifiable with its country of registration. For example, TWA and PAN AM are considered to represent the U.S.A.

2. The place for attack can be chosen from a wide selection of countries with an eye to the convenience of those countries in terms of the existing security arrangements, geographical proximity, political sympathy, etc.

3. Aircraft cost up to 50 million dollars. Holding such a prize for ransom can be very effective.

4. Aircraft are relatively fragile and are easily destroyed with a few dollars worth of readily obtainable materials.

5. Aircraft can carry over 400 passengers which on any given day probably have seven or eight nationalities represented among them. They make great hostages.

6. The aircraft, as a target, can also provide the terrorist with a means of escape to virtually any part of the world.

7. Terrorists seek wide publicity for their cause: aircraft crashes and related events are proven headline-grabbers.

It is paradoxical that the more successful nations are in preventing hijacking, the more susceptible they are to sabotage attempts on aircraft. If terrorists cannot hijack, they will destroy.

As international airline pilots, we are historic victims of terrorism. As Americans, we feel proud of our historic role as world leaders. We, therefore, say to the fainthearted, "offer us some realistic alternatives." S. 2236 is the foundation for landmark legislation which will become the keystone for an international effort to combat the evils of terrorism.

We recognize that under existing statutes, the President already has the power to effect some of this bill's provisions. The power to do so is, however, discretionary and in fact has never been used. We have some understanding of the President's reluctance to utilize his constituted powers in these cases. We understand the political implications, both international and domestic, of any such action for it could be viewed from a partisan position or in relation to an otherwise unrelated diplomatic effort.

While we have patiently understood the "foreign policy sensitivity" of the United States acting in a unilateral fashion, we believe the time has now come to show other nations that we are serious about combating the menace of air piracy.

Mr. Chairman, for too many years my Association has been pleading for a diplomatic solution. For too many years the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations has been asking for an end to international hijackings. For too many years the United States has engaged in rhetoric and debate on the subject. And still, we are faced with the escalatory problem of international terrorism. To paraphrase the great Mark Twain's comment on the weather, "everyone talks about terrorism but nobody does anything about it." S. 2236 is doing something about it.

To address the problem of identifying nations who aid, abet or assist terrorists is, we believe, a somewhat less complex task. Those who harbor and train terrorists tend to do so on a continuing basis which makes their identification more objective.

The identification of those nations will be a refreshing shot of honesty in the mendacious world of international politics. Is there any one in this room who could not identify at least a couple of such nations right now? There is no question that they do exist; the odor they produce is, however, tastefully ignored. Legitimate armed conflict between nations is, unfortunately, an acceptable practice. There are few among us who have not personally experienced the scourge of war. There are, however, international limits set on such legal carnage. They are referred to as the Rules of War. Terrorist attacks on innocent people, citizens of non-involved nations and international air commerce should not be targets for military action. American citizens flying in U.S. registered aircraft are not legitimate targets. Those who consider them such are outlaws and should be branded as such. They should

not enjoy the benefits of friendship and trade with decent nations. We believe that the stigma of being labeled an offending nation, an outlaw, may have a salutary effect upon the decent people within such nations who may be motivated to expunge such a slur.

The mere identification of offending nations is obviously not enough. In our society we not only identify criminals, we also provide appropriate punishment for their crimes. Mr. Chairman, this matter before you is no different and the sanctions proposed in the bill provide appropriate punishment which in our view is neither "cruel or unusual."

We are cognizant though that the application of sanctions is a serious and sometimes awesome act, an act which must be authorized and carried out with great deliberation and care. There are concerns being expressed that "automatically-imposed sanctions" might prove to be precipitous, and not in the best interests of the United States.

We would hope that this concern which we have heard expressed will be thoughtfully considered by this Committee and that you will diligently seek some middle ground between "automatic" sanctions and "no" sanctions.

In dealing with other provisions of S. 2236, I would offer the following comments:

The provision which calls for establishing the taking of hostages as an international crime is the briefest part of the bill. It only requires ten words to state it. Those ten words may be the heart of this proposed legislation, for international agreement on this point would delete the greatest weapon from the arsenal of terrorists. Obviously, there are a few who are prepared to sacrifice themselves, but experience has shown that most seek sanctuary to escape the lawful consequences of their crimes. Although this is the simplest part of the bill, we do fear that it will be the most difficult to accomplish. This should not deter us, however, from striving to attain that objective.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we would like to add our strong endorsement to the provision of S. 2236 designed to extend existing safety and security requirements to supplemental carriers and charter operations. We have repeatedly pressed for one level of security for all commercial flights within the United States. Charters, inter- and intrastate passenger operations should all be subject to the same rules, for not only are they equally vulnerable to attack, they can also introduce uncleared passengers into "sterile" flight operations areas in which scheduled airline operations are conducted. We are aware of the vehement protests made by many charter and commuter operations who argue that they cannot afford security. It is an unhappy fact of life that if one operates almost any kind of business, security has become another cost of doing business. We must not permit feeble economic arguments to jeopardize and contaminate the carefully constructed security system we have in place at our airports. Too many people labored too long to achieve this proven effective system to permit this to happen.

Mr. Chairman, by now you no doubt recognize that we are in favor of the kinds of tough provisions proposed in this bill. As airplane pilots, we are pleased with the positive effect it will have upon the security of our passengers, crews and aircraft. We are also pleased, because it goes further into the broader and even more dangerous area of rule by terror. We are fortunate to live in a great and free country, something we will fight to maintain. We would like to fly throughout the world in the same great, free environment. That's something we will fight to obtain.

We thank you sincerely for your initiatives in presenting this bill and for giving us the opportunity to speak to it.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring an authentic American success story to your attention.

The officers and employees of the J. C. Ehrlich Co., are in the midst of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the organization in 1928.

Although the founder, Julius C. Ehrlich, passed away nearly 20 years ago, the second and third generation of his family and their dedicated employees are carrying forward the traditions, dedication, and enthusiasm he left as a legacy.

A native of Frankfurt, Germany, Mr. Ehrlich came to the United States in 1888 at the age of 17. He went to Atlantic City, N.J., to live with his uncle and to work in his men's store during the day and as a waiter in a beer garden at night.

In the late 19th century and early 20th century, a succession of moves again. In Colville, Wash., he worked in a general store. In Greenwood, British Columbia, he was an auditor for a meat packing house. During the summer months, he became a prospector for copper.

His career as an entrepreneur began when he purchased and operated a paper box factory in Spokane, Wash., a brewery in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, and a meat packing house in Boise, Idaho. He then traded the meat packing house in Idaho for a 280-acre range in New Plymouth, Idaho, which was known as the J. C. Ehrlich Scientific Dairy Farm.

After working as a controller at a large cannery, he moved to Reading, Pa., in 1918 to work in the manufacturing end of an optical business which was operated by his sister's husband.

Ten years later while visiting his daughter Hildred and her family in Trenton, N.J., he read a newspaper ad for someone to sell electric sprayers. Part of his product line included the selling of insecticides.

When he found that one of his insecticide customers, a department store, was not using the insecticide he had sold them, he offered to apply the insecticide himself. With this service originated what has become Pennsylvania's largest pest control organization and a definitive name in the industry.

In fact, J. C. Ehrlich Co., Inc., and J. C. Ehrlich Chemical Co., Inc., are not only nationally known for termite and pest control, but for industrial weed control services, floor maintenance equipment and janitorial supplies, lawn care services, bird control services, sanitation inspection services, and as pesticide formulators.

The remarkable aspect of Mr. Ehrlich's initiative is that he founded this company at the age of 57. While his contemporaries were contemplating retirement, Julius C. Ehrlich was developing his business. While others were in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

retirement, Julius C. Ehrlich was hiring more people and planning for expansion.

It should be noted that the formative years of Mr. Ehrlich's business were the early 1930's during the Great Depression.

Hence, a business which started in the Depression survived, expanded, prospered—and has not had an economic layoff in 50 years!

J. C. Ehrlich's formula for success—dedication to hard work, integrity, and a determination to succeed in a pioneer enterprise—firmed the foundation upon which his successors have been able to build.

By 1939, four of Mr. Ehrlich's nephews had immigrated to this country. In the best tradition of family, Mr. Ehrlich brought his four nephews into his fledgling business. (In fact, there were only three other employees with the company at the time.) Unfortunately, one of the nephews, Victor Hammel, passed away in the early 1940's.

Mr. Ehrlich, his three nephews, and a small group of employees worked and struggled together. When Mr. Ehrlich went into retirement, his nephews took command.

Alex Ehrlich, a lawyer by training, became a nationally recognized expert in technical matters relating to pest control technology.

The late Simon Ehrlich Hammel had outstanding marketing instincts. He was a man who brimmed with ideas and enthusiasm for people.

Arthur Hammel is still active in the business and is the companies' chief executive officer. He has provided the overall leadership, business savvy, and administrative abilities necessary to run today's farflung business. Arthur Hammel's association with the company exceeds 40 years.

However, the Hammel family is not the only family loyal to the J. C. Ehrlich organization. There are many who have devoted their working careers to the firm. An additional sign of respect between employer and employee is the many families connected with the company. There are father-and-son combinations, brothers, sons-in-law, and cousins who are associated with the business.

The third generation of Ehrlich management includes four cousins, Richard Yashek, Victor Hammel, Robert Hammel, and Davy Goldsmith.

It is the personnel of the J. C. Ehrlich organization who have made it a premier company in its various fields of endeavor.

Today, J. C. Ehrlich Co., Inc., is Pennsylvania's largest pest and termite control organization with more than 20 offices throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is, in fact, one of the largest companies of its type in the Nation—an organization which is proud to have played its role in helping mankind live harmoniously with his environment.

Copesan, a national pest control marketing association, selected J. C. Ehrlich Co., Inc., as the best pest control company in Pennsylvania.

The Industrial Weed Control Division of J. C. Ehrlich Chemical Co., Inc., serv-

ices industrial and railroad accounts in more than 35 States.

All Ehrlich divisions assist their customers in complying with the regulations of many of our governmental agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Administration, and a host of other State and local regulatory agencies.

I am not just familiar with the J. C. Ehrlich organization because the headquarters and two of its offices are in my congressional district. The Ehrlich name has become a household word in most parts of Pennsylvania.

I know that the Ehrlich name was recognized in the Yatron household since its services were used by my father's ice cream business. The Yatron family is not the only loyal customer of J. C. Ehrlich. Ehrlich is still servicing, 50 years later, its very first customer, a Reading department store.

I prefaced these remarks, Mr. Speaker, by indicating that the Ehrlich organization is a unique success story. I know the Ehrlich company and I know its management. They have invested their energy and reinvested their capital into the business.

However, more importantly, the firm recognizes that the success of the business has been based solely on good service—and the key to good service is the teamwork of its people placed throughout the organization.

Although the company has grown to where it now employs nearly 250 people throughout the United States, they will all join on March 11, 1978, to celebrate, as a corporate family, 50 years of faithful service.

I hope to be able to be with them that night to wish them good luck for their next 50 years.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1978

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of more than 1 million Lithuanian Americans who recently celebrated their independence day.

On July 4, 1976, we celebrated our 200th year of independence. On February 16, 1978, the Lithuanian people celebrated 60 years from the day that they declared independence. However, the people of Lithuania cannot celebrate as we did, because of the fact that they are under Soviet domination. The basic freedoms that we take for granted are repressed in Lithuania. The freedoms of speech and religious practice are restricted. The freedom to gain social, cultural, and economic growth are greatly hindered. These freedoms should be recognized as basic human rights.

The heroic Lithuanians have fought a long and bitter struggle to gain and retain these basic rights of man. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council unanimously declared its independence. To secure this goal, Lithuania signed a peace treaty with the Soviet Union. For 20 years the nation grew and prospered. In 1940 the Soviet Union violated the peace treaty and invaded the Lithuanian homeland. Some 300,000 relentless Lithuanians were deported to Siberia. The Lithuanian people revolted against this barbaric oppression. The revolt lasted for 2 months before a new enemy locked and bolted the door to freedom. The Nazis occupied Lithuania for 3 years, stifling this country's lifeline to liberty. During the period of 1944-1953, 60,000 Lithuanians gave their lives in battles against the Soviet aggression.

Over 1 million Lithuanians are in the United States today. They are people who should be recognized as well as respected by all freedom-loving people. Tribute should be paid to the Lithuanians as a prime example of man's innate desire to be independent. This day should be a reminder to us all that there are many countries that are not able to practice even the most fundamental human rights, which we cherish so much in the United States.

THOMAS G. AYERS

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay special tribute to an outstanding Chicago businessman and public servant, Thomas G. Ayers.

Tom Ayers has been chosen the recipient of the Abraham Lincoln Center Humanitarian Service Award for 1978. This award is reserved for people who through their dedicated civic and community contributions have made Chicago a better place to live.

Tom Ayers is chairman of the Chicago Economic Development Commission, which has been instrumental in bringing and keeping business in our metropolitan area. He has helped minority businesses get financial backing and reduced the flow of jobs to other regions of the country.

A pioneer in promoting equal employment opportunities for minorities and disadvantaged citizens, Tom was one of the first leaders of the Employment and Youth Motivation Program. This program which is sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry is aimed at encouraging inner-city youths to stay in high school and improve their chances to succeed in life.

Tom has chaired the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, which works for integrated housing op-

portunities throughout the metropolitan Chicago area.

In 1973 Tom Ayers was honored as Man of the Year by the Chicago Urban League. In 1977 he was presented the Damien Award by Loyola University of Chicago.

The presentation of the Humanitarian Service Award to Tom recognizes his distinguished service to the people of Chicago and shows how highly esteemed he is by all of us.

Lincoln's words which are engraved on the dedication plaque are a testimony to the ideals of those who, like Tom Ayers, are dedicated servants of their community.

Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith dare to do our duty.

I wish to extend by personal congratulations to Tom Ayers and his family for this great honor.

ENDANGERED WILDERNESS ACT

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, many individuals in southwestern Oregon have devoted countless hours to the passage of the Endangered American Wilderness Act. Their vision and commitment to the preservation of important wilderness areas was invaluable to me during the time we have spent on this legislation.

Gail and Ogden Kellogg, Katy Hallmark, and the members of the Kalmiopsis Committee diligently cataloged every square foot of the southern additions including mineral deposits, flora and fauna, and potential timber yield. Dennis and Nancy Littrell and the members of the Lower Illinois River Committee did the same for the northern Kalmiopsis additions. Kurt Kutay of the Oregon Wilderness Coalition defined the need to preserve certain sections of the Wild Rogue. Joe Walicki of the Wilderness Society kept us all informed of the progress we were making through constant communication between citizens and the Congress. Doug Scott's keen insights and Larry Williams' willingness to go anywhere anytime were invaluable. To Holly Jones we all owe a special thank you. His determination to preserve the French Pete has spanned a 20-year period and his hope kept us all involved until the issue was successfully resolved.

Many others have done hours of work out of the limelight. The organizational work and communication were carried on by Valerie and Forrest Taylor, Dr. Jay O'Leary, Darrel and Wilma Gaunt, Bob and Dori MacArthur, Diane Meyer, Dale Jones, Dorothy and Bob Sherman, Bill Meyer, Dick Noyes, John Kemp, Ned Duhnkrack, Sandy Tepfer, Jim Baker, Paul Nolte, Miradell Gale, Jim Montieph and all the unsung heroes who have dili-

gently written letters, gone to meetings, and participated without proper recognition for the time they have spent.

Lastly, Governor Straub and his aides Janet McLennan and Roger Mellum deserve commendation for a courageous attempt at compromise on the Kalmiopsis additions.

These people understand the need to maintain balance in our management of public lands and the interdependence of one resource with another. It is to these people, Mr. Speaker, that I dedicate my efforts to pass the Endangered American Wilderness Act.

THE BADGE OF FAILURE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, rarely do we come across anything really new in our deliberations of issues in the House. Most arguments are little more than repetitions of those first made long ago. Nowhere is this more evident than in the argument over welfare reform.

William Raspberry, the thoughtful and incisive columnist of the Washington Post, has broken this pattern. In a recent column, "Time to Scrap the Welfare 'Badge of Failure'", Raspberry suggests that instead of stressing and reinforcing the negative aspects of welfare participation (sheer need) the Government should devise programs in which there are incentives for self-help and self-improvement.

As Raspberry says, "none of this is particularly profound" but it is a new slant on an old problem. At this point, therefore I would like to insert in the RECORD this column by William Raspberry, from the Washington Post, February 21, 1978.

TIME TO SCRAP THE WELFARE "BADGE OF FAILURE"

(By William Raspberry)

Human beings seem to need opportunities to set themselves apart in ways that are considered positive.

We know that, of course, and we act on that knowledge in countless aspects of our lives. We pass out gold stars and other rewards to children who do their school work uncommonly well. We give bonuses to workers who show themselves to be unusually useful.

We sponsor testimonials, award honorary degrees and name public buildings for people who demonstrate uncommon devotion to the public good. We are forever devising ways to satisfy the human urge to be set apart as special.

But somehow, this instinct—so effective in reinforcing and encouraging those attributes we believe to be in the public interest—abandons us when it comes to social welfare.

We create all sorts of potentially useful programs for the needy among us—public housing, financial assistance, job training, special educational projects. But instead of

using these programs to reinforce and encourage good things, we do just the opposite.

The one overriding criterion for access to any of these programs is failure.

You have to be a failure to get into the housing projects (you're kicked out if you show signs of overcoming). You have to be virtually without resources, financial and otherwise, to qualify for public-assistance payments. You have to be an academic failure to gain entry into a whole host of special-education programs.

In general, we reward those things we wish to see repeated. But in social welfare, we reward those things that most distress us, and we are endlessly surprised when people react negatively to the things we offer as rewards for their negative attributes.

We wonder at the number of broken windows and urine-soaked elevators in public-housing buildings, at the broken and vandalized playground equipment in low-income neighborhoods, at the contempt with which poor children treat their free-lunch coupons. We never seem to understand that by rewarding failure we encourage failure and contempt for its symbols.

I have a feeling we'd all be better off if we turned the thing on its head. Suppose, for instance, that in addition to sheer need—a negative criterion—we established positive criteria for, say, public-housing eligibility. We could require, for instance, that public-housing applicants commit themselves to being responsible for the upkeep of both their apartments and, on a rotating basis, such common areas as halls and lawns.

Suppose these families, by exemplary fulfillment of their assigned duties, could earn merit points toward more desirable public housing and, if their economic situation improved a bit, assistance toward home ownership. (The other side of that coin, of course, would be demerits for poor behavior, an accumulation of which would render the family ineligible for public housing altogether.)

My guess is that we would thereby not only greatly diminish the amount of vandalism and other evidences of contempt for public assistance, but also greatly increase the number of families "graduating" into self-sufficiency. In addition, it might have a salutary effect on the ability and inclination of the families to discipline their children.

Why does such elementary psychology elude us? I suspect, it is because those who make the rules tend to see everything through their own middle-class eyes. Middle-class people think of themselves without money, and imagine that being broke is the same as being poor. It isn't.

Middle-class people without money always consider their penury a temporary condition

and, generally, have rather clear-cut plans for overcoming it. Poor people are more likely to consider their poverty a more-or-less permanent state, with only vague dreams that things might someday be different.

If you're merely broke, rather than poor, being reduced to public housing or public assistance might in itself be an incentive to do better, even if doing better means moving into ostensibly worse housing that is your own. That is, you'd make every effort to demonstrate that you and your family are not the complacent failures that your public-housing neighbors appear to be.

None of this is particularly profound, when you think about it. But we never seem to think about it. If we did, we might conclude that the single most important thing the Carter administration could do about welfare reform is to use public aid as an incentive.

As it is, we've made it a badge of failure. No wonder it works so badly.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Mr. MINETA and I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the record and outstanding contributions of the Santa Clara County region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews was established in 1928 to promote justice, understanding, and a spirit of unity among all religious groups. Locally, our Santa Clara National Conference of Christians and Jews has stressed the administration of justice, education, and youth leadership. They have provided an extremely valuable service to the community by sponsoring a forum for discussion of issues of vital concern to all of the citizens of Santa Clara County.

As the National Conference of Christians and Jews celebrates their 50th anniversary, we would like to congratulate them on a job well and professionally done, secure in the knowledge that they will continue to provide outstanding

service to the growth of understanding in our community.

RETIREMENT LIVING COSTS COMPARED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am frequently asked about the cost of living in Arizona for retired couples. Arizona Business, a publication of the College of Business Administration at Arizona State University, recently published an article on the cost of retirement living in Phoenix and a comparison of costs among Phoenix and 23 other metropolitan areas in the Nation.

Objective of the article is to set forth the expenditures necessary to maintain an intermediate level of living for a retired couple in the Phoenix metropolitan area, based on budget studies developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The study found that a retired couple living in the Phoenix area in 1976 needed \$6,805 to maintain an "intermediate level" of living. (It is estimated that the figure would have to be \$7,200 for 1977 as Phoenix and all other areas experience cost increases.)

Looking back 10 years to see what has happened in Phoenix, the study found that the most substantial increases between 1969 and 1976 have been in medical care and food. Housing is now consuming a smaller percentage of the couple's total budget than in 1969 as are clothing and personal care and other family consumption. For the first time since 1969 the Phoenix area budget exceeds that of the U.S. average in the BLS-monitored areas. However, the total budget needed for Phoenix is only slightly above that of the national average in absolute expenditures.

The following table compares a retired couple's budget costs in 24 metropolitan areas in 1969 and 1976:

HISTORICAL COMPARISON OF RETIRED COUPLE'S BUDGET COSTS: PHOENIX AND 23 OTHER METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1969 AND 1976

[Numbers in parentheses indicate ranking in cost]

Area	1969 budget	1976 budget	1969-76 increase		Area	1969 budget	1976 budget	1969-76 increase	
			Amount	Percent				Amount	Percent
Boston	\$4,643 (3)	\$8,017 (1)	\$3,374	72.7	Detroit	4,194 (17)	6,731 (13)	2,537	60.5
New York-New Jersey	4,689 (2)	7,929 (2)	3,240	69.1	Minneapolis-St. Paul	4,277 (14)	6,720 (14)	2,443	57.1
Honolulu	4,755 (1)	7,691 (3)	2,936	61.7	Pittsburgh	4,241 (15)	6,702 (15)	2,461	58.0
Buffalo	4,604 (6)	7,400 (4)	2,796	60.7	Chicago	4,309 (12)	6,700 (16)	2,391	55.5
San Francisco-Oakland	4,607 (5)	7,309 (5)	2,702	58.6	Kansas City, Mo.	4,224 (16)	6,635 (17)	2,411	57.1
Seattle	4,623 (4)	7,128 (6)	2,505	54.2	St. Louis	4,289 (13)	6,613 (18)	2,324	54.2
Washington, D.C.	4,422 (8)	7,118 (7)	2,696	61.0	San Diego	4,179 (18)	6,595 (19)	2,416	57.8
Philadelphia	4,380 (10)	7,056 (8)	2,676	61.1	Baltimore	4,106 (21)	6,591 (20)	2,485	60.5
Cleveland	4,520 (7)	7,019 (9)	2,499	55.3	Houston	4,017 (22)	6,523 (21)	2,506	62.4
Milwaukee	4,386 (9)	6,934 (10)	2,548	58.1	Cincinnati	4,111 (20)	6,437 (22)	2,326	56.6
Phoenix	4,202 (19)	6,805 (11)	2,603	61.9	Dallas	4,000 (23)	6,292 (23)	2,292	57.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach	4,374 (11)	6,756 (12)	2,382	54.5	Atlanta	3,923 (24)	6,149 (24)	2,226	56.7

Source: Compiled by Bureau of Business and Economic Research, College of Business Administration, Arizona State University, in cosponsorship with First National Bank of Arizona.

**PROSPECTS OF BUMPER GRAIN
CROP DIMS WITH FARMERS' AT-
TITUDE**

Hon. Theodore M. (Ted) Risenhoover
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. RISENHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, across the farmlands of the Midwest, moisture-laden snow signals another bumper grain crop.

And, along the corridors of the Capitol, angry farmers are carrying their "strike" message to Congress. They say they will not plant this spring because farming has become a losing business.

The proven law of supply and demand governs prices of agricultural products. In a competitive marketplace of many independent suppliers, wracked by unpredictable weather and uncontrollable equipment and supply costs, farm prices are chaotic. There is little to guarantee a profit for farmers. Survival on the farm now is questionable.

Our farmers, who today are up to their hips in snow, have long been up to their necks in debt. As the warmth of spring soaks the snow into the soil, Congress must act to improve the marketplace to assure economic stability for farmers.

Today, I am introducing legislation to stimulate exports of farm products. Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate.

One bill provides Commodity Credit Corporation financing to exporters who wish to extend deferred payment terms to foreign buyers in order to meet foreign competition and increase export sales.

The thrust of the bill is to bring the CCC into a partnership with private-enterprise sales people who are promoting U.S. farm products.

A second bill, which I also am introducing today, would increase to \$1 billion the funds which could be used to purchase American agricultural commodities for the food for peace program. This represents a \$200 million increase over the current budget of \$800 million, and offers new hope to U.S. farmers by increasing the money available to purchase their products.

I believe the farm bill enacted last year holds many answers to old problems. I do not, however, expect a miraculous reversal of 8 years of neglect of American family farms. The philosophy of planting from fence-to-fence, without regard to markets, has led to low prices because of oversupply.

With time, I expect the domestic agricultural scene to improve. But, in the immediate future, we need to search out new international markets and provide incentives and support of foreign sales. The bills I have introduced are designed toward these ends.

In the past few days, I have talked with soybean farmers in my district. They are deeply concerned, but not gloomy. The fat cattle market has in-weak. But, agriculture in general needs proved, partly because grain prices are a boost in exports.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There are hungry people in much of the world. Elsewhere, there are food surpluses. With the ingenuity of the American trader, backed by the new farm bill and legislation such as I have introduced, we can sell ourselves out of many of the problems which exist for farmers and consumers.

THE COST OF REGULATION

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, this article, which appeared in the Washington Star on January 28, points out the cost of needless Government regulation.

So that my colleagues may begin to get an idea of the real cost of all this regulation, I call the following article to their attention:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 28, 1978]
**REGULATORS COST DOW \$186 MILLION—EX-
PENSE OF COMPLIANCE RISES 27 PERCENT IN
YEAR, FIRM SAYS**

(By Stephen M. Aug)

Dow Chemical Co. spent \$186 million to comply with the myriad of minutiae required by federal regulatory agencies in 1976—a 27 percent increase in the cost of complying with government regulations in a one-year period.

The costs, the study points out, are passed along to Dow consumers. The cost of regulation represents about 3.3 percent of \$5.7 billion in sales and 30 percent of Dow's \$613 million in profits in 1976.

Dow, which is one of the few corporations known to have performed an in-depth study of the cost of government regulation—and to have made the results public—contends that some of the costs of government regulation are clearly proper. In fact, of the \$186 million, Dow analysts figure \$103 million was spent to comply with rules that are appropriate.

That leaves \$83 million wasted from Dow's point of view—\$69 million spent to comply with regulations it figures are clearly unwarranted and another \$14 million of costs that are questionable.

The \$186 million figure compares with \$147 million as the cost of complying with government regulations in 1975, the first year for which the comprehensive study was undertaken.

Since Dow is a chemicals company, it is not surprising that the largest costs of regulation are in the environmental area—\$84 million. Dow figures that \$50 million of this is appropriate, with \$25 million excessive and \$9 million of questionable value.

Paul F. Orefice, president of Dow Chemical USA, in a speech in San Francisco yesterday, contended that government regulatory agencies and those who support their efforts have shifted recent years to the point at which they seek a "zero risk" society.

"This country was founded on the principle that you are innocent until proven guilty. But the 'ultraenvironmentalists,' with the regulatory agencies as their weapon, have now decreed that everyone and everything is automatically guilty until proven innocent."

Orefice said "those who demand zero risks are leading us down a path so costly that they indeed threaten our standard of living. 'Sometimes I wonder whether we should

be more concerned about environmental pollution or the mental pollution that these people create by spreading fear and constantly knocking our country and its institutions."

He said the costs of excessive and questionable regulation had increased between 1975 and 1976 by 38 percent.

The cost of paperwork alone to comply with federal regulations cost more than \$20 million, Dow said.

Dow separated the costs of regulation into four general areas: environment; transportation; health and safety; and "other."

Transportation was the second most costly area of regulation. Presumably it involves the cost of regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, since much of what Dow ships probably is carried by regulated companies.

The cost of transportation regulation, Dow said, was \$51 million in 1976, up from \$45 million in 1975. The study said only \$28 million of this cost is appropriate, with \$2 million questionable and \$21 million excessive.

Compliance with health and safety regulations cost Dow \$28 million, of which it figured \$16 million was appropriate, \$2 million questionable and \$10 million excessive.

The cost of complying with all other federal regulations was put at \$23 million, with only \$9 million said to be appropriate, \$1 million questionable and \$13 million excessive.

In compiling the costs of regulation, Dow studied the impact of regulations of more than 70 government agencies. The company was divided into hundreds of units for purposes of the study and the cost of regulation of each unit and nearly every product was determined. Dow has not made the detailed study available.

**PENNSYLVANIA AMERICAN LEGION
CITES DANGER OF PROGRAM
MERGER**

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at their recent meeting in Gettysburg, Pa., the members of the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, adopted a resolution citing the danger to veterans of a merger between the Pennsylvania State Employment Service and CETA programs.

The State Employment service currently provides a preference to veterans in making job referrals, CETA programs do not.

I offer for the RECORD the text of the Pennsylvania American Legion's resolution, because it is a timely statement calling our attention to how a merger between these programs would affect the veterans' preference in referrals to jobs:

DEC RESOLUTION NO. 391

Whereas: The State Employment Service has been providing preference to veterans in job referrals; and

Whereas: Said preference in job referrals has resulted in many veterans finding employment; and

Whereas: Pending legislation in Congress would merge the State Employment Service with CETA programs; and

Whereas: These CETA programs have not provided the special services to veterans provided by the State Employment Service; and

Whereas: Such a merger would seriously affect the veterans preference in referrals to jobs provided by the State Employment Service; now, therefore be it

Resolved: That the Department Executive Committee, The American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, in regular meeting on January 28-29, 1978, at Gettysburg, Pa., oppose any merger of State Employment Services and CETA programs as proposed in the legislation known as the Steiger Bill or any other such legislation, and that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the National Economic Commission of The American Legion and to all members of Congress from Pennsylvania.

**U.S. CONSUMERS AND BUSINESSES
DISADVANTAGED BY CANADIAN
ACTIONS ON ALCAN PIPELINE**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting today further correspondence Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN and I have directed to the administration on our concerns regarding a recent Canadian Government action that adversely will impact on U.S. businesses and consumers. This is in connection with construction of the Alcan natural gas pipeline from Alaska through Canada to the lower 48. Our letter today to Secretary James Schlesinger, Department of Energy, is similar to our concerns expressed Tuesday, February 21, 1978, in our message to Secretary Cyrus Vance, Department of State, on the Alcan pipeline agreement.

I insert the letter to Secretary Schlesinger at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 22, 1978.

HON. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,

Secretary of Energy, Department of Energy,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are deeply disturbed by recent events in Canada with respect to efforts to construct a pipeline to carry natural gas from Alaska through Canada to the lower 48 States. It appears that several recent actions by the Canadian Government may be inconsistent with agreements with the United States, costing United States' consumers additional hundreds of millions of dollars and severely disadvantaging United States' manufacturers, particularly our steel industry.

As you know, on November 3, 1977, the Congress adopted a Joint Resolution approving the President's decision selecting the Alcan Pipeline System (now known as the Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Company) to deliver natural gas from Alaska. A U.S.-Canadian Agreement on Principles was submitted as part of the President's decision.

Section 7 of the Agreement on Principles, which you negotiated, committed each government to the position that the supply of goods and services to the pipeline project would be on generally competitive terms. In this connection, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Bosworth testified before our Subcommittee that this provision "assured that American materials specifically will have access to inputs into this pipeline on a competitive basis".

Recent events in Canada lead us to conclude that the Canadian Government may

already be in violation of its commitments in the Agreement on Principles and the prohibition against discriminatory treatment contained in the Transit Pipeline Treaty.

First, the Canadian pipeline enabling legislation was introduced in the House of Commons on February 3, 1978. This legislation requires that the level of Canadian goods and services for the pipeline (called Canadian content) be "maximized". The legislation also requires that maximum advantage be taken of opportunities provided by the pipeline to establish and expand suppliers in Canada. In addition, the legislation establishes a mechanism which gives the Canadian Federal Government the power to block proposed pipeline contracts for goods and services negotiated by the Canadian pipeline company (called Foothills) that fail to provide sufficient Canadian content. The official Canadian press release accompanying the introduction of the legislation said that this condition was "in keeping with Foothills' stated objective of achieving some 90% Canadian content".

Restrictions similar to those proposed by the Canadian Government are conspicuously absent from the President's decision.

Second, the Agreement on Principles between the U.S. and Canada specified that the technical study group would address the issue of the diameter and operating pressures for the 1100-mile portion of the Canadian pipeline (between Whitehorse and Caroline Junction) that would carry a commingled stream of Alaskan and Canadian natural gas. The technical study group was required to test and evaluate 54-inch 1120 pounds per square inch (psi), 48-inch 1260 psi and 48-inch 1680 psi pipe, or any other combination of pressure and diameter which would achieve safety, reliability and economic efficiency for operation of the pipeline. The Agreement on Principles specifically recognized that the decision relating to pipeline specifications remained the responsibility of the appropriate regulatory authorities.

The United States has informed Canada that it prefers the 48-inch 1680 psi alternative for the portion of the pipeline between Whitehorse and Caroline Junction. The 48-inch system is considered to have the lowest cost of service.

The U.S. steel industry currently has one facility capable of manufacturing 48-inch pipe. Presumably under the Agreement on Principles this company would have a fair opportunity to supply pipe for this portion of the pipeline.

Yesterday, however, Canada announced it has selected a 56-inch 1080 psi system for this segment of the pipeline system. The cost of service of this system is greater than that for a 48-inch system. Using 56-inch pipe is estimated to cost U.S. consumers additional hundreds of millions of dollars over a 20-year period.

Canada currently has two facilities capable of manufacturing 56-inch pipe. One of these facilities is an affiliate of one of the Canadian pipeline companies constructing the pipeline system in Canada. The United States presently does not have any facilities that produce 56-inch pipe. We understand that other countries such as Japan and Germany can produce 56-inch pipe.

Both of these actions by the Canadian Government appear to be inconsistent with Canada's promise to ensure that the supply of goods and services to the pipeline project would be on generally competitive terms. Both actions effectively deny a fair and competitive opportunity for U.S. manufacturers to participate in the supply of goods and services to the pipeline in Canada.

The Subcommittee specifically inquired into the operation of Section 7 of the Agreement on Principles at our hearing held on October 14, 1977. Subcommittee counsel

asked who would be responsible for determining that materials purchased by the Canadians would be on generally competitive terms. Mr. Goldman of your staff responded that the Federal Inspector would most likely be responsible and would "through the consultative processes established in the agreement, have that raised with the Canadians . . ." The following colloquy then took place:

"Mr. BRAUN. Have the Canadians committed to make all documents that are relevant to the construction and operation of this pipeline available to you under this section? (Section 7).

"Mr. GOLDMAN. We have no specific commitment from them about individual documents. The whole tenor of the agreement and the consultative processes established in the agreement lead us to believe that that should not be a problem."

In light of the actions by the Canadian Government detailed in this letter it would appear that the consultative processes established in the Agreement have either not been used or have been unsuccessful. Accordingly, we request that you inform us of the consultations that have occurred between the United States and Canada on the matters raised in this letter.

Even more disturbing is the failure of the Agreement on Principles to guarantee that the United States will have access to all the materials relevant to a determination of whether, in fact, the goods and services procured for the pipeline in Canada meet the test of competitiveness set forth in Section 7. The matters raised in this letter indicate to us that you should move expeditiously to obtain a commitment from the Canadian Government that the United States will have access to all the information necessary to enforce the terms of Section 7 so that American industry will be assured of a fair and competitive opportunity to supply goods and services to the pipeline in Canada.

This matter raises serious concerns with respect to the degree to which the Canadian Government considers itself legally bound by the Agreement on Principles and the Transit Pipeline Treaty. To the extent these documents go unheeded, the President's decision on this matter has been severely undermined.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Ranking Minority Member.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1978

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian people have always been industrious and a vital part of American society. It is unfortunate that the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been under the iron rule of the Soviet Union, whose policies have resulted in the suppression of their human rights and have denied the right of self-determination for the Baltic peoples.

Even though the people are suppressed by the Communists, the Lithuanians will never give up their desire to be free from

political domination. And so there remains today the bright hope that some day soon the freedom that Lithuania achieved 60 years ago on February 16, but which has been brutally suppressed by the Soviets, will someday shine again.

THE TEXT OF H.R. 7711, THE PRODUCT LIABILITY INSURANCE TAX EQUITY ACT

HON. EDWARD W. PATTISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. PATTISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the authors of H.R. 7711, the Product Liability Insurance Tax Equity Act, have a rather pleasant problem. It seems that there have been so many requests for copies of our legislation that the Documents Room is unable to keep a supply of the bill on hand. We have even exhausted the available supplies of copies of the bill as reintroduced under other numbers.

Consequently, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of H.R. 7711, so that the bill will be more readily accessible to the general public. Please note that the text I am placing in today's RECORD includes a correction of the printing error that once appeared in the section entitled, "Limitation on Amount of Deduction." The version appearing here is the correct language.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 7711

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that trusts established for the payment of product liability claims and related expenses shall be exempt from income tax, and that a deduction shall be allowed for contributions to such trusts

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Product Liability Insurance Tax Equity Act of 1977".

SEC. 2. TAX EXEMPT PRODUCT LIABILITY TRUSTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to organizations exempt from tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(21) (A) A trust providing for the payment of product liability claims against one or more persons (or against any employee of such a person) who are engaged in any trade or business, if, under the terms of the trust, it is impossible for any part of the corpus or income of the trust to be (within the taxable year or thereafter) used for, or diverted to, any purpose other than the payment of such claims, any administrative expenses of such trust, and any expenses directly related to the investigation and settlement (or opposition) of such claims.

"(B) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, a trust (otherwise meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A)) shall be considered to meet such requirements notwithstanding the fact that the terms of the trust permit corpus and income to be withdrawn from the trust by any person who made any contribution to the trust and used for any purpose other than the payment of such claims and expenses. The pre-

ceding sentence shall apply to a trust only if the aggregate amount which may be so withdrawn and used by any person may not exceed the aggregate amount of contributions by such person to the trust. Any amount so withdrawn and used by any person shall be included in the gross income of such person for the taxable year in which withdrawn.

"(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'product liability' means—

"(i) in the case of any person engaged in any trade or business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling any manufactured good, any liability arising from any defect in or use of such good; and

"(ii) in the case of any person engaged in any trade or business of providing any service, any liability arising from the providing of (or the failure to provide) such service."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTION TO TAX-EXEMPT PRODUCT LIABILITY TRUST.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part IV of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 192. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CERTAIN PRODUCT LIABILITY TRUSTS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer who is engaged in any trade or business there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount (determined under subsection (b)) contributed during the taxable year to a trust described in section 501(c)(21) which provides for the payment of product liability claims against the taxpayer and arising in connection with the trade or business of the taxpayer.

"(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, a taxpayer shall be allowed a deduction under subsection (a) for any contribution during the taxable year to any trust only to the extent that such contribution does not exceed the reasonable cost to the taxpayer (but for such trust) for insurance for such year for the payment of product liability claims and expenses directly related to the investigation and settlement (or opposition) of such claims.

"(c) PRODUCT LIABILITY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'product liability' has the meaning given such term by section 501(c)(21)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 192. Contributions to certain product liability trusts."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ALLEN L. BYRON

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I note the untimely passing of Allen L. Byron, an individual who touched the lives of his family, friends, and members of the community with a great and long-lasting influence.

Although we were in no way related, it was my honor and pleasure to have been acquainted with Mr. Byron and his family and to have nominated his son, 1st Lt. Michael Byron, to the U.S. Air Force Academy, graduating class of 1977.

A 20-year resident of Ellicott City, Md., Mr. Byron was the director of human resources for Hitman and Associates, a member of the Hiring of the Handicapped Committee of Howard County, and a member of the Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce. Always concerned with young people, Mr. Byron founded the Howard County Youth Baseball League, and was an organizer of the Grantley Post team in the American Legion.

He will be greatly missed by his wife, Frances, and family and all who knew him. I know you will join me in extending the official sympathies of the House to this unselfish and civic-minded American.

THE NAVY'S TOP 1977 RECRUITER

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last month the U.S. Navy saluted its Outstanding Recruiters of 1977.

I was extremely proud that a young Navy man from my congressional district, DP1 Charles W. Krahn, Jr., Ocala, Fla., was chosen the Outstanding Navy Recruiter of the Year. According to Rear Adm. E. S. Briggs, commander, Navy Recruiting Command, he was the one who exemplified the highest personal and professional standards of the Navy Recruiting Command. He enlisted 109 applicants into the Navy in fiscal year 1977-93 of whom were eligible to attend Navy class "A" school.

Petty Officer Krahn and his fellow honorees were invited to Washington, D.C., where they and their ladies had a most marvelous and memorable visit.

On Monday, January 23, they attended an awards ceremony, a luncheon sponsored by the Navy League of the United States and a reception hosted by Admiral Briggs. DP1-Krahn was meritoriously promoted to the grade of chief petty officer.

Tuesday, January 24, they breakfasted with the Honorable W. Graham Claytor, Secretary of the Navy; toured the Pentagon and had some free time to look around the Washington area.

Wednesday, January 25, was to them a red-letter day. They toured the White House early in the morning. Next, they visited the Capitol Building, where our former colleague, the Honorable Fred Schwengel, now president of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, conducted them through an exciting tour of our Nation's congressional history.

At noon the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, chairman, Armed Services Committee, and the Noncommissioned Officers Association of the USA (NCOA) hosted a reception and lunch in the Rayburn House

Office Building. Joining me in congratulating our top Navy recruiters were Representatives MENDEL J. DAVIS of South Carolina and BOB WILSON of California, and Senator JESSE HELMS of North Carolina. Sending representatives were AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Member of Congress, and Senator H. JOHN HEINZ III, both of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Normand M. Gonsauls, executive vice president of the NCOA, presented certificates of appreciation and merit to the outstanding recruiters. He lauded their efforts in behalf of the All-Volunteer Force and encouraged them to continue their devotion to the U.S. Navy.

Admiral Briggs was on hand along with the outgoing and incoming directors, Navy Office of Legislative Affairs, Rear Admirals E. R. "Gus" Kinnear II and Thomas J. Kilcline, respectively.

Admiral Briggs presented honorary Navy recruiter certificates to Senator HELMS, Fred Schwengel, and "Mack" McKinney, staff director, NCOA National Capital Office, who acted as the NCOA coordinator for the luncheon.

Admiral Kinnear introduced me and, along with earlier remarks by our colleagues MENDEL DAVIS, BOB WILSON, and Senator JESSE HELMS, I commended the Navy and NCOA for recognizing the dedication and devotion exhibited by this group of young men—America's finest.

Mr. Speaker, this week I encourage my colleagues to join me, the U.S. Navy, Navy League of the United States, Navy Wifeline and the Noncommissioned Officers Association in saluting the following Outstanding Navy Recruiters of 1977 and their lovely ladies:

DFC Charles W. and Mrs. (Rebekah) Krahn, Jr., Navy Recruiting Station, Ocala, Fla.

ADJ1 David T. and Mrs. (Geraldine) Warmkessel, Navy Recruiting Station, Wildwood, N.J.

FTM1 William J. Hallmark and fiancée, Diana Karchella, Navy Recruiting Station, Washington, Pa.

ETN2 Joseph V. and Mrs. (Cheryl) Bruno, Navy Recruiting Station, Chicago, Ill.

EN1 Shawn T. and Mrs. (Cheryl) Kolstad, Navy Recruiting Station, Thornton, Colo.

FTM1 Daniel J. and Mrs. (Jacqueline) Petz, Navy Recruiting Station, Glendale, Ariz.

AHM1 Robert F. and Mrs. (Stella) Baxter, Veteran Recruiting Orientation (VETRO), New Orleans, La. Chief of Naval Reserve "Recruiter of the Year, Air Programs."

YNM Frederick C. and Mrs. (Elizabeth) DerBaum, Jr., Naval Reserve Center, Charleston, S.C. Chief of Naval Reserve "Recruiter of the Year, Surface Programs."

Captain Jack M. Kennedy, Commanding Officer, Navy Recruiting District, Miami, Fla. Commanding District winning Best in Officer Attainment, Best in Enlisted Attainment, and Best Overall District.

REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1978

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of last week's 60th anniversary of

the Re-Establishment of Independence in Lithuania, I would like to express my admiration for the people of that country and those Americans of Lithuanian descent who have worked tirelessly for the renewed freedom of that country.

Surely a country with only 3.3 million people would never be expected to be so assertive against the collective, oppressive power of the Soviet Union. And yet, despite the repression that such assertiveness brings, the spirit of the Lithuanian people remains unbroken.

It is the epitome of pretentiousness for the Soviet Union to believe that they can interrupt 727 years of Lithuanian nationality where none has been able to heretofore.

There is nothing so immutable as a proud people's desire for freedom. The Lithuanians have freed themselves from the Russian yoke before, and it is the hope of free people everywhere that that feat will be repeated.

FARM POLICY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for February 22, 1978, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FARM POLICY

The U.S. farmer enters 1978 worried about another big harvest and more low crop prices.

The farmer's present position is an uncertain one. His net farm income this year is expected to be about \$20 billion, the fifth largest amount in history. Also, the value of his land and other assets has reached \$730 billion, up an astounding \$60 billion from just a year ago. But his farm production costs will rise steadily, and that's the rub for him. Although about one-half of the nation's farmers, mainly small operators, are debt-free, farmers as a group are deeper in debt than ever before. In terms of what his earnings can buy, the farmer's income today is the lowest it has been since 1930. He receives only 39 cents of every dollar consumers spend for food.

These general statistics, though accurate, may not be much help in understanding the economics and politics of agriculture. Farming in America is an enormously diverse and complex enterprise. It varies greatly from county to county, not to mention from state to state. This past summer crops were ruined in the South and along the Atlantic Coast, but farmers in Iowa and Wisconsin did quite well. Some grain farmers were hurting, but others were prospering. The farmers who were in deep trouble called for 100 percent of parity and threatened a strike, but the farmers who fared well did not join in the protest. The 4.4 million workers on the nation's 2.8 million farms are no monolithic group. They are many in number and their problems are real, but they have much difficulty in organizing for action.

In recent years farmers have been encouraged to grow and sell all the food they could. Supporters of this policy of maximum production say that it takes the government out of agriculture. Critics call it a "boom-bust" policy that ultimately causes wide fluctuations in food and farm prices. This controversy is really not very useful because it does not allow us to understand the forces that are shaping agricultural policy today.

From 1972 to 1976 foreign demand for large quantities of wheat, corn and soybeans kept prices up. Farmers did not have to concern themselves with a government "safety net." They grew what they wanted and the prices they received spiraled up and up. Many of them planned for perpetual prosperity. However, in 1977 the farmer ran into slackening demand abroad. His heavy production resulted in surplus. Wheat farmers were especially hard hit as record crops added to a 1.1 billion bushel stockpile (the largest in 13 years) that was already on hand. Soon there was simply too much grain with nowhere to go. Prices, which had begun to slump in 1975, dropped sharply. Under a free-market farm policy, farmers were supposed to take the lean years with the good, and 1977 certainly was a lean year. Many farmers suffered severe losses.

Agricultural policy is changing, but not as much as the rhetoric might suggest. The basic policy continues to stress the importance of the marketplace as the main determinant of farm income. Agricultural exports are critically important, so expanded overseas markets and lower trade barriers are sought. Farmers are to be as free as possible from government restrictions, though certain devices are to be used to prevent wide swings in prices. Under the policy as it is evolving, farmer-held grain stocks are promoted, government payments to farmers are increased, wheat and corn acreage in production is reduced and a national emergency reserve is created.

In effect, there has been a modification of previous farm policy rather than a rejection of it. The new view is neither a policy of totally free markets nor a policy of rigid controls and fixed market shares. The idea is to dampen the familiar boom-bust price cycle and to permit modest grain reserves to absorb the shock of bad weather, crop failure and sudden price fluctuation. There is opposition to this approach from those who believe that grain reserves tend to restrain prices. Reserves probably do restrain prices to some extent, but it is both expensive and irrational to have an unlimited free market when prices are rising and market controls when prices are falling. The new policy aims to set up an essentially free-market system in which prices will neither collapse nor rise as high as farmers would like to see them. In this way the real trouble of recent years, the radical instability of farm prices, can perhaps be avoided. Fears of a renewed surplus are unfounded, according to most experts. World grain consumption is simply too high and world grain production too uncertain.

In assessing farm policy, two important facts should be noted. First, the weather will have more to do with the supply of grain than will all the agricultural policies of the world put together. Second, despite the uncertain nature of farming, the American consumer still gets his money's worth at the supermarket. He spends more on his automobile than he does on his groceries.

FURTHER CUTS IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM UNWISE AND UNWARRANTED

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House, and, indeed, of all those concerned with child nutrition to the unwarranted and unwise proposal of President Carter to virtually

eliminate the special milk program from our schools and other eligible child care institutions. The proposal, according to the President's budget submitted on January 23, would completely eliminate this program in all schools and institutions which currently have a school lunch or breakfast program.

In my State of Minnesota this would eliminate about 92 percent of all the public and private elementary and secondary schools from the program. Nationally it would eliminate over 90 percent of the schools. The result would be that millions of children would be denied an extra half pint of milk each day, with a consequent serious nutritional loss to many, particularly children from lower income families. This would cut Federal support for the milk program by \$112 million annually, from a current estimate of \$142 million for fiscal year 1979, an 80-percent slash.

Last year, in H.R. 1139, enacted as Public Law 95-166, the House agreed to a Senate provision which cut \$25 million out of the special milk program by denying a second half pint of milk to a child served a free lunch. I vigorously opposed accepting that in conference and pointed out the basis for my opposition during the House debate on the conference report on October 27, 1977. I said then:

The proponents of this claimed that the "duplication" of milk service was unnecessary and costly. But I voted against receding to the Senate on this issue. I do not consider the service of a pint of milk to a needy child to be excessive. Milk is still the best and most natural food known . . . [and a] full pint of milk for a child who probably is a nutritional risk does not seem to be unwarranted.

At that time, at the suggestion of Minnesota school food officials, I made certain during the debate that the congressional intent clearly could not be read to completely deny a free milk to a needy child who brought a lunch from home. However, I still considered the action unwise. The \$25 million cut, incidentally, was made at the suggestion of the Carter administration or at least with its full support.

Now the administration and the Department of Agriculture proposes to virtually wipe out the special milk program. The damage to child nutrition would be immense and by its very nature irreparable. This proposal would impose a particular hardship on students who most need the additional nutritional value of extra milk. In most schools, children who pay for their meals and receive a half pint of milk would be able to purchase an additional half pint if they desired. However, children unable to pay for a lunch and receiving a half pint of milk with a free or reduced price lunch probably would be unable to afford an extra milk—a milk which in most cases would have been made available under the special milk program at another time during the day. Moreover, extra milk would also be unavailable to paying students except at the time of meal service, thus depriving all children of the opportunity for extra nutrition.

Worse still, many kindergarten and other preschool children do not attend

school during a breakfast or lunch period, but do receive a half pint of milk under the special milk program, and they could be denied this benefit under the proposed legislation. Thus a considerable number of very young children who most need the extra nutrition of milk would not receive it.

On January 17 of this year Art Buchwald, in his widely syndicated satirical column, "Capitol Punishment," wrote of the \$25 million cut by Congress and headed the column "From Now On, Kids, Its One to a Customer." Near the end he said, jokingly, of course:

The men and women responsible for this bill deserve high marks for serving notice on the schoolchildren of America that we taxpayers are sick and tired of giving them second half-pints of milk, and if they aren't careful we might even take their first half-pint away from them, too.

Perhaps Mr. Buchwald has an avid and serious reader in President Carter or someone high in his Office of Management and Budget, for in many cases that is exactly what the President's proposal would do. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee which would have to consider the President's proposal to slash the school milk program, I can assure parents and all other citizens concerned about proper child nutrition that this will not be approved without determined opposition from at least this member of the committee.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TOWNS AND TOWNSHIPS ADDRESSES WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON BALANCED GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress a most excellent and comprehensive statement presented February 1, 1978 at the White House Conference on Balanced National Growth and Economic Development expressing the vital role of the towns and townships of our Nation in our American Government economic system, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TOWNS AND TOWNSHIPS INTRODUCTION

My name is Barton Russell and I am the executive director of the National Association of Towns and Townships. I am here today on behalf of NATAT's Board of Directors to share with you the viewpoints of township officials as they relate to the theme of this historic White House Conference, balanced national growth and economic development.

NATAT: A NATIONAL SUPPORT CENTER FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The National Association of Towns and Townships is a federation of state organizations representing local officials from over 13,000 units of local government around this country. Since it was founded in 1963, NATAT's objectives have been: to be the

spokesman for the nation's towns; to conduct research and develop training programs designed to foster improvements in local government; to encourage intergovernmental cooperation; and to promote an understanding of the significance of town government, its heritage, and its future role in the federal system. In short, NATAT is the voice of America's towns in Washington.

TOWNSHIPS AS A LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTION

The township system was the first form of local government adopted in America. Established in Massachusetts in 1620, townships moved west as the country grew. Today this system of local government serves 45 million people living in approximately 17,000 communities.

Over the years, townships came to be known as the nation's rural form of local government, serving a defined area without regard to population concentration. Today, while many townships have a non-metropolitan nature, a number of them are also developing into urban communities with demographic characteristics similar to those of the bigger cities. Although many towns have not been given broad municipal authority to govern by their respective states, most have been granted, over time, the power to provide a wide variety of vital, general purpose, local government services.

This conference, appropriately, is a microcosm of the township system in that it, too, is providing many of our citizens and leaders a direct opportunity to participate in the affairs of our country and shape its direction. Writer Neil Pierce has referred to this historic event as the first National Town Meeting on economic development.

PROBLEMS AFFECTING TOWNSHIPS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

There is a serious lack of information about township government at the national level. Many federal policy-makers in both Congress and the Executive branch come from outside the New England, mid-Atlantic and north central regions, where the township system is prevalent, and may not even be aware that townships exist. Or they may have read the very limited, outdated, and usually biased information which has been written about this system of government and are under the mistaken impression that townships are an antiquated system for which there is no citizen support or demand. Nothing could be further from the truth!

TOWNSHIP GOVERNMENT IS VITAL

As stated recently by the Honorable Robert A. Roe, Chairman of the Economic Development Subcommittee of the House Public Works and Transportation Committee, "Townships are a responsive and viable form of government . . . (they) continue to effectively provide outstanding public service and . . . work cooperatively on regional, state and national concerns."

Congressman Roe, who played an important part in planning this Conference and was primarily responsible for the participation of NATAT's president, Robert Robinson, has also stated, "... I am a former township official and I know from experience that the character and structure of township government lend (themselves) well to the task of increasing service to citizens on an efficient and economical basis."

Mr. Roe knows the necessity for efficient and economical operation in local government. He also knows that these qualities in public management are essential to the long-range economic integrity of every community in this country. "Balanced growth and economic development," he said in remarks he prepared for this Conference, "is not just a national concern . . . Many of our local governments have done a far better job than the federal government in planning for fu-

ture growth and development and in making hard policy decisions among conflicting demands." The ability to make such decisions is a characteristic of township officials.

Governor James R. Thompson of Illinois also recognizes the need for the qualities of township government:

I continue to believe that there is indeed a vital, necessary and growing need for township government in Illinois. . . . I travel this state a lot and I see that people at the township level of government are sometimes better attuned to the needs of the people than a lot of those at (the state capital) The need for township government . . . is not confined to the rural areas; it plays a vital role in the urban areas, too.

VIABILITY IS MEASURED IN QUALITY, NOT QUANTITY!

Despite the fact that township government has merged as an integral part of the intergovernmental system, some still view the township as an outmoded form of local government. They mistakenly conclude, because total and per capita expenditures by township governments are often much lower than expenditures by cities and counties, that townships are less viable or less important to their citizens. This is absurd. As stated by Dr. George Beelen, a professor at Youngstown State University in Ohio, ". . . (the township system) offers more personal service, more attention to individual needs, and a better understanding of local problems than any other unit of local government . . . because it is closest to those it serves."

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: DEALING THE TOWNSHIPS IN

The time has come to move beyond the question of whether the township system of local government is viable or whether it will die. Township government is here to stay, despite the fact that some theorists would like to see it go the way of the dinosaur. The question remaining is how townships can continue to improve their capacity to deliver services at the local level and strengthen their role in the intergovernmental system. In this respect, at least one basic change is necessary at the national level: federal officials must become better informed about the township system and, as legislation and regulations are written, must include townships in each program as they would any other system of local government. Otherwise, there can be no equity.

NATAT: REPRESENTING SMALL COMMUNITIES

The vast majority of the over 13,000 towns which the National Association provides representation for and assistance to are considered small (under 50,000 in population) by federal standards. In light of the fact that over one-half of all Americans live in townships and cities of this size, NATAT provides the forum for an intergovernmental perspective which is absolutely vital to a program of balanced national growth and development.

It is not widely known that such a startling number of U.S. citizens live in so-called small communities. In fact, from all the attention which Congress, the White House and the media give to the big cities, one might think that the majority of Americans live within the boundaries of such metropolitan centers. Some figures provided by the 1972 Census of Governments indicate quite the opposite. Of the 35,508 townships and cities which are recognized by the Census Bureau as general units of local government, only 108 of them represent more than 100,000 people. Another 298 localities are between 50,000 and 99,000 in size. Thus, out of the over 35,000 local governments in this country, not even 500 have a population in excess of 50,000.

A variety of rationales has been offered to explain Washington's myopic concern with the problems of the big cities. Some say that our megalopolis areas are going bankrupt and need immediate relief. There is no doubt in the minds of NATAT officials that some serious problems exist in some of these urban centers which require short and long term solutions. However, we do not feel that it is in the national interest to ignore or only pay half-hearted attention to the very real difficulties being experienced in many of our nation's smaller communities in order to "save the big cities." We feel that this Conference is a very appropriate place to begin talking at the federal level about balanced growth and development in the context of all communities, large and small.

RECENT POPULATION TRENDS ADD PRESSURE TO THE SMALL COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

With the advent of New Federalism, small communities for the first time became an integral partner in the intergovernmental system. This effort by the Congress to decentralize government and return a significant amount of control to the local level gave town officials new and important responsibilities to meet public needs. Occurring almost concurrently with the shift in federal philosophy was a shift of population from urban areas to smaller communities in non-metropolitan areas. For the first time in this country's history, more Americans began moving away from metropolitan areas than moving to them.

This revival of population growth outside urban and even suburban areas represents a trend which is expected to continue indefinitely and which, when coupled with the increasing public management responsibilities faced by public officials at the local level, carries serious implications that must be considered.

A 1977 report by the Rand Corporation focused on the issue of outmigration and its implications:

Perhaps the most intriguing of the many issues raised by non-metropolitan growth is its effect on the character of "Rural America" . . . Bow, New Hampshire, for example, has been converted from a farm town with 1,300 residents into a bedroom community of 3,200 residents and 12 housing developments since 1960. As Bow's administrator observed of this growth, "People move in here who are accustomed to certain services. For a year or two they are content with low taxes, but then they start demanding snow clearance, black-top roads, street lights and garbage pick-up . . . Soon," he said, "Bow will have to build a high school, a sewer system and a second fire station."

Although the population explosion in rural areas has varied in degrees of intensity from region to region, the experience of the Bow administrator is viewed as typical of most developing non-metropolitan locales. As stated by Dr. Landrum Bolling, President of the Council on Foundations:

On the small-town level, the local government—often led by part time officials—faces a serious lack of resources with which to deal with the increasingly complex problems of small communities.

The issue is critical, as indicated in a report written by an official of the Farmers Home Administration:

Inevitably the next 30 years will bring an explosion of urban-type growth in areas that now consist of farm trading towns, placid villages, and the fields and woodlots of farmers. . . . (officials of local government) are the critical factor in determining the environment in which Americans live out their lives. (They) administer public and special services. They acquire land and apply land-use controls. They raise revenue and direct capital investments.

CAPACITY-BUILDING IN SMALL TOWNS

NATAT's members recognize the continuing need for developing methods to improve the capacity of officials from smaller communities to be more effective local managers and partners in the intergovernmental system. In Pennsylvania, for example, some townships are employing a "circuit riding" manager to provide them with professional services in areas such as budgeting and accounting, capital improvement plans, and state and federal grantsmanship. This program, funded by a grant from the Economic Development Administration, is designed to assist communities which by themselves are not large enough or wealthy enough to hire a full-time manager. The program represents the creative kind of approach to local decision-making which smaller communities are now taking. Such improvements at the local level are not, in and of themselves, the complete answer to the problems of small town government.

INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL COMMUNITIES FOSTERED BY FEDERAL POLICIES

A few selected quotes from a recent issue of a New England publication are indicative of the problems experienced by officials from townships as a result of federal policies:

"Red tape grows so slow you don't notice it at first," explains Theodore H. Moe, Jr., a former selectman in Swanzy, New Hampshire, which like many New England towns has had its fiscal underpinning shaken by federal orders to close the town dump, and build a costly (\$5 million in this case) sewage-treatment system. Moe, the postmaster in East Swanzy by day, was working almost 20 hours a week in the town hall at night when he decided last spring to call it quits.

"For most selectmen, there just aren't enough hours in the evening to deal with federal money," he says. "If revenue-sharing hadn't been so considerable, we'd have stuck it in an envelope and sent it back."

"For a while, towns had money. But they don't anymore—the federal government does—and selectmen can't get federal grants because they don't know the rules of the game or have time to play it."

Phillip Schenck, town manager in Farmington, Maine, and a director of the Maine Municipal Association, figures up to half his working day is devoted to "federal stuff—from civil defense to food stamps." And Schenck doesn't consider his problem unusual.

"Local government is becoming a delivery mechanism for state and federal programs . . . It's being forced to grow to keep up with the mandates."

Contrary to the philosophy prevailing in some federal departments and commissions, consolidation of small units of government into fewer, larger units is not the answer to the problems of managing smaller communities. Studies show that citizens do not support the idea of more centralization and less local autonomy. Also, where programs have been consolidated, there is no clear evidence that money has been saved or programs are more effective. In fact, it is NATAT's conclusion that centralization most often just puts distance between the people and their government.

FEDERAL CHANGES ARE NECESSARY

In order to improve the management situation at the small town level, drastic changes in the federal approach to intergovernmental relations are necessary. Typically, local governments are required to alter their character and structure to meet federal requirements. It's time it is recognized that this approach does not work and that federal programs must be restructured to reflect the system of delivering public services which works for small towns today.

THE 1978-79 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President, Robert Robinson, Executive Director, Michigan Townships Association, 3121 West Saginaw Street, Lansing, MI 48917, 517/321-6467.

First Vice President, Dan Holtz, Executive Secretary, Minnesota Association of Township Officials, Hawick, MN 56246, 612/243-3949.

Second Vice President, Ed K. Krueger, Executive Director, Wisconsin Towns Association, Route 4, Box 320, Shawano, WI 54186, 715/526-5629.

Secretary/Treasurer, B. Kenneth Greider, Executive Director, Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors, P.O. Box 158, 3001 Gettysburg Road, Camp Hill, PA 17011, 717/763-0930.

Immediate Past President, Chester Hummell, Executive Director, Ohio State Association of Township Trustees and Clerks, 40 South Third Street, Columbus, OH 43215, 614/221-8792.

Richard Howe, Executive Director, Massachusetts Selectmen's Association, 6 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02108, 617/523-8292.

James Ginther, President, Indiana Township Trustees Association, 408 Riley Road, East Chicago, IN 46312, 219/932-2530.

Leo Gray, President, North Dakota Township Officers Association, Inc., Rosholt, SD 57260, 518/465-7933.

George Miller, President, Township Officials of Illinois, 817 LaPorte, Melrose Park, IL 60164, 312/455-8616.

William K. Sanford, Executive Secretary, Association of Towns of the State of New York, 90 State Street, Albany, NY 12207, 518/465-7933.

Mrs. Pauline Jackson, New Jersey Association of Townships, 8 Chatham Place, Vincetown, N.J. 08088.

Executive Director, Barton D. Russell, Suite 1030, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, 202/452-8100.

A LITTLE SAMPLE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Santa Maria Times reflects what I believe is a growing concern among a great deal of Americans: U.S. policy vis-a-vis other nations. According to the editorial, the Panama Canal treaties represent just another example of the U.S. weakened position in the world.

The editorial follows:

[From the Santa Maria (Calif.) Times, Feb. 6, 1978]

A LITTLE SAMPLE

President Carter tells us that passage of the Panama Canal treaties will improve our position of leadership among nations. But will it?

Will it increase our stature or will it add to the growing doubts around the world of America's leadership position? Will it lead to further examples of defiance of the United States, such as the most recent example of Vietnam telling us it will keep its United Nations ambassador in New York despite our insistence that he leave?

There was a time when America was respected by the rest of the world. There was a time when a challenge such as that offered by the Vietnamese would have been dealt with swiftly.

Recall the Barbary pirates, and how the U.S. quickly dispatched that threat?

But now America's diplomacy is scoffed at by nations large and small. Ignominy after ignominy are heaped on the nation and its representatives by tinhorns from nations that weren't even on the map in the days when Teddy Roosevelt followed the philosophy of treading softly but carried a big stick.

We aren't advocating gunboat diplomacy, but neither are we advocating caving in to every demand and threat tossed our way. And the threat voiced that our South American neighbors might not like us if we don't give away the canal, and the billions of dollars of revenue it represents, doesn't bother us one whit.

America has always been a generous nation. It has stepped in and helped throughout the world. What nation doesn't still owe huge sums to the U.S.—amounts that could help erase the national debt that each and every working man in the U.S. labors daily just to help pay the interest on. And what friendship has that bought?

We feel along with the majority of Americans that the Panama Canal should be retained. And we don't fear what a dictator in a banana nation may do to us.

MICHAEL J. KADAR, JR., "CITIZEN OF THE YEAR"**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, some one once described the difference between a pessimist and an optimist as follows: the pessimist finds difficulty in every opportunity; the optimist finds opportunity in every difficulty.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a man who exemplifies the optimist—Mr. Michael J. Kadar, Jr., who has been chosen "Citizen of the Year" by the Greater McKeesport Jaycees. Mr. Kadar is richly deserving of the honor. He has had a wide ranging career, involving him with numerous opportunities to confront problems and never has he failed to convert the problem into the opportunity to help people. His community and its citizens have been the beneficiary of his knowledge, ability and experience.

By profession, Mr. Kadar is a banker's banker, presently serving as vice president of the Union National Bank of Pittsburgh and the manager of its McKeesport branch office. His interest in finances stretches back more than 30 years and he is prominent today in various banking organizations.

But, the world of finance is merely his vocation. He spends as much or more of his time on his avocation—helping others. "Mike" Kadar rarely, if ever, misses an opportunity to serve the McKeesport community and the surrounding area.

He has served on the local school board and is a past president of the Mon-Yough Chamber of Commerce, a past president of McKeesport Kiwanis Club, is vice president of the Mon-Yough Area Industrial Development Corp., a member of the Mon-Yough Management Associa-

tion, serves on the board for the Downtown McKeesport Association and the local Salvation Army.

"Mike" is an active member of the Masons and Elks and has worked for many years on behalf of the United Fund and the Girl Scouts of America. If he has a favorite labor of love, I expect it would be the American Cancer Society. He is extremely active in this area and presently is general chairman of the Mon-Yough branch. It is typical of "Mike" to insist that the proceeds from his testimonial dinner on March 1 be donated to the Cancer Society.

Mr. Speaker, "Mike's" wife, Bette, and his daughters, Mollie and Karin, have every reason to be proud of him. He is a man held in high esteem by all who know him. I take great pleasure, therefore, in extending to him on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States our formal congratulations and best wishes.

HOW ARMY FARES MINUS DRAFT SYSTEM**HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Army Clifford Alexander was interviewed for the Washington Star's February 15 "Q and A" column on the status of today's Army.

Secretary Alexander has done an excellent job as head of the U.S. Army. He has shown strong, effective leadership, and he has been impressive in the degree to which he has sought to determine just where the Army stands, what its problems and strengths are.

The firm judgment of the Secretary is that the Volunteer Army "works quite well." Secretary Alexander's comments are instructive. He discusses Volunteer Army quality and costs, unionization, and other issues that should be of interest to all of us.

I commend the interview to the attention of all who read the RECORD.

HOW ARMY FARES MINUS DRAFT SYSTEM

(Clifford Alexander, the secretary of the Army, was interviewed by Washington Star Staff Writer Lance Gay.)

Question. The General Accounting Office just issued a report that says the all-volunteer army caused a substantial increase in the Pentagon's budget—more than \$3 billion since 1973. Is the all-volunteer army cost effective?

ALEXANDER. I believe it's quite cost effective. The GAO report addressed the past costs that were associated with not only the all-volunteer army but the costs of the Army generally. The most important driving force of that report was the salary increase which actually took place two years before the all-volunteer army started. Those are the largest dollars in terms of increase. We base our assumptions on the present costs and the present salaries for an all-volunteer army versus the draft army. The proper question really is, "If we were to go to a draft, is there a cost savings?" I think the answer is clearly no. If you make the assumption that you're

going to cut salaries in half, which to me would be quite inequitable, of course you're going to save money. What the GAO figures indicate is that there was a salary increase and during the all-volunteer years, those salaries caused an increase in expenditures. People in the Army today really don't make much money. They make an adequate wage to sustain themselves and that's it.

Q. You feel that the nation went the right direction in eliminating the draft?

A. I do. Perhaps if we had to sustain the draft, the question would have to include indices of internal turmoil, but they have been happily on a steady decline. AWOLs, for example, in 1974 were at 108 per thousand. In 1976 they were down to 56 per thousand. Desertions were 33 per thousand in 1974. In 1976, down to around 13 or 14. If you look at the number of court martials, they have significantly gone down. One of our stockades in Europe—in Germany—has been closed. If you go around the country as I have and see bases, you'll see a great lessening of the stockade population. Crimes of violence have decreased. This indicates that people are doing better within the Army. Training has escalated and gotten better. There's a good upswing.

Q. There seems to be a growing movement of unionizing the army. This seems to be an issue that is not going to go away. Is there a groundswell out there that a union could respond to?

A. I don't think that we've noticed a groundswell on the part of soldiers. Soldiers do have, however, certain legitimate gripes. In the year I've been here my emphasis has been on the people in the Army and what and how they look, how they're trained, how they're regarded. That means we have to concern ourselves with their housing, with how their capacity to transport their family with them when they're sent overseas, child care, what is on base for them in terms of recreation. We address those problems and if the uniformed leadership of the Army continues, as it has done, to think about people, it seems to me that many of those gripes are answered. In talking to soldiers I don't hear them saying they want to join a union. And indeed when the AFGE took a poll of its own membership, over 80 percent said, "We see no reason to try to unionize the Army." But despite there isn't great interest on the part of the soldier, it's our responsibility, and mine specifically, to be helpful to the needs of the soldier, to recognize those needs so that we have a better environment for our soldiers to defend their nation.

Q. Would you support a unionization movement?

A. No, I certainly would not.

Q. Why not?

A. I think it's basically inconsistent with the discipline that's required in the military. It's a matter of life and death that orders must be responded to. You really must have a chain of command. Individuals in that chain of command must be able to respond literally on a moment's notice. They can't be looking over their shoulders to see if there is some other representative group on hand that is saying, "No, go in another direction." So I find it to be inconsistent with what our mission is.

Q. Under the all-volunteer Army you have a shortage of physicians. Do you think the draft should be reactivated to get more doctors into the Army?

A. The perception of the question is accurate. We're dealing with it by contracting out for civilian physicians. We're trying to be more imaginative in the use of physicians in the reserve over the weekends so people can come and use their services. We cannot compete with the outside dollar. We're also thinking of possibly shorter terms for physicians. There are many training possibilities in the military that might attract physicians

to come in. I don't think we should draft physicians at the present time. I think we do have to encourage physicians to come in because we do have a shortage.

Q. Some people say that the draft, for all its troubles, did bring a certain diversity to the Army. It brought in non-military people who were only going to be there for two years—that it brought a softening effect into the military structure. Do you agree with that?

A. Well, I think the premise behind that is misplaced romanticism. If you bring in a draftee—an E-1—that person doesn't set policy for the Army—and certainly doesn't achieve such status within two years. And that's as it should be. It's the same with people who are in three or four years. They don't set policy. It seems to me that the Army of the draft or volunteer eras have professional leadership. I've been associated with the volunteer army for a year and I'm happy we have the quality. It gives service to the country. There are checks and balances in the system, civilian control, etc. I think it works quite well. It seems to me the diversity people speak of is there. The person who volunteers is a little lower economically than the average, but not much. He comes from a variety of backgrounds. Education is a tiny bit lower. Of course, it is higher in the officer ranks. There is happily an incentive that seems to build in the non-commissioned officers as they move along to increase their education. For example, now we bring in about 56 percent high school graduates last year. The Army overall is almost 84 percent high school graduates. Now, in their 18th, 19th or 20th years, many have now had college and beyond. That's a good thing.

Q. The all-volunteer army has also resulted in a disproportionate number of minority-member soldiers compared to the general population. How do you see this as a factor?

A. The Army is a place where people can achieve their opportunities according to their skills. Of course there are exceptions but fortunately becoming rarer and rarer. The first question I asked of our leadership is, "Are our soldiers doing the job?" The answer is a clear yes today, we are doing it better and better each year. So I have no concern at all about the numbers of minorities in the Army. I do keep an eye out and will have a concern about how they are progressing, and whether they are progressing fairly in relationship to the minority of the services. We have very interesting and positive statistics in the noncommissioned officer ranks. In the officer ranks there is improvement but it is slower than I would like to see it. We do have some good signs in ROTC—about 22 percent black in that category. The Army is a place where people do get an opportunity. But I find it to be of greater moment that many of our black soldiers tend to re-up at a much higher rate than our white soldiers. That is because of the perception, sometimes, that their opportunities would be lesser in corporate America than they would be with Army America. Again, I'm proud of what we're trying to do and continue to do.

POTTSVILLE BAND

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to pay tribute to the famous Third Brigade Band of

Pottsville, Pa.; 1979 marks the 100th year since the reorganization of the band, which began in 1849.

The musical organizations of Pottsville have truly played a significant role in the history of our Nation. For this reason, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a brief historical sketch which I recently and gratefully received from Mr. Harry C. Hostetter, president of the Third Brigade Band:

A SKETCH OF POTTSVILLE'S BANDS

The first Pottsville band of which there is any record was organized in 1849. The leader was Lamar H. Bartlett.

In 1858, the Pottsville Cornet Band was organized with Joseph Derr as leader. They used to meet at Railroad and East Market Street.

About 1860, a band was organized by a man named Feger. They reported to the front and were on duty at the siege of Petersburg, Va.

September 2, 1861, the 48th Regiment Band was organized with J. W. Sauders as leader and William Maize as drum major. They were mustered out of the service August 14, 1862.

November 8, 1861, the 96th Regiment Band was organized with N. J. Nehr as leader. There were six brothers (no record of names) in the band. They left for Washington immediately after and were discharged August 4, 1862.

At the discharge of the 48th and 96th Regiment Bands, they reorganized with Horace Walbridge as leader and reported to the 48th Regiment at Lexington, Kentucky and were in service for three months.

In 1867, a Negro band was organized by John Jones, living on Minersville Street.

The West End Band came into existence. Its leader was a man named McDaniels.

September 16, 1867, the Jones Cornet and Orchestra Band was chartered. B. Bryson McCool made application for the charter.

In 1870, a band called the Young America Band was organized, but went out of existence shortly thereafter.

From early in 1879 to the latter part of the year, Pottsville was without an organized band, and in order to have music for a big demonstration, it was necessary to go to Reading for a band. This showed the absolute necessity of having a brass band.

September 18, 1879, for the second time in Pittsville's history, a band called the Pottsville Cornet Band came into existence. A Regimental Band Master named Jim Alexander was named leader. At the first meeting, Fidel Fisher, Jim Alexander, Horace Walbridge, George (Gov) Ochs and Adolph H. Kopp were appointed a committee to devise ways to put the band across. Many of the members had previously been members of the bands which preceded this one.

August 17, 1880, the Pottsville Cornet Band became the 7th Regiment Band.

August 2, 1881, General J. K. Siegfried mustered the band into the service as The 3rd Brigade Band of Pennsylvania, Pa. N.G.P. This position was held until Brigade Bands were discontinued in 1903. In 1903, Pennsylvania Legislature passed legislation terminating Brigade Bands in the National Guard. Bandmaster Lt. Frederick Gearhard was asked to consider transferring himself and the band intact to the 4th Regiment Pa. N.G.P. After careful consideration of this request by Colonel O'Neill, it was finally decided not to become a Regimental Band.

In 1887, Professor Alexander resigned, and was succeeded by F. R. Zeitz.

Sometime after Prof. Zeitz took over the band, dissension began between some of the members. This was probably caused because of the Bandmaster's insistence on playing everything to his own liking, in particular,

German Nationalistic music, which was in a way popular at this period. However, this met with disfavor with some of the members. As a result, about December, 1889, there was a split in the band, and The Liberty Band was organized with Elam Jenkins as leader.

On January 7, 1890, a young man, a member of the 3rd Brigade Band from its inception, and just graduated from Boston Conservatory, returned to the Pa. N.G.P. as a Lieutenant. His name, Frederick Gearhard; he was designated as Bandmaster of the 3rd Brigade Band of Pottsville, Pennsylvania, Pa. N.G.P. When Gearhard became leader, the band was again unified with all personnel re-enlisting in the Guards.

From 1890 until 1914, under Lt. Gearhard, the Band prospered and gained fame throughout Pennsylvania, as not only a fine marching band, but also a fine concert band. General Gobin once said of the band, "The 3rd Brigade Band is the best band in the best National Guard in the best State in the Union."

July, 1892, the band was in active service at the Homestead riots. They attended every annual encampment while in the service. They went with the troops in March to serve in the Spanish-American War, but were not sent to the front.

In the year 1881, the 14th day of September, a petition to the courts of Schuylkill County was finally granted and the charter of a society to be known as "The Pottsville Musical Association." This was to be the backbone for the band for many years to come. It existed intact into the 1920's, during the time when C. P. Hoffman was leader of the band. The last entry in the minutes was February 14, 1921.

On October 7, 1914, Prof. Frederick Gearhard died. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Joseph Painter was elected to succeed him. He served in that capacity from 1914 to 1917. Then, with a nucleus from The 3rd Brigade Band, he became the leader of a band offered for service to the United States Government in World War I. This was the first band accepted by the War Department as a unit. The Band reported at Schenectady, N.Y., but was never mustered in. Prof. Painter then entered the A. E. F. and held a commission in the Army; one of the few musicians that did.

July, 1917, Charles P. Hoffman became the leader of the band and practically reorganized it because of the fact that the Army Band had taken away practically one-half of the membership. Up until now, C. P. Hoffman was a member of the Pottsville Musical Association, and this was a factor which could help the band.

During his time as leader of the band, which is one of the longest on record, Hoffman helped the band very much. He took the band to many important engagements, such as "The Rajah Silver Jubilee" at Philadelphia in 1917, Rajah Temple Dedication in 1922. August 27, 1924, was another trip, this time to Atlantic City. During this period a Giant Bass Drum was purchased by the band and was used extensively until after Gov. James' Inauguration.

Unknown to both himself and the band, C. P. Hoffman was to lead his last concert just five days before his death. The band played a free concert Friday, January 11, 1935. C. P. Hoffman passed away Wednesday at his home at 518 Mahantongo Street, January 16, at 9:00 A.M. from a brain tumor.

Not long after the death of C. P. Hoffman, Robert Braun, who in the 1920's had coached the band, assumed the duties of leader. Under Dr. Braun the band underwent some changes again. Some older members were reunited with the band and some new members were added. The band strength at that time was built up to about fifty men. Some of the outstanding engagements played at the time were: Gov. Arthur James' Inauguration at

Harrisburg, The First Inauguration of F. D. Roosevelt at Washington, D.C., and the "Goodwill Trips," with parades and concerts at both Atlantic City and New York City. During Dr. Braun's term as leader, the band was able to purchase two new uniforms. The band played many successful engagements such as parades and concerts. One of the best concerts ever played by the band was played under Dr. Braun at Hershey Park, Pa.

Again in 1942, the band began to feel the effects of World War II. Dr. Braun had to recruit a lot of youthful musicians, who along with the older men, would hold the band together until after the war. To help out at this time was Tony Tremittiere who was bandmaster at Minersville High School. Tony was instrumental in recruiting many of the young musicians. At this period he was assistant leader.

Following World War II, the band was probably at its best. It was at this time one of its finest uniforms was purchased . . . Patterned after the U.S. Army Officer's uniform. The band also had at this time some of its finest musicianship.

Dr. Robert Braun died March 7, 1955, after having conducted the band for 20 years. Dr. Braun, incidentally, was the nephew of the former leader, Prof. Frederick Gearhard.

Shortly after the death of Dr. Braun, Mr. Elmer Evans was elected leader with Webster Steidle elected as President, Harry C. Hostetter, Vice-President, Merlyn Jenkins, Secretary and George Smith, Treasurer.

During Mr. Evans term as leader some changes in members occurred to improve the band. It was the intention of the leader and the officers at the time to make every improvement possible. It was their intent to secure the best musicians possible.

In the Fall of 1957, Mr. Evans resigned as conductor and the band was without a leader for about a month. Finally, Mr. John V. Hanf from Shoemakersville (a native of New Brunswick, N.J.) accepted the post of conductor. During Mr. Hanf's term of conducting, a lot of new innovations were added. The band bought a new bass drum, cymbals, and a floor tom-tom. He organized and made special band arrangements for a mixed chorus, and during this time new summer uniforms were purchased. John Hanf resigned as conductor, because of conflicting circumstances and his work, after serving as conductor for thirteen years, effective January 1, 1971.

Mr. Karl Bowers, C.W.O., U.S.N., Retired, was contacted near the end of February 1971, and agreed to take over the band. He began conducting rehearsals March 16, 1971.

Mr. Bowers had a brilliant career as a musician in the Navy. He ended that career with a tour of duty as procurement officer, brass wind instructor, and rehearsal conductor at the Naval School of Music, and finally a tour of duty as Assistant Conductor at the U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

Under Mr. Bowers the band enjoyed almost three years of successful engagements and his display of professional conducting skill did much to inspire the musicianship of the members. During this time the band enjoyed many enthusiastic audiences, and both the band and the conductor enjoyed the applause. Karl, unfortunately suffered a heart attack in the fall of 1971, and was finally forced to tender his resignation shortly before the summer concert season of 1974, much to the reluctance of the members to which he had endeared himself.

For the remainder of the 1974 concert season, Mr. Webster Steidle, cornetist and associate conductor, was called to conduct the band. By the end of 1974 it was necessary to look for a regular conductor, because Mr. Steidle was urgently needed as principal cornetist. He had done a wonderful job all summer, but it was realized that he was desperately needed on first chair cornet.

November, 1974, while preparing for the annual New Year's Concert at the Pottsville Club, it was decided to elevate R. Leland Wesner (associate conductor) to Conductor and Music Director. "Lee" has been a member of the band since 1957 both as baritone player and narrator. He graduated from West Chester State College, and is presently associated with the music department of Pottstown Area School District.

The band had a very successful 1975 summer concert season under "Lee", and the band was overwhelmingly received by applause in two parades in Schuylkill Haven, during their Two-hundredth Anniversary Celebration. The band appeared in the two parades on a float designed to represent an old fashioned park band stand.

The 1976 season saw the appointment of Mr. Nicholas Reading and Mr. Webster Steidle as associate conductors. Mr. Reading is a graduate of Mansfield State Teachers' College, a music major. Mr. Steidle has been a principal cornetist with the band for forty-four years.

As the U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District and as a resident of this area, I am proud of the heritage of Pottsville's 3d Brigade Band. The band is presently planning a 3-year celebration from 1979 through 1981. I am calling on the cooperation of city, State, and National officials to let this heritage be known throughout this great land of ours. The band will be appearing this summer in new uniforms and hopefully over the next 3 years will be bringing nationally known musicians to Pottsville to join in its concerts.

Concert bands are part of America's heritage, ever since Pat Gilmore and John Philip Sousa advanced them to such fine institutions. We can all be happy that this organization has remained intact all these years and has proudly produced the "Sousa sound."

INDEPENDENCE AND LIBERTY FOR LITHUANIA, 1978

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1978

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 60th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Each year, we in the Congress pause to pay tribute to the peoples of Lithuania and the other captive nations. It is a rather small contribution that we make, however, for as we exercise our freedoms of speech and assembly in these Chambers, the oppressed people of the world remain in bondage.

The enslavement of Lithuania began in 1795 when it was annexed by Russia. On February 16, 1918, the date which we are commemorating today, the Republic of Lithuania declared its independence. The opportunity to build a free and just society was to be short lived. In June 1940, the Soviet Army invaded and gained control of Lithuania. Ever since, it has been the victim of severe repression. Families were disbanded and deported to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern

Europe. Lithuanian industry and labor were exploited. Deprivation of basic human rights, including religious persecution, began in 1940 and continues to the present hour.

These courageous people have endured pain and suffering for over three decades. The grip of totalitarian rule, however, continues to threaten their cultural heritage and individual integrity. Although Soviet techniques of subjugation have become more sophisticated, the Lithuanian spirit has never once faltered. The Lithuanian people face imprisonment and ostracism for their defiance, and yet nowhere in the Soviet Union today is dissent so well organized and persistent.

The most recent example of Lithuanian dissent was the report of rioting in the city of Vilnius on the night of October 10, 1977. As thousands of spectators left a stadium following the Lithuanian-Russian match, cars were overturned and pro-Soviet banners torn down. The cry of the demonstrators is one which has been passed down from generation to generation, "independence and liberty for Lithuania."

At a time when America is making an effort to moralize its foreign policy, we would do well to make a firm and uncompromising commitment to our determined brothers. The results of our present stand on human rights will not be measured by the number of speeches delivered, but instead by our ability to advance the cause of freedom in the captive nations.

Sixty years ago the Lithuanian people expressed the same desire embodied within our own Declaration of Independence. How long will they be denied the opportunity which we have been blessed to enjoy for more than two centuries? How long will they remain in bondage? How long will they be forced to endure such unprecedented abuse?

Mr. Speaker, let us reaffirm our support of the Lithuanian people and any people whose desire for freedom is threatened by an imposing power.

LETTING THE SUN SHINE IN

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to bring to the attention of this distinguished House the laudable efforts of a man from my own Third District in Georgia whose work in building energy self-sufficient homes is making great strides. Mr. Billy J. Barnett of Kathleen, Ga., president of Advanced Living and Construction Operating Techniques, which is based in Kathleen, has taken the initiative of making these homes available to the general public. If this country is to ever become totally self-reliant on its own energy sources, it will be through the efforts of individuals such as Mr. Barnett.

I congratulate Mr. Barnett and invite each Member to review this interesting

article, entitled "Let the Sun Shine In," written by Julia Baldwin and published in the Saturday Macon Telegraph and News of November 19, 1977:

LETTING THE SUN SHINE IN

(By Julia Baldwin)

"Do It With The Sun" is the company motto for ALCOT, Inc., an acronym for Advanced Living Construction Operating Techniques. Owned by Bill Barnett and based in Kathleen, Ga., the firm's purpose is to build houses cheaper than can be done with conventional techniques and to then be able to operate those houses cheaper than one could conventionally-built houses.

To accomplish that object, Bill Barnett has incorporated some 65 energy-saving techniques into the design of his solar energy homes, this house has 2,427 square feet of heated and cooled floor space. Barnett has designed homes incorporating the energy efficient measures that are sized from 1,200 to 2,800 square feet.

Another objective of ALCOT, Inc. is to design solar energy homes that do not outwardly appear any different from conventional ones. This two-story gray and white structure is the Old Federal Period design, and only the solar panels on the southern exposure of the roof reveal the modern concepts this house embodies.

The plans for this house and others in the series call for it to be approximately square; thereby, it can be changed around to fit any lot. According to Barnett, the plans incorporate the following design parameters:

(1) Heating and cooling of the house is accomplished totally by a hydronic system—that is, running hot or cold water through pipes in the house. The solar panels create heat to warm the water for winter, while a highly-efficient electric water chiller cools the water for summer.

(2) Waste disposal is handled by the Clivus Multrum Organic Waste Treatment System, a self-contained system no water, depending on the natural decomposition of organic materials. Not only does this reduce a homeowner's water bill by one-half (on the average), but the use of this system enables ALCOT to build its houses on lots that do not have city sewage and are not suitable for septic tanks. Both kitchen garbage and bathroom wastes go into the system.

(3) Air convection through the Clivus Multrum system creates an air exchange throughout a house to keep the air fresh at all times.

(4) The house is constructed on a concrete pad. Specially insulated concrete blocks were then stacked and covered with surface bonding, a mixture of cement and fiberglass. Properly insulated and installed, these construction materials are stronger and provide more waterproofing and soundproofing at a cheaper cost than conventional materials, according to Barnett.

At this point Barnett still uses some electricity, but a greatly reduced amount than that required by a conventional house. His total heating load is 17,000 B.T.U.'s per hour, while a conventional house would require 50,000 to 60,000 B.T.U.'s per hour. He maintains that his house can be cooled with one ton of air conditioning, while it would take four to five tons for the same size house built with standard techniques.

The house in Kathleen has 10 solar panels (ALCOT includes their purchase cost and installation in the cost of their houses). Barnett says he will recover the difference in the cost of a conventional system and his solar system within one year due to the difference in operating costs.

Incorporated in the design of the house are two separate back-up units for providing heating and hot water. One is the fireplace which when lighted heats a grate through which water flows. Two hours of fire will supply enough warm water to heat the

house for 24 hours, in case there is not sufficient sunlight to make the solar panels effective.

The second back-up is the electrical lines run to the house to heat water in a special tank that can supply heat for the house "if I am too lazy to build a fire," said Barnett.

The solar system should be totally sufficient, however, as Barnett has studied the weather patterns for Kathleen.

By July, 1978, Barnett plans to have installed in the house a second type of solar system. He is now building parabolic concentrating collectors which will be installed alongside the standard solar panels on the roof of the house. These special collectors will have lines filled with peanut oil running through them and into a 2,000-gallon underground storage tank. The oil will be heated to temperatures up to 600 degrees F, run through a heat exchanger, and used to operate a solar stove, refrigerator, freezer, air conditioner, and clothes dryer. If the peanut oil proves to be unsatisfactory, Barnett will use Methanol 66 which, though effective, is more expensive.

After all these systems are installed, the remaining power requirements for the house will be about two kilowatts for lighting and operating small appliances. Barnett plans to eventually use the parabolic collectors to generate the power for the remaining requirements and has been testing this procedure for over a year. Barnett states, however, that he will continue to have electricity run to his house to use as a back-up system.

While this particular house features a combination of the surface bonding over concrete blocks and clapboard siding, Barnett can design a house in a variety of styles. The design complies with the requirement by the Housing and Urban Development Authority (HUD) that a house have 10 percent of its living space in windows. Barnett, however, has these windows facing north and south, not east and west, to make heating and cooling more efficient.

The roof of the house is pitched to expose more of it to the north thereby reducing the cooling load by 10 percent. This maneuver also provides the correct angle for the solar panels on the south side of the roof.

The overhang of the roof is mathematically calculated to allow no direct sunlight in the house on the south side after April 15 of each year, but does allow the sunlight to filter in after the first of October to help heat the house.

The foyer of the house can be closed off with doors leading to other areas; this is done to help control heating and cooling losses. The fireplace has a glass screen to prevent a draft from taking the warm air up the chimney.

A greenhouse adjacent to the rear of the house is entered through sliding glass doors in the living area. The Barnetts plan to have decorative plants growing there as well as vegetables grown hydroponically. Water for the vegetable troughs will be provided by waste water from the kitchen sink and dishwasher and the bathroom sinks and tubs. A special Trickle Filter removes lint from the water before it goes to the greenhouse.

The first floor of the house contains a foyer, Barnett's office, a great room, kitchen and bath. The attractive stone fireplace is the focal point of the entire first floor. The design of the interior can be varied to suit the needs of the owner, Barnett pointed out.

A patented system provides the most even heating and cooling available, Barnett stated. Coils are installed throughout the house and are attractively covered to blend with the decor. The size of the coils varies as to the size of the room. The natural flow of air from the floor over the coils and across the ceiling and back down to the floor eliminates cold floors. Residents of the house are

then more likely to keep the thermostat turned down, said Barnett.

The cooling system removes heat from the air by running cold water through the coils. The system automatically provides dehumidification: moisture in the air condenses on the coils, drips into pans and runs down through pipes under the house. Also, the system provides automatic air purification: dirt in the air collects on the water molecules and is washed out of the house.

Barnett pointed out that many of these systems are not new. They have been in operation in other places for a number of years, but they are new to this area.

Another simple but effective energy saver was to design the master bedroom (on the second floor) with closets on the outside walls, which act as additional insulation.

In addition to the master bedroom, this house has two other bedrooms and a bath on the second floor. Again, this floor plan can vary according to the needs of the residents.

The interior walls of the house are the surface bonding material applied over the insulated concrete blocks. The material was given a smooth finish which looks like sheetrock and can be painted, paneled, or wallpapered.

A native of Warner Robins and a graduate of Warner Robins High School, Barnett served in the navy, attended Georgia Tech, worked at Robins Air Force Base, and then moved to Connecticut for about 20 years. His work background is in engineering; he did the engineering work on a gyroscope work space in 1960 and wrote the specifications for the Air Force's "clean rooms."

Barnett's wife, Joan, is from Connecticut. She has had a lot of input into the design and construction of their house. In addition to refinishing old pieces of furniture, Joan enjoys collecting 18th century American art.

The Barnett's house meets the specifications of the Southern Building Code and complies with the FHA Minimum Property Standards. It also complies with the provisions of a national code for solar systems that will be issued within the next few months.

The State Public Health Code does not at present approve the Clivus Multrum system. Barnett received special permission, however, from the State Health Department to install the system in this house. Noting that a number of these systems are in operation in other sections of the U.S.A. and in other countries, Barnett hopes to have requirements changed to allow the Clivus Multrum System in Georgia.

The Solar Division of the Federal Energy Office and HUD are currently soliciting grant requests for a total solar community. Barnett plans to submit a request and plans to build the first total solar community in Houston County. Such a community would be comprised of about 50 houses, a community clubhouse, recreation center, and a central power plant with a basic monthly charge to residents for their utilities.

Barnett will sell his designs to other builders and provide the solar systems and Clivus Multrum systems as well as his expertise in installing them. He is convinced that he can build one of his designs on the owner's lot at \$22 a square foot and realize a profit. Barnett noted that although most people think a solar energy home is more expensive to construct, it can actually be built for less than a conventional one, if properly designed "from the ground up as are the ALCOT houses," he added. While Barnett is financing this house himself, he has a verbal commitment from a financial institution in Houston County that they will finance any others.

A house of his design, incorporating all of the energy-saving techniques, can be operated at a maximum monthly cost of \$35 for water and electricity, Barnett main-

tains. There are approximately 30,000 solar houses in the U.S.A. now and he expects another 30,000 to be built next year. "I am convinced that solar energy is the answer to the energy crisis and shortage," Barnett concluded.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK— FEBRUARY 19-25, 1978

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 200th anniversary of the beginning of formal education in engineering. America's engineers must be commended not only for the contributions they have made in the building of our Nation, but also for the important role they play in our day-to-day living.

I would like to take this opportunity to share an article written by Dr. Lawrence P. Grayson of the National Institute of Education. Dr. Grayson received his engineering training at Fort Belvoir, Va., a military installation in my district.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S ORDER OF JUNE 9, 1778
AND THE ORIGINS OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION
(By Dr. Lawrence P. Grayson)

Prior to the time of America's declared independence, there was little need for a school of engineering in the colonies. The military requirements that existed, such as those during the French and Indian War, were met by engineers educated in England who served in the British army or by colonists who served under them. The engineering needs of a civilian nature, which were reflective primarily of hand-craft technology, were met largely by ingenious or industrious men who were self-educated. With the beginning of war, however, America's requirement for qualified engineers became critical.

Shortly after assuming command of the continental forces on June 15, 1775, George Washington advised Congress that the army labored under numerous disadvantages, including "a Want of Engineers to construct proper Works and direct the Men". He continued "I can hardly express the Disappointment I have experienced on this Subject; the skill of those we have being very imperfect." Washington's concern, which he voiced on numerous occasions over the next few years, was shared by many other colonial leaders, including John Adams and Henry Knox.

The lack of a sufficient number of engineers in the army persisted throughout the Revolutionary War, and almost all of those who served as engineering officers were of foreign birth and education. It was recognized that most of these men would return to their native countries when the war ended. America required engineers, not only for the immediate military needs, but also to meet the future requirements of a civilian population when the nation would be independent and developing. These were the conditions and sentiments of the times when the army established winter quarters at Valley Forge, on December 20, 1777.

Shortly after encamping, Brigadier General Louis Duportail, a French volunteer who was serving as chief of engineers, drew up a plan for the establishment of an engineering corps as a permanent part of the Continental army. His plan dated January 18, 1778, called for the formation of enlisted men into companies of sappers headed by officers, and proposed that the companies might serve as a school of apprenticeship for the men.

On January 28, Washington endorsed Duportail's plan and recommended to Congress that an engineering department be organized. This was done by a Resolution of Congress on May 27, 1778, as part of a general organization plan for the army. The engineering department was established with three companies, each to contain 1 captain, 3 lieutenants and 68 enlisted men, with the requirement that "These companies to be instructed in the fabrication of field works. . . . The commissioned officers to the skilled in the necessary branches of mathematics".

Washington readily complied with the resolution, stating in the General Orders issued at Valley Forge on June 9 that:

"Three Captains and nine Lieutenants are wanted to officer the Companies of Sappers: As this Corps will be a school of Engineering it opens a Prospect to such Gentlemen as enter it and will pursue the necessary studies with diligence, of becoming Engineers and rising to the Important Employments attached to that Profession as the direction of Fortified Places &c. The Qualifications required of the Candidates are that they be Natives and have a knowledge of the Mathematics and drawing, or at least be disposed to apply themselves to those studies. They will give in their Names at Head-Quarters."

The need and sentiment for educating engineers in the United States was clearly present at this time, although almost a quarter of a century would pass before a formal school of engineering would be established. In the winter of 1778, General Knox, while camped at Pluckemin, N.J., established "an academy where lectures are read in tactics and gunnery". For the decade following the end of the war in 1783, numerous people, including Washington, Hamilton, Randolph, Knox, Duportail, Baron von Steuben, L'Enfant, Benjamin Lincoln and Timothy Pickering, both of whom served as Secretary of War, and numerous others, stressed the need for officers trained in engineering and the need to establish a military academy. George Washington, in his Presidential message of October 25, 1791, advocated the establishment of a military academy, which actually commenced at West Point in 1794. The academy, in which much of the instruction was devoted to fortifications, continued until April 1796, when a fire destroyed the barracks. On March 16, 1802, an Act of Congress stationed the Corps of Engineers at West Point to constitute the Military Academy, which has continued to the present day. The engineers and cadets at the Academy were made available for such duty and service as the President of the United States might direct, thus allowing them to perform works of a public as well as a military nature. This availability was in keeping with the sentiment expressed in 1800 by James McHenry, the Secretary of War, that "We must not conclude that service of the engineer is limited to constructing fortifications. This is but a single branch of the profession; their utility extends to almost every department of war; besides embracing whatever respects public buildings, roads, bridges, canals and all such works of a civil nature".

The Military Academy as originally established was loosely organized, operated on meager resources, and had no definite or consistent system of instruction, examination or length of study. It was only as a result of the appointment of Sylvanus Thayer at the time a captain in the Corps of Engineers, as Superintendent in 1817 that the academy developed. Following a trip to France to study its educational system, Thayer arranged the cadets into four annual classes, divided the classes into sections requiring weekly reports, developed a scale of marking, attached weights to the subjects in the curriculum necessary for graduation, instituted a system of discipline and an honor code,

and set a standard of high achievement. These characteristics have remained with the academy until the present time, and formed the pattern for technical education in America.

On April 29, 1812, a Congressional Act set further provisions for the Military Academy, including establishing the position of "professor of the art of engineering in all its branches". One of the most influential persons to occupy the position was Dennis Hart Mahan, who was appointed in 1832. His pioneering efforts in the preparation of textbooks on engineering subjects did much to break this country's dependence on the translation and republication of European works.

Alden Partridge, who was the first person to hold the title of professor of engineering in the United States and served as acting Superintendent at West Point, resigned from the army in 1818 and established the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy at Norwich, Vermont. This institution, which later became Norwich University, was the first civilian school of engineering in the country. In 1824, the Rensselaer School was established and eleven years later granted the degree of civil engineer for the first time in America and Great Britain.

From these initial acts, engineering education in the United States has grown until today there are almost 295,000 graduate and undergraduate students studying engineering on a full-time basis, and an additional 47,000 students studying part-time, at 289 institutions of engineering. In addition, there are some 58,000 full-time students and almost 20,000 students studying part-time at 119 institutions that offer programs in engineering technology.

As a single event, George Washington's call for a school of engineering is but a minor footnote in history. Taken, however, in a larger context as part of a continuing series of events, it is an act by the Commanding General of the Continental Army and future first President of the United States, recognizing the importance of engineering education to meet the needs of an independent and sovereign nation. The celebration of the 200th anniversary of the call, scheduled for June 9, 1978, at Valley Forge, will be formal testimony by the engineering profession to the foresight of George Washington and a reaffirmation of the continuing importance of engineering education to the future of America.

NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to each Member of the House the following analysis written by my good friend John Perry. Mr. Perry shows great insight in his discussion about the great economic and political problems facing our burgeoning and increasingly complex government. He also discusses with great clarity the reasons why our Nation should consider implementing the national dividend plan.

PERSPECTIVE

(By John H. Perry, Jr.)

An Analysis of the Current Opposing Political Philosophies: Why the liberal viewpoint has so successfully outbid the conservative—What the consequences of this movement are likely to be and how it is possible to redirect the enthusiasm of our citi-

zens toward the preservation and improvement of a Free Society.

THE LIBERAL PHENOMENON

Since the Depression of the 30's, more and more Americans have turned to government regulation and government spending to help them with their economic system. Those who have responded to this trend, and who have advocated a greater role for government in dealing with the individual problems people attribute to the economy, have been dubbed "liberals." Much of the successful economic progress the nation has enjoyed since the Depression, and particularly since World War II, has been credited to the liberal philosophy and the role government has played in our economic system.

Programs undertaken in the name of liberalism have had a significant part in restoring and maintaining the confidence of the American people in their economic system. Because of the apparent success of this movement and the confidence it has generated, Americans have generally entrusted their national government to these modern liberals.

Until recent years, little thought has been given to the possibility that national economic progress may not have been due to the active role of government but instead to the inherent strength and productivity of American business. In short, success has come not because of, but in spite of, governmental intervention. Now, for the first time in four decades, the need to seriously reevaluate the role of government in the economic system is clearly apparent. The long period of economic progress and affluence following World War II has created expectations beyond the system's present ability to fulfill. Coupled with this has been a proportionate increase in economic illiteracy and basic public misunderstanding of the American business system. As a result, over-emphasis on non-economic issues and problems and increased governmental intervention have produced serious distortions which now threaten the viability of the entire national economy.

Yet, in spite of their frustrations and complaints with their economic system, Americans continue to look to government for solutions. Today, one-and-a-half times as many people think there is not enough regulation of the economic system as believe there is too much. For these reasons, a great mass of the electorate seem to embrace the philosophy of "liberalism" and elect those who want further intervention of government in the market-place. The liberal response is, therefore, an accurate reflection of the demands those in the political arena believe the American public is making.

THE CONSERVATIVE REACTION

Great civilizations generally have faltered and finally collapsed as they ran out of money. This usually comes when the people finally demand of government too much of what government cannot produce: Wealth. When government responds and seeks to control more and more economic activity to meet those demands, individual initiative and the incentive of the people are smothered. Continued government control and economic stimulation beyond the system's ability to respond invariably produces inflation, unemployment and other serious social and economic problems. These create additional demands for government benefits and control, further compounding deficit-spending patterns.

Eventually, concerned individuals, supported by the evidence of history, warn of impending economic chaos. Yet, these individuals, these conservatives, fail to realize that in the broad base of any democratic society, warnings in the language of economics are not understood by most people. Therefore, they mean nothing to the majority of

the nation. The conservative's recognition of economic realities usually is expressed by reaction—reaction to the liberal recognition of actual demands by the people for action.

Those who see the dangers simply fail to communicate them to the people. They fail to put in personal and relevant terms the alternative to the demand for government to provide solutions. That alternative is clear: it is a private enterprise approach to solving the frustrations and complaints Americans have about economic problems.

While public opinion continues to favor government regulation to relieve economic problems, it does so only because the conservative has offered no viable and appealing alternative beyond reaction. Conservatives are viewed as defensive, and unable to understand the "real" problems, such as the impact of inflation, unemployment, and inequities in the tax system.

Yet, at a time when more individuals consider themselves to be "conservative", and the fewest since the 40's consider themselves "liberal", there is no question that the American people could embrace an approach other than more government involvement to solve the problems they see in their economic system.

THE EFFECTIVE APPROACH: THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND

It is apparent that those who embrace the liberal philosophy are reading accurately the public's present allegiance to government as a problem-solver. It also is apparent that those who have won and continue to hold political office by responding to this allegiance do not realize that, paradoxically, the American public wants no major change or structural modification in our basic economic system, nor any reduction in personal economic freedom and opportunity. Today, more than 40% of our adult population consider themselves as "conservative," and more than half view their economic system in terms of personal freedoms and opportunity. Although Americans look to government for solutions, national surveys clearly reflect that a great majority see government regulation as a temporary application to a specific problem. They do not accept the idea of permanent government intervention and involvement in the economic process—even though almost every case of government intervention in the marketplace becomes permanent.

Americans seem to be saying: "We like our system because it gives us freedom and opportunity. But it's not working right these days . . . The system is basically good. It should be made to work again." Yet, so long as those who recognize the threat of further government control to the economy fail to get their message across to the people, there seems little chance a "private" solution will be forthcoming to the frustration and apprehensions Americans attribute to their economic system.

Knowledge tends to come from personal experience. When this personal experience involves economic self-interest, it is educative. Therefore, if the conservative, the non-liberal, desires to mobilize the essentially conservative instincts of the American public and provide a non-governmental approach to solving individual economic problems created by the system, he must do two things. First, he must be willing to recognize the passive role Americans cast for themselves in relation to the economy, and the fragmentary economic understanding most of them have of the business system. Second, he must be willing to actively involve the public through economic self-interest in that system before he can hope to have the average American turn away from government and towards a free enterprise-oriented economy for solutions to problems people perceive.

The National Dividend Plan has been developed to meet this challenge. Through a

process of national profit-sharing, NDP offers a "private" alternative to government as a provider of solutions. Through rechanneling the present Federal corporate income tax collections directly to the individual, NDP seeks to visibly involve the electorate in the economic process. Through economic self-interest, NDP is educative. Through the utilization of corporate earnings, NDP is non-governmental. Through the utilization of private banking systems, NDP is non-bureaucratic. Being progressive in nature, the National Dividend Plan addresses, in non-government terms, the egalitarian impulses found in a democratic society. In essence, it is a program designed to "sell" the American business system through "participation," by providing, through the private sector, solutions to many of the problems bothering Americans about their economy.

Clearly, the most compelling challenge to the business community today, and to those individuals who consider themselves "conservative", those concerned about the damaging role government now is playing in the economy, (as well as those who consider themselves "liberal", who genuinely are concerned about unmet human needs,) is to improve the average citizen's understanding of how the private enterprise system operates, and also, to make the system work better for more people. Clearly, government is not in a position—and perhaps never will be—to adequately do this job. If business and those individuals concerned about the future of our economic system and our individual freedoms do not respond to the challenge, the United States may end up with a system its people do not want—one that is neither free nor prosperous.

Is NDP a strategy to get the job done? Yes, but perhaps just as important, NDP provides a way for America to restructure financial problems on a "pay-as-we-earn" basis so as to restore confidence in our monetary system. This erosion of faith in our dollar is at the root of many of our social, economic and political problems. As a nation, we seem to have forgotten that to pay for our social progress, we must first earn the dollar.

And only people, business and the private sector can earn that dollar.

NDP AND "STATUTORY RACHETING"

After attending a recent seminar on the National Dividend Plan at the Harvard Business School, Ernest Christian, Jr., Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, suggested adding a provision to the NDP that could halt further deficit spending and effectively check inflation. It would require that any Federal deficit be deducted from the annual National Dividend before it is distributed to the nation's registered voters. Thus, for example, if the National Dividend in a given year totaled \$60 billion and there was a budget deficit of \$50 billion, only \$10 billion could be distributed to the voters. Obviously, pressure for a balanced budget would be so great the Congress would not dare permit a deficit. In tax policy jargon this is known as "statutory ratcheting." Most economists agree that if deficit spending were eliminated we then would be in a better position to keep a check-rein on inflation.

COMMENTS ABOUT THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN

"This gigantic profit-sharing plan would reinforce a sense of tangible participation in the economic system. One person, one vote, one dividend."—Michael Novak, Washington Star, November 3, 1976.

"... The great impact of (NDP) is, first of all, that it causes us to think about where we are, it causes us to take into consideration where we have been and more importantly, it

forces us to try to answer the question 'where are we really going as a nation?'—Bert Lance, Georgia State University, February 24, 1976.

"The National Dividend Plan—a blueprint for the central problems of today..."—Robert F. Hurleigh, Commentator, Mutual Broadcasting System, July 21, 1976.

"... I obviously support the thrust of your efforts—to limit the growth in government and to give our people a clearer identification with the free enterprise system."—William E. Simon, Washington, D.C., August 10, 1976.

"A national dividend program would provide incentives for employees of all corporations to increase their productivity, because if they made their companies more profitable, those companies would pay more taxes and the employees would then have a chance to garner even more for themselves in a larger payment."—John Connally, Dallas Morning News, August 23, 1975.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

At 60, John H. Perry, Jr.'s activities span a wide range: Newspaper publishing and printing technology, oceanographic and energy research, cable television and economic research. The president of several companies and two foundations, he is acknowledged as a leader in the development of commercial submarines and ocean habitats. Mr. Perry's thoughts on economic systems led to the development of the National Dividend Plan, first unveiled in 1964 in his book, *The National Dividend*. Mr. Perry serves as president of the National Dividend Foundation, Inc.

NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN IN BRIEF

The National Dividend Plan sets forth a program of national profit sharing whereby those funds earned by the nation's corporations and paid in Federal corporate income taxes would be designated as a National Dividend. Such a dividend would be administered by the states and distributed through local banking systems to each registered voter on a per capita basis. All dividends would be tax free and the level of corporate income tax would be capped at 50%. To fund the National Dividend from economic growth and to avoid the need for new or increased taxes, the Plan calls for a moratorium on the implementation of any new major Federal spending programs during a five-year phase-in of NDP. The National Dividend is estimated to reach approximately \$750 per registered voter upon full implementation of the Plan.

ABOUT THE FOUNDATION

The National Dividend Foundation, Inc., is a non-profit, educational organization devoted to the study, research and analysis of proposals which would affect the American economic system, federal tax law and the role of government in society. A principal project of the Foundation is the National Dividend Plan, which is designed to revitalize American enterprise by encouraging participation in, understanding of and support for a private, competitive economic system. A function of the Foundation has been to produce detailed analyses of proposals such as the National Dividend Plan and alternatives thereto, and to make these analyses available to the public.

The Foundation is classified as a Section 501(c)(3) organization under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended. It is further classified as a "private operating" Foundation. Individuals, corporations, companies, associations and foundations are eligible to support the work of the Foundation through tax-deductible gifts. Your interest and participation in the work of the National Dividend Foundation, Inc., is invited and your inquiry for further information is welcome.

A CASE FOR THE NEUTRON BOMB

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the loudest noises against the neutron bomb are coming from the direction of Moscow. However, as is usual in such cases, some well-meaning Americans and some not so well-meaning Americans have joined the campaign against the neutron bomb. Recently, a Mr. George G. Harman of Laytonsville, Md., wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Star in favor of the neutron bomb, that was published on Sunday, February 5, 1978. He argued the case very effectively and, therefore, I would like to call his letter to the attention of my colleagues. The letter follows:

The Soviet Union has recently launched an unprecedented propaganda campaign to prevent the United States from producing the so-called neutron bomb and deploying it in Europe. Brezhnev and Gromyko have both called this weapon barbarous and inhuman and threatened to develop one of their own if we deploy it. This must be interpreted as an admission of their intent to conquer Europe in the near future, otherwise it would not be a threat to them.

No one in his right mind, and certainly not the Russians, could possibly think that NATO is going to use that bomb to invade Eastern Europe. NATO is too weak and disorganized. The East bloc has a 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 superiority in manpower, tanks and all other war-making capability. Also, the Soviets well know our purely defensive intentions, since they have long penetrated NATO security (e.g., the recent West German spy cases). Therefore, the only conclusion one can reach is that the Soviets are afraid that the neutron bomb will stop or alter an already planned aggression.

The neutron bomb is frightening only to troops, since civilians either flee battle areas or go underground for protection. In such positions, they would be largely shielded from the radiation, and later, after the battle, could return to their undamaged homes. No radioactive fallout would plague them.

This weapon is certainly no more inhumane than conventional cannon or bombs (e.g., the fire bombing of Dresden in World War I) and infinitely more humane than fission or fusion bombs that completely destroy vast areas and then sterilize them and surrounding areas with radioactive fallout. The neutron bomb is less barbarous than poison gas, already deployed by the Russians, since gas will kill innocent civilians in basements, subways or wherever they may be hiding.

The entire purpose of the neutron bomb is to blunt a massive, overwhelming surprise attack on NATO forces without significantly destroying cities and their civilian populations. If the Russians are really morally indignant over this weapon, then we have a unique opportunity to test their true intentions. We can use it to bargain for the security of Europe. If the USSR will agree to reduce its forces to approximately the level of NATO forces (a purely defensive posture) and remove its poison gas weaponry, then we will not deploy the neutron bomb.

If they refuse this honest peace gesture, then let us produce and deploy it with all haste, for they obviously plan to use the huge army they have built at such great cost. Do not let Brezhnev finesse us out of it!

GEORGE C. HARMAN,
Laytonsville, Md.

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Americans are becoming more and more concerned with the increasing tax burden.

The Carter administration has added to this concern and to the increasing tax burden on the American people. The taxes proposed in the energy bill will add a burden to everyone who drives a car or heats a home. The tremendous boost in social security taxes will take more money out of the pockets of the taxpayers and will add to the tax burden of everyone, directly and indirectly. Finally, the increased Government spending will fuel the fires of inflation and further reduce the amount of money the taxpayer has to spend.

Bob Ferguson of the staff of the House Republican Study Committee, has put together a very informative fact sheet entitled, "The Tax Burden." He does a thorough analysis—supplemented by charts—revealing how the social security tax increases, the proposed energy taxes, and inflation will oppress the hard-working taxpayer. He points out a frightening result:

Under the Democratic game plan of trying to balance the budget by increasing personal taxes instead of decreasing expenditures, the American taxpayers will suffer a severe reduction in their standard of living. Something must be done to head off this eventuality and its negative consequences.

Mr. Ferguson points out that the President's proposed tax cut is actually less than the total burden which would be added by the energy and social security taxes and "it leaves untouched the massive increases due to inflation's effect on the progressive structure of the income tax system." He demonstrates that in order to reduce the 1979 tax burden to the 1978 level, a tax reduction of \$31 billion would be needed, rather than the \$17 billion reduction of personal income taxes proposed by President Carter. An effort to reduce the 1979 tax level to the 1977 level would take a \$53 billion tax cut.

We need to relieve our citizens from oppressive taxes, not add more taxes. We need a major reform of our tax system to ease the tax burden. Unfortunately, the Carter administration is blind to such an economic policy.

Mr. Ferguson has put together an effective document. This very useful fact sheet can be obtained from the Republican study committee.

I would also like to commend to my colleagues a study of the problem of inflation and the growing tax burden on Americans. The study, by Dr. Donald J. Senese, is entitled "Indexing the Inflationary Impact of Taxes: The Necessary Economic Reform" and has been recently published by the Heritage Foundation. Dr. Senese points out that despite pay increases, the taxpayer can never get ahead of inflationary pressure and loses ground financially as an unindexed tax system pushes him into a higher tax

bracket with no increase in real income. He suggests indexation of the tax rates which would protect the American taxpayer from inflation-induced tax increases.

The idea of indexation is receiving more attention. I am entering into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an informative piece by Robert J. Samuelson entitled "Indexation: An Idea Whose Time Has Come." This article, which appeared in the National Journal and was then reprinted in the Washington Post (January 31, 1978), presents a concise discussion of this important idea.

The article follows:

INDEXATION: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME
(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Tax indexation is an idea whose times has come—and this year is going to prove it.

Though indexation sounds complicated, it actually is simple. It means that the government automatically corrects the income tax system to prevent inflation from kicking taxpayers into higher and higher brackets. Assume, for example, that inflation raises a family's income 10 percent. It goes into a higher tax bracket, and its tax rate increases even though its "real" income hasn't. Without indexation, Congress must pass a major tax "cut" every few years to prevent this invisible tax increase.

That's precisely what has been happening. Assuming a tax package passes in 1978, Congress will have approved major tax reduction bills in three of the past four years. So long as inflation persists at a 5 percent to 6 percent annual rate, the cycle will continue.

The defects of this system are now becoming increasingly clear.

Most important, it's fundamentally dishonest. It confuses the average citizen and, indeed, possibly the average congressman. It puts the nation's highest officials, starting with the president, in the foolish and ultimately self-defeating position of pushing half-truths on the public. They promise tax reductions, but in the main, all they are doing is repealing automatic tax increases.

Average taxes, as a percentage of personal income, are declining largely against what they would have been, not what they were. Even if President Carter's program passes as proposed the average tax level is estimated to be higher in 1979 than in seven out of the past 10 years, as the following table indicates. It shows federal income taxes as a percentage of personal income since 1969:

	Percent
1969	11.6
1970	10.5
1971	9.9
1972	9.9
1973	10.3
1974	10.7
1975	9.9
1976	10.2
1977	10.1
1978	(est.) 10.3
1979	(est.) 10.5

Bombarded from Washington with propaganda about the beneficence of tax cuts and confronted with a largely static bill, the average taxpayer sooner or later is bound to react in anger and disillusionment.

A second flaw of the current system is that it hampers economic policy and increases the likelihood of an economic downturn or recession. In the days when inflation crept along at an annual rate of 1 percent to 3 percent, the dynamics of the income tax system were thought to represent a helpful "automatic stabilizer." If inflation increased, incomes would rise and, consequently, so would the tax bite. That would reduce consumer spending, the economy would slow, and inflationary pressures would abate. This was a comforting notion.

Unfortunately, it does not sit well with reality. As the past few years have demonstrated vividly, inflation has an independent momentum. Through powerful unions, oligopolistic companies, government fiat and social custom—the idea that everybody should stay "even"—inflation gets perpetuated, checked only feebly by weak constraints.

In this climate, the "automatic stabilizer" simply puts the economy on its backside—or threatens to do so—with a mild impact on inflation. There is then a rush to pass a tax cut to revive the economy.

The outlook for 1978 illustrates the risks. Many economists worry that the economy may slow down in the second half of the year, in part because the rising tax bite will curb consumer spending. But the administration doesn't think it can possibly get its tax cut passed before Oct. 1. So Carter's economists are forced to bite their nails and hope that the timing turns out right.

A final defect of the existing anarchic approach is that it constitutes a cruel and unusual punishment of congressmen. This, of course, contradicts the conventional wisdom that politicians like nothing better than approving tax cuts and then basking in the ensuing public approval. Many congressmen may have once embraced this simple logic, but, by now, a more complicated reality is forcefully asserting itself.

That reality is that Congress stirs up as much grief as gratitude when it acts on a major tax bill. Every interest group that feels entitled to some new tax break, or simply wants to protect an existing benefit, makes a pilgrimage to Capitol Hill. Any congressman is bound to disappoint some of these petitioners. And the more big tax bills there are, the greater the opportunity for offense.

Moreover, on the other side of the political ledger, public gratitude for tax reductions is increasingly tempered by the realization that they largely represent a holding action against inflation. The political arithmetic of this process is not especially favorable. The more the cycle of phantom tax cuts occurs, the worse the arithmetic will become. Ultimately, Congress is bound to search for an exit.

Indexation would minimize its problems. Although adjusting corporate and business taxes for inflation is difficult, the necessary alterations for the personal tax present no insuperable technical problems. Tax rates, deductions, exemptions and credits can automatically be changed to reflect inflation.

Indexation wouldn't—and shouldn't—empt Congress from the necessity of changing the tax laws. There are fundamental political and social problems that will not conveniently vanish. As Social Security taxes rise (reflecting the program's higher costs), should Congress let the total federal tax bite increase, or should it cut some existing spending? Should the tax system be used more aggressively to promote income redistribution or, on the other hand, investment?

Regardless of what it does, Congress will have a difficult time permanently evading these issues. But, already overburdened by complicated problems that it only dimly understands, it does not need to create added uncertainties by having to fiddle with tax rates every 18 months.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks I was involved in a legal

case in Atlanta, Ga., which prevented me from being present for various votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll No. 42, no; roll No. 43, no; roll No. 44, no; roll No. 46, no; roll No. 47, yes; roll No. 48, yes; roll No. 49, no; roll No. 50, no; roll No. 52, yes; roll No. 53, no; roll No. 54, no; roll No. 56, yes; roll No. 60, yes; roll No. 62, no; roll No. 63, no; roll No. 65, no; roll No. 66, no; roll No. 67, yes; roll no. 68, no.

LOSS OF CIVILIAN JOBS AT FORT INDIANTOWN GAP, PA.

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, since April 1, 1976, the Army has been considering a possible transfer of functions from Fort Indiantown Gap, Pa. A transfer in functions would mean the loss of 819 civilian jobs from the Annville, Pa., area.

We in the Northeast have been most concerned about the number of military base closings in the area and their impact on the economy. The President has stated that additional military cutbacks would not be made in the Northeast except in cases where there is overwhelming evidence that the cutback is necessary.

Today, I am entering into the RECORD a letter, which I have obtained from the commander of the U.S. First Army to the commander of the U.S. Army Forces Command. The letter notes Fort Indiantown Gap's outstanding support of the First Army mission and makes it clear that the First Army prefers to retain the status quo at Fort Indiantown Gap. In fact, the First Army makes it clear that a transfer of Army functions from Fort Indiantown Gap probably will result in an efficiency lag which would take 3 or 4 years for the Army to overcome.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Secretary of the Army will do what is best for us all: Maintain Fort Indiantown Gap in its present status.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Fort George G. Meade, Md.,
February 2, 1978.

DEAR FRITZ: During the past six months Fort Indiantown Gap (FIG) has continued to support the Reserve Components (RC) in an outstanding manner. From a First Army point of view, a realignment of the installation would disrupt or degrade the support of the RC. Accordingly, we'd like to go on record as supporting the status quo at FIG.

As we understand the situation, the current realignment action—which has been fermenting for over a year—has two basic alternatives:

Alternative 1: U.S. Army occupancy at FIG would terminate. The U.S. Army Garrison would be disestablished, less the Training Aids. The Medical Clinic and Communications Detachment would be disestablished. The Readiness Group, BOD, and TASO would become tenants of the Pennsylvania Army National Guard (PAARNG).

Alternative 2: FIG would be retained in Semi-Active Status as a sub-installation of

Fort George G. Meade. The Garrison would be reduced to minimum essential to support Active Component (AC) and RC units. The Medical Clinic and Communications Detachment would be disestablished. The Readiness Group, BOD, and TASO would remain.

The First Army Staff believes that the magnitude of the personnel and dollar savings portrayed in either Alternative 1 or 2 in the current PORSOOM analysis are overstated—and would very much like to participate in a revised analysis. For example, as outlined to me, the PORSOOM analysis estimates net reductions of civilian employees of 310 and 180 for Alternatives 1 and 2, respectively. The First Army estimate for either Alternative is an initial net reduction of approximately 150-125, with a probable lesser net reduction after one year occasioned by the need to restore civilians if further deterioration of RC services and support is to be stopped. The PORSOOM Analysis also includes outdated cost avoidance data on USAR School OGSC course heretofore conducted annually at FIG, but now scheduled for relocation.

Another point: Our surveys show that 85% to 89% of the DAC's now at FIG whose skills would be needed at Fort Meade under either PORSOOM alternative would not relocate. That situation would be somewhat compounded by the 100 space FY 78 civilian cut Fort Meade has taken. Thus, a hire and operating efficiency lag which might take 3 to 4 years to overcome would likely occur—a lag which might, in the end, result in increased overall costs.

The overall efficiency of the FIG DA civilian force is quite good in our judgment. Turnover is low, job satisfaction high. Support given to the Reserve Components receives much praise. In the past few days, I've had letters from such diverse sources as the 99th AROOM and the Adjutant General of Massachusetts asking that no changes be made in view of the excellent support.

Despite all the above, we recognize the realities of directed reductions. In this regard, our estimates are that the Alternative 2 would save as many civilians and dollars as would the more drastic Alternative 1—and would be less disruptive.

There are other points that could be made and considered—however, the best procedure would seem to be a reevaluation.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY G. SMITH,
Lieutenant General, USA.

COCA-COLA AND A RECORD OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, in any disaster there are always individuals and groups that never receive recognition for their efforts to help disaster victims. I would like to mention one of the unsung heroes of the 1977 Johnstown flood—Coca-Cola.

Coca-Cola sent 250,000 gallons of drinking water into the flood disaster area. Water began arriving just 3 days after the flood and continued from July until October.

Seven communities received some of the 58 truckloads of water under extreme circumstances. People told me about truck drivers returning from some flooded areas soaked and completely covered with mud.

On this emergency project, Coca-Cola spent \$86,000. That does not include volunteer hours donated by truck drivers from the Baltimore area and the extensive hours donated by the employees of the Ebensburg plant. The company used containers given by the International Paper Co. for the emergency. Also, the Coca-Cola Co. donated about \$7,000 worth of soft drinks to the disaster distribution centers.

On behalf of the entire community, I want to express our heartfelt appreciation for the volunteer help, the efforts of the Coca-Cola Co., and all the men and women who helped with this part of the flood relief project.

PRAISE FOR 200-MILE LAW

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are constantly reminded of the poor, inadequate, and unnecessary legislation that is produced by this body.

Therefore it is particularly rewarding when one of our products not only accomplishes the task for which it was intended, but is generally recognized as a good bill as well.

Let newcomers be misled into believing that effective legislation can be hastily drafted, I would remind my colleagues that the 200-mile-limit bill was 10 years in the making, and required considerable investigation before agreement was reached. The final version of the bill considered the special problems of American fishermen, the most effective procedures to guarantee the continuity of our dwindling fish and marine resources, and the Coast Guard's ability to properly enforce the new concept.

I think my colleagues will enjoy reading the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner.

[From the San Francisco Examiner,
Feb. 19, 1978]

200-MILE LAW PRODUCING RESULTS

San Franciscans and other Northern Californians reacted angrily when Russian fishing fleets invaded Pacific coastal waters and scooped up fish by the ton. Adding insult to injury, the intruders—visible from San Mateo County cliffs—even brought along a factory ship for instant processing of their catch.

But the Soviets and other foreign fishing vessels haven't been around for a long time. Unless they have proper U.S. credentials, they had better continue to make themselves scarce, because the Coast Guard is enforcing a new law with considerable success.

Congress showed good sense when it approved a 200-mile limit, giving American fishermen 2.5 million square miles of water they can call their own. The law went into effect last March 1.

After a year the statute is showing better results than expected. Foreign fishing off the nation's coasts has been reduced by an estimated 30 percent. Stocks of fish in some areas have improved noticeably.

The National Marine Fisheries Service administers the law. Foreigners can fish within the zone only for species declared surplus if

they obtain a license from the NMFS, which sets a limit on the catch.

The law is tough to enforce because of the vast area involved, roughly equal to two-thirds of the country, but the Coast Guard has been doing a remarkable job, boarding more than 1,000 vessels during the first seven months. At least 300 skippers were cited for violations. Poachers were fined a total of \$500,000.

Fish is a precious resource with high nutritional value, important in the American diet. Foreigners were depleting the stocks in our traditional fishing grounds. Thousands of jobs were jeopardized. These trends are now slowly being turned around. For this, Congress rates an A.

NEW MEXICO VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. HAROLD RUNNELS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year more than 250,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

In New Mexico, this year's winner is Virginia Mary Hatcher, age 17, of Farmington, N.M. Miss Hatcher is quite an accomplished young lady at age 17 having been chosen Valedictorian out of a class of 515 students. Some of her other accomplishments include being chosen as Student Body President, Speech and Debate Club President, Speaker of the Year, Presidential Classroom delegate, and Girl's State delegate.

I would like to share with my colleagues Miss Hatcher's winning entry in the VFW Voice of Democracy competition. She expresses quite eloquently the theme of this year's contest, "My Responsibility to America."

Her speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICA

(By Virginia Mary Hatcher)

The clay is shapeless and meaningless. But when the artist shapes that clay into something beautiful—there is magic. The clay is responsive to his touch and as he makes it beautiful he can also make it into a horrid creation. He owes his best to that clay.

The clay—the United States. The artist—myself.

I do have a responsibility to America, but what is that responsibility? A wolf has a responsibility to her cubs. A young girl has a responsibility to her doll. A dreamer has a responsibility to his dreams. Somehow, my responsibility to America includes all of these.

The mother wolf nurses her cubs into life. Her time is devoted to finding the food they need. She uses her body to warm the young wild babes, and if needed, she would sacrifice her life to protect them.

This was the responsibility of our forefathers. The leaders of the revolution dedicated their time to finding the nourishment for the infant nation. They gave their best to form a workable system of government

With enthusiasm, they inspired people like me to perform the greatest task. People, like me, sacrificed their life to protect the new nation.

Though she is now an older and stronger child, America is still dependent on us to make the right decisions concerning her welfare. I can do that only by informing myself of issues, and then by exercising my most important right as an American citizen. I must be involved.

The young girl clings to her doll with a devotion unparalleled. The love she feels for the doll is hardly expressed in words. Rather, it is shown through her extreme loyalty and faithfulness to the toy that becomes an irreplaceable part of her life. She worries until she knows that the doll will be comfortable and she feels genuine pain when the doll is torn.

During the Civil War, the loyalty to America was deeply rooted in each citizen. Each person had his own set of beliefs and was so devoted to them that he would die to uphold his side. Even at this time, America was so young that she was like a doll and depended upon her people to make her government a comfortable one. And though they fought bitterly, there is no doubt that the citizens felt great pain where the union was torn.

As simple as love is, it is still the hardest feeling to express. To the country which has watched but not interfered with our development, we must give our respect and faith.

The faith that if something is wrong, it can be changed. The respect that we will abide by her laws though we might disagree with them. My constant attention should be given to the country, for a doll that is forgotten will soon be meaningless.

A dreamer has a delicious imagination and a powerful belief that he can and will achieve his high set goals. With confidence he takes the necessary steps to climb his ladder of fulfillment. He reaches for that seemingly unreachable star and sometimes touches it.

Such dreamers have been the backbone of our existence. Any advancement made in education, technology or belief has come through one "crazy fool" who took his idea so seriously that he made it happen.

Scientists are not the only dreamers. Everyone at one time or another sets a goal for himself. It is my duty, to the still growing nation, to believe in myself, and to try to make myself the best I know how to be. A family is strong only when its members are strong. If we, the pillars of the nation, are sturdy, she will stand. Our ideals must be high and our morals untouchable.

A dream that is ignored will disappear and benefit no one.

My responsibility to America is a difficult one. Your responsibility is a difficult one. Together we must think of the nation as a child that is powerless without us. We will make the decisions to govern her.

We must love and be tender with the nation. We can correct problems, if they arise, and remember that the problems are a result of our own doings.

Finally, we must be a good example. As stated by Jo Petty, "Children need models more than they need critics." If the pillars deteriorate, the building will crumble. We must keep in mind that a beautiful future lies ahead, for America, and reach for it.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS ASKED FOR DROUGHT RELIEF ACT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I supported H.R. 10532 when it was passed

by the House on January 30. As one of the participants in the original enactment of the Drought Relief Act, I can assure my colleagues that it adequately met the need for which it was created. Due to circumstances beyond the control of project applicants, however, the deadline date provided in the amended act simply does not allow for enough time to complete approved projects on which construction is well underway. H.R. 10532 will fill this administrative void.

One matter to which H.R. 10532 does not provide a solution, however, is for some Indian projects which received some funding, and on which construction was initiated, but did not receive full funding because the date for fund obligation came and went. These are not new projects—in many cases they are more than half complete—but due to a narrow interpretation of the term "obligation" held by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, these projects will not be completed with funds from the Drought Relief Act because more funds cannot be obligated.

I did not bring this matter to the attention of the committee, because I understood the necessity of passing general extension legislation in an expeditious manner. I do not believe, however, that the Indian projects to which I refer can be overlooked. Because it was administrative error on the part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs that caused this halt in construction of these projects, I would hope that the Department of the Interior will recognize its obligation and immediately explore avenues of internal reprogramming or the possibility of a supplemental budget request for funding to complete these projects in a timely manner.

THE BRIDGE CRISIS

HON. DOUGLAS WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I received the following letter from one of my constituents, John F. Graham. Mr. Graham depicts the magnitude of the bridge crisis in Allegheny County, Pa., and strongly supports funding the special bridge program at \$2 billion. This is the figure which is contained in Representative HOWARD's bill, which I have cosponsored and is currently before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of Public Works.

I was especially struck by Mr. Graham's point that, in real dollars, we have not made much progress in our expenditures for bridge repairs in the past 50 years. Put simply, the administration's proposed bridge repair funding of \$450 million is not only inadequate but also behind the times:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALGREN: For approximately ten years now Congress has been debating the bridge problem ever since the collapse of the Silver Bridge between West Virginia and Ohio. It appears that 1978 may

be the year that Congress will do something about solving a vital link in our defense system, viz., the bridges.

Allegheny County, between 1927 and 1931, spent approximately \$75 million for bridge construction. This was in good part funded by the Federal Government. At today's prices, this represents over \$600 million. Last year, Secretary Adams said that the FHWA has allotted up to \$180 million per year for bridge replacement for the entire country. This is approximately what Allegheny County spent per year for four consecutive years in 1927-31.

This should alert Congress that the \$2 billion which Congressman Howard has proposed to allot is not unrealistic for 50 states.

You will also note that the bridges which the Federal Government funded in the late 20's are now over 50 years old and need major rehabilitation or replacement.

It is also a fact that construction costs have increased tremendously over the years and that even the 10% local share is a burden that some governments like Pennsylvania cannot assume at this time.

I strongly recommend that you support legislation, whether it is yours or others which will adequately fund the bridge problem and create a bridge trust fund which will continue to fund bridge rehabilitation for years to come.

I further recommend that all FHWA projects can be changed to 90/10 ratio.

I also recommend that the highway trust fund be left undisturbed and used to not only finish our Federal Highway System but to properly maintain and update it.

I recommend that the Federal Government strongly consider using the County Governments to administer FHWA funds for off-system roads and bridges so that this other important vital link in our nation's defense system can be maintained but at a lower standard and cost than our federal highway system.

Lastly, I recommend that the existing highway trust fund and any future ones be legislated so that the fund is stable and cannot be manipulated at the whim of the President. This will create a better and more stable design and construction climate.

JOHN GRAHAM.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF PRODUCING GASOHOL

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have contacted me regarding the production and use of gasohol. The University of Idaho has recently completed a study which deals with the technology involved in the production of energy from agricultural and forest resources. They have also pointed out questions which deal with the economic feasibility of producing gasohol.

I believe Stephen Smith, M. L. Jackson, and Leonard Johnson at the University of Idaho have done an excellent job in addressing the issues involved with gasohol and I would like to share that study with you.

THE FEASIBILITY OF GASOHOL: AN EXAMINATION OF THE ISSUES

(Summary report of the University of Idaho committee to study and recommend action relative to the 1977 Farm Bill by Stephen M. Smith, M. L. Jackson, and Leonard Johnson)

SUMMARY

The recent interest in producing alcohol from renewable agricultural and forest resources for use as a gasoline additive has raised many questions about the feasibility of the proposal. Many proponents of gasohol give the impression that it is a panacea for many of our agricultural problems, energy problems, and balance of payments problems. However, a closer look reveals a complicated series of interrelated issues and questions, many of which place gasohol in a less favorable light. The questions concern the technical feasibility of producing alcohol from available commodities, and of mixing it with gasoline; the availability of commodities for conversion to alcohol; and the economic feasibility of the entire alcohol/gasohol process.

The production and use of alcohol as a gasoline additive appears to present few technological problems. Fermentation processing of agricultural commodities is technically feasible and has been accomplished for years from a variety of starch and sugar sources. Woody products and residues are less amenable to processing because of the requirements that the cellulose first be reduced to glucose (sugars) by hydrolysis. The alcohol produced from such sources can be employed as a satisfactory automotive fuel. This was demonstrated many years ago [Lincoln] and has been confirmed recently by tests in the United States and by a national program in Brazil.

The major problem with using alcohol as a fuel is that it is not economically feasible now, nor will it be in the foreseeable future, unless supported by substantial state and/or federal government subsidies. Proponents of gasohol dispute this conclusion [Scheller and Mohr, 1976a, 1976b, 1977]. However, their calculations show that revenues exceed costs very marginally, and that this occurs only under very restrictive and tenuous assumptions. In addition, the calculations consider only production costs, and fail to include other major costs, such as obtaining and delivering the raw commodities, distributing the alcohol, and mixing it with gasoline. Other key issues which have not been fully examined, and which have considerable bearing on the feasibility of gasohol, are the mechanisms by which a supply of raw commodities will be guaranteed and the alcohol distributed and mixed, the net energy balance in the production of alcohol, the impact on our balance of payments, the impact on countries which depend upon our food exports, and the impacts on government revenues from different subsidization schemes.

The purpose of this paper is to briefly present the various aspects of the gasohol proposal. The first two sections consider the technological means for producing alcohol from agricultural and forest commodities, and the potential raw material sources which can be used. The third section examines the economic feasibility of alcohol/gasohol production. In the concluding section an agenda of unanswered questions, or research needs, is presented.

TECHNOLOGY

The choice of technology to produce energy from agricultural and forest commodities is from among three general types of alterna-

tives: combustion to produce steam and electricity, pyrolysis to produce liquid and gaseous fuels, and fermentation processes to produce ethyl alcohol or methane gas. Of these, combustion is the most simple and direct, and produces a product which is readily marketable. Combustion of these commodities does not produce sulfur in the stack gases, and as such has been employed in combination with coal burning to reduce the amount of sulfur dioxide produced. Pyrolysis processes depend upon the use to which the products are put, and are most feasible when the oils or gases are used for energy where subsequent clean-up is not necessary. The tars from pyrolysis appear as a fine mist which is difficult to remove from gases and which might inhibit their use as pipeline gas. The gaseous products from pyrolysis also could be converted to methanol.

The production of alcohol from woody materials (methanol) such as trees and forest residues, agricultural stalks, and straw, is not now economically feasible because of the extra processing required to convert cellulose to simple sugars and to separate the lignin associated with the cellulose. As yet, no completely satisfactory method of acid hydrolysis has been developed to facilitate conversion to ethanol. A process of hydrolysis that would avoid the use of strong acids appears to be a good area for research. Current research on the evolution of enzymes for hydrolysis of wood has some promise but commercial use appears to be in the distant future.

Fermentation of agricultural commodities to produce ethyl alcohol (ethanol) is perhaps the most feasible process. It has been accomplished for years from a variety of starch and sugar sources, and is responsible for approximately 85 percent of the industrial ethanol produced outside the United States [Scheller and Mohr, 1976a].

The use of ethanol as a satisfactory component in automotive fuel is not new, dating back to at least the early 1900's in the U.S., with subsequent and often continual use in many countries [Scheller, 1977; Lincoln, Hieronymous]. Ethanol and gasoline can be mixed in all proportions. Twenty percent of less liquid volume of ethanol in unleaded gasoline is recommended because engine modifications are not needed at these proportions. Ethanol also serves as an anti-knock compound because of its high octane rating, and thus reduces pollution by not requiring lead. Other purported advantages include the following: when ethanol is mixed at less than 16 percent, the gasohol mixture expands in volume and slightly offsets the lower amount of energy per gallon produced by ethanol than gasoline; better winter performance and starting; lack of vapor lock problems; and better mileage at less than 68°F [Scheller, 1977].

Thus, it can be concluded that it is feasible to produce alcohol from a variety of agricultural and forest commodities with existing technology, and that the product is a satisfactory fuel for internal combustion engines. There are few needed research areas with respect to either production or use. Two possible exceptions, concerning the raw commodities to be used, are noted in the next section.

POTENTIAL RAW MATERIAL SOURCES

Idaho and the Northwest Region have a variety of raw materials which are suitable as feed stock materials for fermentation to provide alcohol. They are: potatoes, sugar beets, wheat and other grains, wood and wood residues, and agricultural residues. The tech-

nology exists to utilize most of these materials. One exception is the use of whole potatoes (especially "pee wees") and the whole sugar beet, as opposed to processed wastes and the already extracted starch and sugar content. Another is the use of several commodities either simultaneously or in succession, depending on the availability and price of commodities at a given time.

The technological utilization of these commodities is not a major problem, however. The key problem areas concerning raw materials are (1) a steady, guaranteed source over the long run; and (2) mechanisms (mainly marketing and transportation) to obtain the commodities and get them to the processing plant.

Wood fiber is available from underutilized wood and bark at wood and paper processing plants, from residue left in the forests, at landings after logging operations, and from dead and diseased trees. However, unused wood and bark residues at processing plants have been decreasing greatly, as they are being used for a variety of products, including direct burning for fuel. The future availability of wood residues for use as fuel in any form is uncertain as demand increases (and thus, the price) for these residues in the production of various wood products.

Considerable supplies of forest residues are also available, but they will be a more costly form of energy than mill residues because of the costs and physical problems involved in collecting and delivering them to a processing point. Another unanswered question is the ecological effect of removing this residue from the forest. Residues left after logging or natural destruction will return nutrients to the soil. Removal of these residues could affect future productivity of the forests.

Agricultural commodities for use in ethanol production can be obtained from surplus stores, residues of commercial processing, residues left in the field after harvest, spoiled commodities, and production specifically intended for conversion to energy. While each initially appears to be a readily available, and often cheap source of raw material, closer examination reveals costs which may be prohibitive, or other problems which must be overcome before a full-scale gasohol program is begun.

The current wheat surplus is a major impetus to gasohol production. However, recent history provides ample evidence of how the vagaries of weather and the world grain market can cause surpluses to disappear "overnight." An alcohol processing plant must be assured of stable supplies over many years (at least the economic life of the plant) in order to operate efficiently and economically. Reliance on surpluses with large annual variations will not provide this supply. Similarly, spoiled or "distressed" products are by no means a stable source of raw material. Not only are they greatly weather-dependent, but the existence of such commodities is most often regionally isolated.

Fermentation feed stocks obtained from residues of commercial processors may provide a stable, long term supply. Before relying on this source, however, consideration must be given to the mechanisms and costs of collecting the residues, and to whether or not sufficient quantities are available regionally. Furthermore, most of these residues are currently utilized, presumably in economically profitable uses. Can they be used more profitably to produce alcohol? Or will the increased demand for the residues

drive the price beyond the point where alcohol production is feasible, if it is presently?

The use of field residues requires consideration of methods and costs of collection, as well as the impacts on soil fertility and soil structure if the residues are no longer returned to the soil.

Perhaps the best method of assuring a supply of raw commodities is to contract with growers. There is considerable precedence for this approach in vegetable processing and barley for brewing beer, where one or a small number of buyers constitute the market. However, doing this for wheat, corn and other grains will present added problems. One is establishing and maintaining a contract price in a market that is both world-wide and volatile. In times of world grain shortages, it may be in the farmer's best economic interests to breach such contracts. Another problem is the development of contracts to assure long term supply, rather than annual contracts.

Given the problem of considerable variation in the availability of commodities, a plant which relied on one commodity would be a very risky venture. Thus, a process and plant which could utilize several commodities would be much preferable to a process and plant which did not. It could take advantage of changing production and marketing conditions in order to ensure itself a continued supply of commodities at the lowest price. Idaho and the Northwest appear uniquely qualified in this respect, since large quantities of a variety of raw materials for making ethanol are present, particularly wheat, potatoes, and sugar beets.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF GASOHOL

The key to the feasibility of gasohol production is whether or not the benefits exceed the costs, that is, whether or not ethanol production from agricultural commodities is economically profitable. Nevertheless, it is in the area of economics where the least amount of study has been done. Proponents of gasohol maintain that production will be profitable (Scheller and Mohr, 1976a). However, these results appear to hold true only under very restrictive and somewhat tenuous assumptions. In addition, there are several other aspects of gasohol production which have not been fully considered, but which will have great bearing on its economic feasibility. These issues are discussed in the remainder of this section.

Currently, the production of ethanol and gasohol is not profitable, even at the existing low prices of agricultural products. The figures in Table 1 indicate that, with the exception of sugar beets, the cost of a gallon of ethanol greatly exceeds that of a retail gallon of gasoline when only the cost of the raw agricultural commodity is considered. To these costs must be added approximately \$.41 per gallon in conversion costs (Scheller and Mohr, 1976a, p. 8) plus profit, interest on debt, taxes, transportation of the ethanol, and mixing of the ethanol with gasoline. Thus, without a sizeable subsidy, gasohol cannot compete with gasoline.

It is reasonable to expect, however, that if and when gasoline prices rise (perhaps to the \$1.50-\$2.00 per gallon levels existing in Europe and South America), gasohol could become economically feasible. This possibility leads to one of the more important areas of needed research: the relationship between the future demand, supply and real price of the agricultural products which can be used to produce ethanol, and the future real price of gasoline/petroleum.

TABLE 1.—COST PER GALLON OF ETHANOL CONSIDERING ONLY THE COST OF THE RAW AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY

Commodity (unit of commodity)	Gallon of alcohol per unit	Commodity cost per unit	Commodity cost per gallon of alcohol
Corn or sorghum (bushel)....	3.0	\$2.60	\$0.87
		3.00	1.00
Wheat (bushel)	2.85	2.50	.88
		3.00	1.05
		5.00	1.75
Sugarbeets (ton).....	22.0	16.00	.73
Potatoes (100 lb).....	1.03	2.95	2.86

A considerable rise in the price of gasoline is necessary to make ethanol production profitable. How much of a price rise is needed and when it is likely to occur are pieces of information which are basic to determining when and if gasohol will be economically feasible. This analysis must be related to the probable range of yearly prices for agricultural commodities. A plant built to operate on a narrow profit margin based on a specific price may not survive one or more seasons of adverse prices. Furthermore, as the price of gasoline rises, so will the costs of producing agricultural commodities and the costs of energy to operate an alcohol plant. So an increase in the price of gasoline may also indirectly increase the cost of producing ethanol. How much a given increase in gasoline prices will increase the price of various agricultural commodities and other energy sources must also be determined.

The actual production process must be examined more thoroughly. Scheller and Mohr's (1976a) contention that an ethanol plant with a 20 million gallon a year capacity is economical must be verified. Such verification must include an examination of various conversion processes in relation to the range of commodities which can be used. Again, the use of more than one commodity may be the key to the long run feasibility of gasohol production.

The need to use several commodities may be a major factor in deciding on the most economical location for a conversion plant. A location which provides easy and economical access to sufficient quantities of several commodities over the long run is necessary.

Another aspect of the economics of the production plant is the need for storage facilities. Proponents of gasohol appear to either have overlooked this need or assumed it to not be necessary. However, sizeable storage facilities for more than one type of commodity will be necessary for two reasons. One is to assure that commodities are available to keep the plant operating year round. The second is to guard against supply shortages of one or more commodities in bad years.

Another key factor mentioned earlier involves mechanisms that will assure a long term supply or middlemen, ties with suppliers of a range of commodities throughout the region or nation, and investment in large capacity storage facilities for a variety of commodities.

The mixing of ethanol with gasoline (determination of both best technical mix and least cost mix) and its distribution to consumers is another key step. If these stages are not carried out efficiently the resulting costs and bottlenecks will severely retard the adoption of gasohol. Complete cooperation and integration with the existing distribution system for gasoline is necessary. The point at which the ethanol is to be mixed with gasoline must be determined and the facilities for doing so must be in place and operating in time to handle the ethanol. In addition, consumer education on all aspects of gasohol may be required. Furthermore, the

distribution and mixing of ethanol will add costs which must be considered.

According to Scheller and Mohr the use of the by-products from ethanol production is crucial to both the net energy analysis (1967b) and the profitability (1967a) of the plant. The markets for the by-products must be examined to determine if they can absorb large increases in supply, and to determine the possible price changes of these by-products and their competing products. Considerable decreases in price might be expected. If these occur, the ethanol plant considered by Scheller and Mohr will not be economically feasible.

With respect to a positive net energy balance (amount of energy obtained from the ethanol being greater than the amount used to produce it) Scheller and Mohr's (1976b) result is based on two factors which are questionable at best. The first is that corn is used as the example. As discussed above, however, a plant relying on a single commodity is not likely to be feasible. Second, their analysis called for the burning of 75 percent of the corn cobs, husks and stalks to provide the energy necessary to yield a positive energy balance. Consideration is not given to the prospect that corn will not be used, nor to the impacts of diverting these residues from their current uses as feed and soil builders. A more comprehensive assessment of the net energy balance is necessary, including consideration of a range of commodities and more realistic assumptions concerning use of residues.

Another series of questions which has not been given adequate consideration can be placed under the heading of net social value, or the benefits and costs of gasohol production to society as a whole. Determining the net social value of producing gasohol is complicated and often tenuous, and depends upon the future expectations and priorities of those doing the analysis. In addition, political decisions may be the key factors. Nevertheless, there are certain questions for which answers will be necessary. One is the trade-offs incurred in diverting human, monetary and physical resources from current uses to the production, use and subsidization of gasohol. For example, if the goal is to increase or maintain farm incomes, is it less costly to directly subsidize the affected farmers in some way, or to try to create a market for their produce which is sufficiently large to raise prices the required amount? Or, will the costs be less or the pay-offs greater if the resources are spent in developing other energy sources, or in developing more efficient ways to use our current sources?

Another question of net social value concerns the impacts of the diversion of large quantities of foodstuffs from the export market to the production of ethanol. Will the decrease in foreign exchange earnings be balanced by lower expenditures for foreign oil? If not, does reducing our dependence on imported oil warrant sizeable government subsidization? How much subsidy will be required, what forms could it take, and what are the impacts of different types of subsidies? How much will oil imports decrease because of the use of gasohol? Perhaps no decrease will occur, and only the rate of increase will slow. Furthermore, if large quantities of foodstuffs are diverted from the export market, how will this affect the countries who presently depend upon our food and who may depend upon it much more in the future, given their high growth rates of population? That is, do our agricultural commodities have a higher value (however determined) when used for human consumption than for energy production? Perhaps our agriculture can increase produc-

tion enough to cover current and future demands for food and energy. The physical possibilities of this occurring must be examined, along with the costs involved.

RESEARCH NEEDS

The foregoing brief discussion of the issues and questions surrounding gasohol forms a large research agenda. This section will provide a summary listing of the more important research needs which were identified.

1. The design of a process and plant to produce ethanol from a combination of agricultural commodities. In the Northwest a likely combination of commodities would be wheat, potatoes and sugar beets.

2. New approaches to the hydrolysis of cellulosic materials. If successful, they would be highly useful and would add to the supply of starting materials.

3. The future demand, supply and real price of the agricultural commodities which can be used to produce ethanol.

4. The future real price of gasoline/petroleum.

5. The physical and institutional mechanisms by which a supply of needed agricultural commodities can be assured.

6. The costs—primarily transportation—of obtaining the commodities and getting them to the processing plants.

7. The costs, methods and institutional arrangements of marketing the ethanol/gasohol, including transportation, sales to wholesalers or retail gas stations, and mixing of ethanol with gasoline.

8. The economics of the location of ethanol plants, which depends upon which commodity(ies) are used, and on points 6 and 7.

9. The economics of the production plant, including optimal plant size, investment and operating costs, and expected profits (losses) for several scenarios of projected prices of input commodities, by-products and gasoline, including the presence or absence of several forms and levels of government subsidy.

10. The types of residues produced, how they can be used, how and what it costs to market them, projected demand given the (large) increase in supply, price effects of a (large) increase in supply of residues, and price effects on products with which residues may compete.

11. The trade-offs incurred in diverting human, monetary and physical resources from current uses to the production, use and subsidization of gasohol.

12. The net impacts on our balance of payments.

13. Impacts on foreign countries, with a long run dependence on our food, of diverting large quantities of foodstuffs from the export market.

REFERENCES CITED

Hieronymous, William. "Brazil Tries Mixing Alcohol from Sugar with Gasoline to Reduce its Oil Imports." *The Wall Street Journal*, Monday, Nov. 28, 1977, p. 30.

Lincoln, John Ware. 1976. *Methanol and Other Ways Around the Gas Pump*. Garden Way Publishing, Charlotte, Vermont 05445.

Scheller, William A. 1977. "Ethanol as a Renewable Energy Source in Automotive Fuel—Nebraska GASOHOL." Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, October, 1977.

Scheller, William A. and Brian J. Mohr. 1976a. "Grain Alcohol—Process, Price and Economic Information." Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, September, 1976.

———. 1976b. "Net Energy Analysis of Ethanol Production." Department of Chemi-

cal Engineering, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, April 7, 1976.

(Note: University files contain many additional references, bibliographies and reports relating to the utilization of agricultural-forest commodities in general and gasohol in particular.)

"DISGUIISING THE TAX BURDEN," BY PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of Harper's magazine carries an excellent article about tax reform called "Disguising the Tax Burden," by Dr. Paul Craig Roberts.

Once again the House is going to take up tax "reform." If past history holds this will mean more tax increases on the American people with very little to show for it. Indeed, we are still working to patch up all the mistakes that were made in the last two tax reform acts that raised taxes rather than lowering the rates to restore incentive.

I suggest that all tax reformers read Dr. Roberts' article carefully:

DISGUIISING THE TAX BURDEN

LITTLE-KNOWN FACTS BENEATH THE RHETORIC OF REFORM

(By Paul Craig Roberts)

Even when they appear singly, major tax increases have a way of slowing down the legislative process. It has to be worked out how to disguise the tax so everyone thinks it is falling on someone else. Then the Congress and the Administration have to work out among themselves who gets to hand out how much to which spending constituency. This is what is known as politics, and ordinarily the politicians can think of enough new rhetoric to explain the levying of new taxes. But by the end of his first year in office President Carter had proposed so many tax increases (the energy tax, the Social Security tax, and the tax-reform tax) that the system temporarily collapsed.

It was more new taxes than could be negotiated, and the major tax-reform proposals of last September have been withdrawn but not discarded.

From the standpoint of the government's interest, tax reform is a necessity. The rich are a depleted resource, and so it is inevitable that the government will come up with a new source of revenue in tax reform. As is customary in these matters, tax reform will be justified on the grounds of "equity," that is, closing loopholes and helping the poor. Tax reform to help the poor is easy, because the poor don't pay any taxes. Therefore, it doesn't cost the government anything. Look at the table prepared by the Tax Foundation from data published by the Internal Revenue Service in *Statistics of Income*, and be amazed at the distribution of the tax burden.

Half of the taxpayers, those whose adjusted gross incomes place them in the bottom 50 percent, account for only 7 percent of the total personal-income-tax collections. Taxpayers in the lowest 25 percent account for less than half of 1 percent of the personal income tax collected by the government. That's why the government likes to cut taxes for lower-income groups. It doesn't cost

much to buy half the votes, and what guilt-ridden upper-income taxpayer would complain about compassionate government?

Besides, "everyone knows" that the bulk of the taxes is paid by lower-income earners, while the rich largely escape taxation. Public citizens' tax-reform organizations, peoples' tax lobbies, and other sheltered spokesmen for organized welfare groups have no difficulty getting out their well-packaged, public-spirited message. Meanwhile, the true facts pass unnoticed in the IRS's *Statistics of Income*.

The table shows that taxpayers with incomes in the top 5 percent—those with adjusted gross incomes of \$29,272 or more—paid over one-third of the total personal income taxes collected by the federal government in 1975. The top 10 percent of taxpayers—those earning \$23,420 or more—paid nearly half the total tax bill. In contrast, the lowest 10 percent of taxpayers paid only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total tax bill. Taxpayers earning \$15,898 or more—those in the top 25 percent—paid 72 percent of total personal income taxes. Taxpayers whose incomes placed them in the top 1 percent paid more than two and a half times the total taxes collected from the bottom 50 percent.

An income of \$59,338 may qualify for the top 1 percent, but what about the really rich? The latest *Statistics of Income* shows that the 1,149 taxpayers earning \$1 million or more in 1975 paid an average tax of \$1,011,317. The total tax paid by these few high-income taxpayers added up to \$1.15 billion. All of us might pause to ask what public services a taxpayer receives for a million dollars in income taxes.

The table reveals another interesting fact. Since 1970 the tax burden has shifted further away from the lower brackets. In 1970 the bottom 50 percent paid 10.3 percent of total income taxes, and the top 50 percent paid 89.7 percent. By 1975 the bottom's share had declined to 7.1 percent, while the burden carried by the top had risen to 92.9 percent. In addition, the Tax Foundation reports that "several million taxpayers disappeared from the tax rolls altogether as a result of legislative changes benefiting those with lower incomes during the period 1970-75." Many of the untaxed receive transfers in kind, such as food stamps and housing subsidies, together with earned-income credits (negative income tax) and welfare checks, so that their real income exceeds that of many taxpayers.

Most people think that tax reform means making the rich pay taxes. They do not realize that the purpose of closing loopholes is to enlarge the tax base by redefining personal income to include fringe benefits and capital gains and by reducing deductions. Enlarging the tax base will raise everyone's taxes, but it will have the most severe effect on middle-income earners. The government is refashioning its tax net to catch those it pretends to protect. Fringe benefits are a larger percentage of a \$15,000 salary than they are of a \$100,000 salary, and so are itemized deductions. The government, of course, will give reassurances that it is only after the rich, just as it did when it brought in the income tax in 1914. Initially the personal-income-tax burden rested on only 357,515 people—less than one-half of 1 percent of the population. Only people with incomes much greater than average were subject to the tax. The rates ranged from 1 percent to 7 percent. Only income in excess of \$117,000 in today's dollars encountered the first surtax bracket of 2 percent. The top tax bracket of 7 percent was encountered only by income in excess of \$2.9 million in today's dollars. The personal income tax soon found its way into the lower

brackets. The income thresholds were lowered and the tax rates raised. The bottom bracket today, an income level not subject to taxation in 1914, is taxed at 14 percent—twice 1914's top rate. The tax rate today on the first \$500 of taxable income is twice as great as the tax rate on a multimillionaire's income in 1914. This does not mean that things got better for the millionaire. The rate in his bracket today is ten times greater, and his average tax rate is 11.4 times greater. In 1914 the total tax on a million-dollar income was \$60,000. Today it is \$685,000. Since, as a result of inflation, the value of money today is only about one-sixth of what it was in 1914, today's millionaire's after-tax income of \$315,000 is equivalent to a 1914 purchasing power of \$53,800. He has only one-seventeenth of the purchasing power of his 1914 counterpart. During a period that has seen a rise in the average standard of living, the millionaire's has declined drastically.

It is an interesting story to trace the growth of the personal income tax, but it can be summarized in the following way: Between 1914 and 1975 the population grew 120 percent, but the number of individual-income-tax returns grew by 23,800 percent.

Hailed everywhere as loopholes for the rich, deductions are the primary income shelter for those in the middle to lower tax brackets, where most of the income is. The percentage difference between adjusted gross income and taxable income is greater the lower the income bracket. For example, in the under-\$10,000 adjusted-gross-income class, deductions come to 48.9 percent of adjusted gross income. In the \$10,000-to-\$24,999 class, deductions are 31.1 percent of adjusted gross income, and in the over-\$25,000 class they are only 22.8 percent. The higher the income, the less it is sheltered by deductions.

According to the latest Treasury figures, the upper-income groups benefited from about \$16 billion in deductions exclusions, and other privileges, about half of which resulted from recognizing the difference between capital gains and ordinary income. Lower- and middle-income groups benefited from about \$50 billion in deductions and exclusions, such as the exclusion of unemployment benefits, Social Security payments, workers' compensation benefits, pension contributions and earnings, employer-paid medical insurance premiums and medical care, the deduction of interest on consumer credit and home mortgages, property taxes, medical expenses, and state and local taxes, and the deferral of capital gains on the sale of a home plus credit for the purchase of a new home. For every dollar of upper-bracket tax savings, \$3 went to the lower and middle brackets.

Dr. Roger Freeman, former White House aide and Hoover Institution Fellow at Stanford University, summed up his book on tax loopholes (*Tax Loopholes: The Legend and the Reality*) as follows:

"The literature of the tax reform drive usually asserts that most of the loopholes were designed for and work for the benefit of the rich, that poor and middle income taxpayers are taxed on all of their income, with no escape possibilities, and that most of the income that avoids taxation is to be found in the very high income brackets. The facts, however, suggest the opposite: much or most of the untaxed income is in the low and medium brackets."

That neatly sums up why the government's tax reformers are interested in reducing deductions. You can't raise revenues for the government unless you go where the untaxed income is.

Untaxed income also means fringe benefits. The President says that taxing fringe benefits means "the three-martini lunch." But

the unions are concerned rather than fooled. They know where the untaxed benefits are that would yield substantial tax revenue. Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (Rep.-Utah), a member of the Joint Economic Committee has calculated that taxing fringe benefits as personal income "would mean an increase in taxes of \$240 on the average taxpayer." With the 76 million tax returns filed in 1975 that reported wage and salary income, that would come to \$18.24 billion, a tidy sum for government. That's why the unions are supporting the resolution introduced by Senator Hatch and Rep. Jack Kemp (Rep.-N.Y.) against the taxation of fringe benefits. They know that taxing fringes is the same as raising tax rates on existing wage and salary levels. You can't pay the IRS with part of your parking place, employer-subsidized meal, employee discount, or employer-paid health insurance and pension premiums.

The third plank of the tax reform redefines assets as income, and in addition to taxing the income from the asset confiscates part of the asset. Suppose you invest \$10,000 in an income-producing asset, and inflation drives the price of that asset to \$15,000. Suppose that family educational or medical expenses force you to sell the asset. Even though its replacement cost is \$15,000—the \$15,000 you receive will not buy any more than the \$10,000 you paid—the government will claim that you have a \$5,000 capital gain and tax it. Suppose you are in the 25 percent bracket. That means \$1,250 of your assets will be confiscated by the government. The greater the inflation, the longer you hold the asset, and the higher your tax bracket, the more will be confiscated. The reformers are even talking about taxing the "capital gain" on an accrual basis whether or not you sell the asset.

The tax reformers showed how far they want to go by proposing to tax homeowners on the rental value of their homes. It's called taxing imputed rent. The reasoning is that owning a home provides income in kind (shelter). The value of that income is the rental value, so up goes your taxable income by the rental value of your home—even though it is not rented and you are living in it. This reform is especially valuable to the government as it pushes homeowners into higher tax brackets, which means they pay higher tax rates on the same money incomes. It is valuable also because it establishes a new principle of taxation that can be applied to home vegetable gardens and to the services of housewives. Cooking services, sexual services, cleaning services, child-rearing services, and laundry services are also income in kind. The imputed value of a housewife who is good at all of these tasks would exceed the salaries and wages of many husbands. The government could then take your house and make you hire out your wife to cover the unpaid taxes you couldn't pay.

So many major tax-increase proposals indicate runaway greed in Washington. It's not as if the government hasn't had a raise. The government gets an automatic increase in tax revenues every year as a result of inflation. Look at what happens to the real tax burden on a person whose incomes rises with the rate of inflation over the course of his working life. To show that it is not just the upper-income taxpayers who are harmed, let's take for an example someone who is today earning only \$6,240 a year. In 1976 he would have paid no taxes. Instead, he would have received a check from the Treasury for \$155 as a result of the earned-income credit. But after 45 years of 5 percent inflation he would be earning \$56,077 a year, on which he would have to pay \$17,019 in taxes (at present rates). His after-tax money income would have risen from \$6,395 in 1976 to \$38,058 in 2021, or by substantially less than

the rate of inflation. His after-tax income in 2021 would have a purchasing power equal to only \$4,345 in 1976 dollars. In spite of his much larger money income, this person would have experienced a decline in his living standard of nearly one-third. This is the result of progressive income taxation plus inflation, which together cause taxes on the same amount of purchasing power—\$6,240 in 1976 dollars—to rise from a refund of 2.5 percent in 1976 to a tax of 30 percent in 2021. The higher the inflation, the worse it would be for him, because the faster he would reach the higher brackets.

Indexing the tax structure (adjusting it to offset inflation) would prevent this deterioration in the living standards of all Americans. One might think that this would make indexing an important issue of tax reform. Yet, it is not part of the tax reformers' proposals. The reformers argue that inflation causes government's costs to rise, so it also needs more revenues. However, the way it is now, the government's revenues don't simply rise by the amount of the inflation, they rise by 1.65 times the rate of inflation. A 10 percent rate of inflation means a 16.5 percent increase in government revenues. That is why governments prefer to fight unemployment.

The claim that inflation hurts the lower income brackets more than the upper income brackets is deceitful. What inflation really does is to push everyone into higher tax brackets. As average incomes rise, more and more people will experience the woes of being nominally rich. One of the woes is that the higher your nominal or money income, the harder it is to stay even with inflation. As the tax bill gets bigger on every raise, your income has to increase progressively faster than the rate of inflation in order to stay even. This is another reason government prefers to reduce the tax rates in the lower brackets. Inflation soon moves the people out of them and into the higher brackets that were not cut.

Dale W. Sommer in the September 26, 1977, issue of *Industry Week* presents some interesting statistics from the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Income and Products Accounts that illustrate the extent to which American incomes have been undone by taxation. Over the past ten years the average wage has risen 77.3 percent, whereas the consumer price index has risen 75.4 percent. So the average worker has kept up with inflation. But the tax burden has risen 144 percent during the same period. On a per capita basis, Americans paid \$2,261 in taxes in 1976 compared with \$1,014 in 1966. The 144 percent growth in the tax bite exceeded the 126.6 percent growth in total production of goods and services (GNP) and the 119.2 percent growth in total national income.

Last year Americans paid \$16.7 billion more in taxes than they spent on the three basic necessities of food, clothing, and housing. The total tax bill came to \$486.4 billion, whereas the total spent on food, clothing, and housing came to \$469.7 billion. Compared with the \$2,261 per capita expenditure on taxes, \$1,048 was spent on food, \$354 on clothing, and \$780 on shelter. Added together the three necessities are still \$79 less than per capita taxes paid.

Taxes far outpace the growth in real income. In 1976 federal taxes grew 20.8 percent. The entire economy grew 11.6 percent, and 5.3 percent of that growth was the result of inflation rather than an actual increase in the production of goods and services.

The greatest loophole of all in our income-tax system works for the benefit of government. It is the loophole that allows government to use inflation to increase taxes on constant and even declining levels of purchasing power without having to legislate

higher tax rates. The central issue of tax reform is closing this loophole. But in their proposal to tax capital gains as ordinary income, the tax reformers show every intention of opening this loophole wider. The widening of this loophole allows government to establish a wealth tax in the guise of an income tax—wealth meaning asset. A wealth tax is not a tax only on the wealthy. Whereas a rich man owns more assets than one who is not rich, the nonrich collectively own many assets.

We have come a long way from the time three decades ago when F.A. Hayek said something about the road to serfdom. A serf was a person who did not own his own labor. Although he was not himself owned by another—that is, he could not be bought and sold like a slave—the feudal nobility, the state of that time, had rights over the serf's labor. When we say that a peasant was ensnared, we mean that he owed a certain amount of his working time to the state. Over time and regions this obligation averaged about one-third of a serf's working life.

The serf's position provides a perspective that lets us sum up the success of reactionary forces in this century in simple economic terms. In 1929 government in the U.S. had a claim to only 12 percent of the national income. By 1960 government had a claim to 33 percent of the national income. By 1976 government had extended its share to 42 percent. In relative terms our position today is worse than that of a medieval serf who owed the state one-third of his working time.

Many may reject this parallel. They may say that we have a democratic government controlled by the people, and that high taxes and big government merely reflect the voters' demands for public goods in the public interest. Such an argument is reassuring but problematical. The income tax was voted in under one guise and retained under another. Furthermore, it was the action of a past generation. For us it is an inherited obligation as were feudal dues, and it is seen that way by the Internal Revenue Service. All of us have been born to the statist gospel that government is the instrument of social progress. Any clamors for tax reduction are translated into proposals for tax reform, which are further transformed into proposals for securing more revenues for government. As we hear the talk about tax reform and "equity," we might pause to consider, if our cultivated progressive image will allow, that "equity" means more taxes on the productive to provide the revenues that build the spending constituencies of Congress and the federal bureaucracy. What is operating is not equity, but the government's self-interest.

The advent of several major tax increases in tandem will destabilize the economy, but from the government's perspective that is desirable. There will have to be more government programs to deal with the consequences of instability. Every sophisticated person is aware of how special interests use the legislative process for their own benefit, but the same sophisticate is badly schooled in how the legislative process furthers the special interests of those in government. Inflation leads to the imposition of wage and price controls and credit allocation, all of which increase the spoils, money, and influence divvied up in Washington. Unemployment means more CETA jobs and public works, and what member of the government class is hurt by that? Put simply, instability increases the demand for the services of bureaucrats and for pork-barrel legislation that builds the spending constituencies of both Congress and the Executive branch. It advances the careers

of academics and technocrats who move back and forth from their think tanks and universities and in and out of government.

Perhaps all of this won't come to pass all at once. Government might so engorge itself with Social Security and energy taxes that it can't reach the tax-reform dish. Or perhaps in a last-gasp effort the vested interests of old will flex their flabby biceps and hammer through a tax cut that will stave off ensferment and economic stagnation for a while longer.

RESONSIBILITY TO AMERICA

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, there is much we can learn about our country and our system of government when we view it through the eyes of our young people. Those who will be custodians of our freedom in the future already are taking a look at their responsibilities for preserving this heritage and planning the steps they will take.

To encourage them in this regard, the Veterans of Foreign Wars annually sponsors a voice of democracy contest, with scholarships being awarded for the most outstanding presentations. The program is now in its 31st year.

Winning first place in the competition conducted in South Dakota this year was Mary Jo Moser of Wessington. I am pleased to commend her thoughts on her responsibilities to America to the attention of my colleagues:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
SOUTH DAKOTA WINNER

(By Mary Jo Moser)

"I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living for . . . my country. . . ."

This portion of the 4-H Pledge of America's youth expresses my feelings of my responsibilities to America. My responsibilities to America must begin with a pledge of myself. This pledge must then be fulfilled, for unless action follows a pledge, it becomes meaningless.

One must be responsible to himself before he can be responsible to anyone else. The pledge of my head and body are towards individual development. Individualism is a vital part of America. I must be myself and be the best that I can be, doing the best that I can do. A person must discover himself and then accept himself to develop self-confidence. Then he can share with others what he is with his own unique talents and forms of self-expression.

When one is responsible to himself, he can then be responsible to others. It is my responsibility to give of myself and to get involved with others. Relationships with people are the most important aspect of life. One must learn to cooperate and to participate. I pledge my hands to service for my country. No job is unimportant if it contributes to building a stronger America. The garbage man, the brick-layer, and the scrub woman are as important as the President and his Cabinet. The responsibilities of the common laborer are the foundation upon

which the great achievements of America are built.

As one of America's youth, it is my responsibility to serve in every way I can—through voting, speaking, or just giving a simple smile that may make someone else's day brighter.

When people cooperate and work together, they cultivate a pride for their work. It is my responsibility as an American to cultivate pride in America—what it has been, what it is, and most importantly, what it can be. It is every American's responsibility to make the best of today's America even better tomorrow. This pledge of my heart, my loyalty, and my pride is my final responsibility to America. It is this pledge upon which all other pledges are based. If we are loyal to America, we must speak out on the issues for which America stands—freedom, equality, and justice for all. Each individual must have pride in what he can do for America, no matter how small the responsibility may be. My pride in America and what it can be is what makes my responsibilities to America a pledge of myself.

I pledge my head, heart, hands, and health. These are my responsibilities to America.

YEAR OF INCLUSION FOR CERTAIN CROP PAYMENTS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to prevent the unavoidable bunching of income for farmer-taxpayers who receive farm disaster payments in 1978 with respect to 1977 losses and for certain farmers who receive deficiency (or "target price") payments in 1978 which ordinarily would have been received and declared as income in 1977.

We are all well aware of the host of problems created by the extended drought of 1976-77. Not the least of these problems is the gigantic backlog of administrative paperwork which has prevented the timely issuance of Federal disaster and deficiency payments.

Many farmers, who are entitled to "prevented planting" disaster payments or other farm disaster payments for crops which they harvested (or would have harvested) in 1977, did not receive these payments from the Department of Agriculture until 1978. Under present law, farmers on the cash method of accounting would have to declare these payments as income in 1978. Since income and/or deficiency payments from crops sold in 1978 would also be reported in 1978, the income of these farmers would be bunched in 1978 rather than spread over 1977 and 1978, as would be the normal situation.

Also, a great many farmers who are entitled to deficiency payments on their 1977 crops because of low crop prices did not receive these payments from the Department of Agriculture until 1978, although, under normal circumstances, these payments would have been received in 1977. The problem appears to

be particularly crucial in the case of deficiency payments for wheat. Deficiency payments for 1977 crop of wheat ordinarily would be expected to be received in November or December of the same year in which the crop is harvested. Since deficiency payments for wheat harvested in 1978 would also be reported in 1978, the income of these farmers will be bunched in 1978 rather than spread over 1977 and 1978.

Several factors contribute to the unusual tardiness of the 1977 payments. While drought and other weather-related phenomena necessitated an unusually high number of disaster payments, low market prices insured broad entitlement to deficiency payments. The deep administrative backlog created by these circumstances was exacerbated by the belated approval of the farm bill on September 29, 1977.

The bill I am introducing today would allow a farmer to elect to treat the disaster payments as 1977 income if he can establish that, under his usual business practice, income from his crop would have been reported in 1977. Similarly, the bill would allow a farmer to elect to treat deficiency payments received in 1978 as 1977 income if, under normal circumstances, the farmer would have received the payments in 1977. If an election is made to accelerate payments under this bill, the farmer must accelerate all of the disaster payments and deficiency payments for which he is eligible to make an election.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that rapid passage of this proposal will alleviate somewhat the unusual burdens now being endured by our American farming population.

A copy of this proposal is attached for your review at this point:

H.R. —

A bill relating to the year for including in income certain payments under the Agricultural Act of 1949 received in 1978 but attributable to 1977

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

SECTION 1. YEAR OF INCLUSION FOR CERTAIN CROP PAYMENTS RECEIVED IN 1978.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer reporting on the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting, if—

(1) (A) the taxpayer receives in his first taxable year beginning in 1978 payments under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, as a result of—

(i) the destruction or damage to crops caused by drought, flood, or any other natural disaster, or

(ii) the inability to plant crops because of such a natural disaster, and

(B) the taxpayer establishes that, under his practice, income from such crops would have been reported for his last taxable year beginning in 1977, or

(2) (A) the taxpayer receives in his first taxable year beginning in 1978 deficiency (or "target price") payments under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for any 1977 crop, and

(B) the fifth month of such crop's marketing year ends before December 1, 1977, then the taxpayer may elect to include such

proceeds in income for his last taxable year beginning in 1977.

(b) MAKING AND EFFECT OF ELECTION.—An election under this section for any taxable year shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations prescribe and shall apply with respect to all proceeds described in subsection (a) which were received by the taxpayer.

CONGRESSIONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I drafted and issued the following announcement and explanation to my California newspapers and the people of the Fourth Congressional District of California. I would remind my colleagues that my statement of departure is not for any load being made up for tonight. I intend to spend a vigorous year working on the problems of the people of the country during 1978:

CONGRESSIONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

This being the day appointed for the annual reading in the Congress of George Washington's Farewell Address to the Nation, it seems fitting and proper that this is likewise a proper day for me to announce my taking leave of the United States Congress at the end of the current year.

As Washington said several hundred years ago after serving 8 years as President, "it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made." His decision was final and so is mine.

If 8 years of public service was sufficient for the first leader of the country, why should it be so difficult for me to explain why twice that number, and more, should be sufficient in my case.

I am releasing this message first to the newspapers of my own Congressional District because this news is of primary concern to the half million Californians that I have had the pleasure of serving the past 16 years.

To some it might seem incongruous to announce the projected termination of public Congressional service, while at the same time acknowledging that nearly 6,000 of my friends and constituents are filing petitions endorsing my candidacy such that I might file for a 9th term without the payment of a filing fee. The petitions will not be filed and for this I should earn the long term thanks from 5 County Clerks in my District whose job it would be to individually verify the signatures.

I make this statement at this time for a large number of reasons. To begin with, nobody is indispensable and there are a select few who have as yet not made themselves available who I believe with some further experience could represent the 4th Congressional District of California with capability and distinction. The winner of any Democratic Primary will have the benefit of whatever political campaign war chest I have accumulated.

Another reason for my decision is the unfortunate blurring of the issues that appear to be developing where the public and media

seem concerned even yet with many items, including gossip, ignoring the major problems separating the two great parties.

Unfortunately, it takes a lot of money, dedicated workers and courageous battle to set the record straight sometimes in an election—all of these items I have or can obtain. Fortunately I have basked for many years in that euphoric state where campaigns were inexpensive, campaign debts and obligations were minor and victories were landslide.

Our District of California with a registration of better than 2 to 1 favoring the Majority Party should be able to continue to elect Majority Party Congressmen with little effort and small political debts. Herein lies the secret of a democracy of excellence. I've never participated in a campaign where I did not have complete control or when public relations experts were needed to market the candidate like a loaf of bread, and in spite of some preliminary flirting with the thought, I do not intend to start now. I could raise several hundred thousand dollars to match the war chest of the poised Minority effort to achieve success in our District—but what a distortion, what a misuse of funds. How can public servants do a proper job of representation when they are possibly bought and paid for by special interests before they ever take office? Believe me, large contributions do buy something and I am thankful that I have never had to participate from any source.

Why is this announcement such a big thing anyway? 33 of my Colleagues have already indicated that they are opting for new careers. Why is it that Members elected to two year jobs, time after time after time, make such news when Washington's course is followed? Would it be that Members could serve 10 or a dozen years in the House of Representatives, make their contribution and then let others carry the baton. Things have changed since I was first elected to the House. Now the younger Members can have their voice heard, can chair Subcommittees after a reasonable time and can be effective. This is so in large part because of the efforts of the Kennedy and Johnson Democrats to continuously raze the seniority system to the ground. No longer do you have to combine with a "Fearless Five" group to take issue with an Armed Services Chairman. Committees are open, younger Members can speak up and are respected for their views and simultaneously the former House of elder statesmen in the United States Congress are nearly absent. There is little grey hair left indeed.

In a broader perspective I regret that in spite of the Democratization of the Congress, the problems of the country after several Democratic and Republican Administrations appear to be more horrendous today than when I entered the House with the New Frontier. Our aspirations in health, education, Social Security, armaments and International Affairs were monumental. We closed the missile gap and then some; we enacted Federal Aid to Education, an Elderly Health Program, tied a cost-of-living escalator to a reorganized Social Security Program and tried to develop an Alliance for Progress in South America. We moved into the "Great Society" but the Society got off the track in Asia and this destroyed several Presidencies. Our Middle East loyalty has fostered now an energy cartel that threatens the very existence of the free world. People's expectations, unfortunately, fuel an inflation that threatens to devour us and is causing an annual National Debt escalation of 100 billion dollars per year that neither Presidents nor Congress, nor the country's brightest, economic minds can respond to. I think we need drastically a form of Wage Price Controls but again unfortunately I am a minority of

one with a policy not shared by either major party and I'm not about to start a third one.

The issues that should be argued in a campaign are these and more. How do we pay for this agonizing retirement dilemma that also threatens to bankrupt the country? Those retired feel that they have been lampooned by inflation and they have. Those working remind those retired that the country is broke and it is—that retired workers in general have only paid for 10 to 15 percent of most retirement benefits and that workers are nearly belly up contributing nearly 9 percent of their earnings for current recipients' medical and support benefits.

Can the country go belly up? You bet—Britain, Italy and New York have and with the current stock market gyrations anything can happen.

Farmers are up in arms—some of them rightfully so—and I support a new farm deal, but there are many in agriculture today demanding more with as much indifference to consequences as any wildcat group in organized labor. Many conservative farmers are demanding more governmental regimentation and socialist assistance today than was ever sought by impoverished groups before. There is no way in a realistic world that current rural demands can achieve majority Congressional support.

The President was right when in his State of the Union Message he stated "We all must moderate our aspirations". Our Society is just not healthy enough today to effectively respond to the "demands" of anybody whether it be farmers, coal miners, the elderly, the Arab shiiks or our friends in Israel.

I have found that I can't effectively represent people if I am forced to seek big campaign money and prostitute myself with election promises that I know can't be fulfilled and I refuse to do so. Could I be elected again? Our informal polling collecting signatures all over the Congressional District indicates that there is better party polarity in my favor today than the last time out of the barn. The expenditure of ½ million dollars on a new campaign diatribe could alter this positive polarity and could produce a tossup come next November. Garbage and gossip would be reshaped rather than the issues I have referred to. Many people would be unnecessarily alienated—inocent people could be smeared—and for what?

I have served what I consider to be a number of extremely successful terms for the people of our District and the Country. I find I don't have an awful lot of ideas to offer that have not been successfully or unsuccessfully offered in the past. I plan that our current and last term will be extremely successful because I have a heavy shopping list to reorganize Alaska lands, rehabilitate our fisheries, try to keep the Panama Canal, fund our Central Valley Water Project, maintain the viability of our local national defense infrastructure, and vote on what I consider to be proper national priorities.

Having made the above decision I can promise to the people of the 4th Congressional District of California my unfettered best judgment in 1978.

RHODESIA AND MR. YOUNG

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, my hat is off to the Washington Star once more. In its Sunday, February 19, 1978, edi-

torial, it has again hit the target dead center. It was noticeable that when Ian Smith announced that an internal solution for majority rule in Rhodesia had finally been reached, there was no applause from Mr. Andrew Young or our Department of State. At least Great Britain was astute enough to remain silent. But our policy and that of Mr. Young's is now out for everyone to see. We will permit no solution that does not allow a terrorist triumph supported and directed by Moscow. The professed interest of Mr. Young in majority rule has been shown to be the strawman it was. The United States policy could not be more hypocritical. The editorial follows:

RHODESIA AND MR. YOUNG

Our United Nations ambassador, Mr. Andrew Young, says that the so-called "internal solution for majority rule in Rhodesia could spark a "black on black civil war." That is a possibility, especially if Mr. Young continues to sound his pessimistic note and his gloomy prophecies become self-fulfilling.

Mr. Young, for reasons he alone knows, believes that the guerrilla forces operating from Rhodesia's neighboring states must be included in any durable regime. Their cooperation would help, of course, and Ian Smith seeks it on reasonable terms. But their ambition is essentially rule or ruin, their cooperation unlikely.

Mr. Young has had an unusually free hand to speak for the United States on the delicate issues of Southern Africa. In keeping—perhaps—with his feckless view that Cubans are a "stabilizing force" in Angola, he has aligned U.S. policy with the Soviet- and Chinese-supported guerrillas of the Patriotic Front and their hard-line attitudes.

He and Dr. David Owen, the British foreign secretary, have tried to talk the Patriotic Front leadership into a more conciliatory attitude; but so far without result. They have produced no born-again revolutionaries.

While the terms for majority rule in Rhodesia were under negotiation, as they have been since November, Mr. Young's personal—some would say eccentric—diplomacy may have been defensible in a way. Keeping one foot in the guerrilla camp may have added some pressure on the white Rhodesian regime to come to terms.

But now that there is agreement between Prime Minister Smith and three prominent blacks—an agreement looking to a reasonable and workable transition to majority rule—it is time to call Mr. Young from left field. His one-man policymaking will no longer do.

The reason is simple. In the coming weeks, if all goes well inside Rhodesia, the U.S. must make a crucial choice. We must choose between supporting and welcoming the new Rhodesian government, lifting economic sanctions against it, maybe even giving it military assistance to resist the assault of Soviet- and Chinese-supplied guerrillas, and Mr. Young's obstructive and unreasonable alternative.

Since the Patriotic Front flatly refuses to cooperate in a Rhodesian settlement which it cannot dominate, the Young policy could put us in league with the outside spoilers against the internal peacemakers—even after elections, even after a government is formed, and even, conceivably, after the new regime has been endorsed by the British government. Not even Dr. Owen clings, as does Mr. Young, to the stubborn view that an internal settlement is necessarily unworkable.

The obvious question, then: Is Ambassa-

doer Young alone to run a one-man show on American policy in Southern Africa? Or will his superiors at the White House and the State Department insist, as they should, that American policy is too important to be tied to the whim of one official?

The new arrangement between Prime Minister Smith and the black moderates of Rhodesia demands at least open-mindedness on our part. If that arrangement proves fair and workable, if it is sustained by fair elections, the U.S. will have no choice consistent with our own political values but to endorse, welcome and assist it. If the Russians and Chinese and Cubans conspire to try to overthrow the new regime, we should see that the Rhodesian army has the means to defend the country.

That means Mr. Young must be weaned from his infatuation with the guerrillas. The weaning is already overdue.

THE MIDDLE-INCOME TAXPAYERS SPEAK OUT ON TAX CREDITS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with my colleagues my testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 6748, a bill I introduced to provide a tax credit for certain expenses of higher education. I feel that this testimony presents an interesting prospective into the subject of tuition tax credits, since it is based on actual experiences of the middle-income families who have written to me to describe the difficulties they've encountered while financing their children's educations.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON H.R. 6748, TO ALLOW A TAX CREDIT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate having the opportunity to present my views on tuition tax credits. Last January, I introduced H.R. 6748, a bill to ease the financial burdens of higher education for parents and students by providing a tax credit for a certain portion of educational expenses, namely, tuition, fees, books, supplies and equipment. Since that time, the response to my bill has been overwhelming—I have received literally hundreds of letters from concerned taxpayers who feel that they will be unable to finance their children's education without some form of tax relief. Today, I would like to share some of their thoughts and experiences with you.

FAMILIES STRAPPED BY RISING EDUCATION COSTS
"Help! Help!" one woman wrote. "It's not that we begrudge money spent on our children's educations, but where will the spiraling costs stop? Any help would be appreciated."

It is well known that the cost of higher education has skyrocketed in recent years. The average total cost of obtaining a college education at a four-year public institution has climbed by 51.5% over the last 5 years, from \$1,984 to \$3,005; at a four-year private institution over the same period the cost has risen from \$3,279 to \$4,905—an increase of 49.6%. Moreover, middle-income families

may face even greater challenges in financing their children's postsecondary education in years to come. According to the Oakland Financial Group of Charlottesville, Virginia, a family with a one year old child can expect to pay an average of \$11,450 per year for an education in a state university when that child reaches college age. For private universities, the average yearly cost will be in the neighborhood of \$20,000 by the 1990's!

One father of five wrote to express the extreme hardship he has faced trying to pay for his children's college educations. "The cost of college for the one who has graduated and the three who are currently attending has been \$39,561.12. That figure is more than I earned in the first ten years in my 27-year working life. The children earned \$13,056.36 of that money. However, the remainder still represents over seven years of work for me and I am only 60% of the way through."

Commented another, "Sending our daughter to college will cost us nearly 25 percent of our after-tax income. When our second daughter enters college in two years, the impact will nearly double." Yet the words of one mother of seven children summarize the anguish expressed by many middle-income parents, "Struggle is the word . . . One of our boys dropped out because he felt it was too much of a burden on us . . . I am sick inside; should we deny higher education to our children simply because they come from a large family? . . . Big corporations can deduct just about everything for their executives, including entertainment. But no deduction is allowed for working families to help them meet the rising costs of higher education."

THE MIDDLE-INCOME DILEMMA

Clearly, middle-income families are hard-pressed to meet educational expenses. Many have written to tell me that they've gone into debt that will "take a lifetime to repay;" others have taken second mortgages, and still others have depleted savings and even retirement accounts. But by and large, most of the letters I've received have expressed the following concern:

"We're too middle-class to either get some financial relief or to afford a high-priced college education for any of our children . . . Soon only the poor or very rich will be able to send their children to colleges or universities. Since the bulk of support for public education comes from middle-income taxpayers, one could question the utility of having state-supported universities if the average taxpayer cannot afford to use them."

In some instances, where both parents are working one or more jobs to help meet college expenses, taxes are swallowing a significant portion of the additional income. Said one man, "I'm tired of getting it from both sides. My income negates any consideration for aid, although I've had two children in college for the last three years, and at the same time by working harder to pay their way, I'm in a higher tax bracket."

A recent survey shows that college attendance of children from middle-income families declined 22 percent during the early seventies, while the attendance of children from lower and upper income families remained stable. It is apparent that rising educational costs and inequitable tax laws threaten to make higher education prohibitive for many families in the middle brackets. We cannot—and should not—let this happen. In my view, tuition tax relief is essential if we are to keep the doors of higher learning open to all Americans.

TUITION TAX RELIEF A MUST

My bill, H.R. 6748, attempts to correct a major deficiency in our tax laws. Presently,

the tax law provides relief only for educational expenses incurred for training required to maintain one's position of employment. No relief is provided for students or parents of students who are pursuing education or training for their career. I believe it is unfair that those who need assistance the most are ineligible under our present laws.

An important feature of my bill is that it covers the broad spectrum of postsecondary education. More than 10 million students at a variety of institutions—public and private, 4-year and 2-year—would receive assistance from this legislation. Colleges, universities, community and junior colleges, business schools, trade schools, technical schools and vocational training centers are all eligible institutions under this bill.

H.R. 6748 is designed to help those people who need the most help in meeting their educational expenses, i.e., families and students in the middle-income bracket. For example, an average student attending Northern Virginia Community College would receive a tax credit for about 87 percent of his or her educational expenses. Students attending George Mason University would receive, on the average, tax credits for about 59 percent of their expenses. Although students attending more expensive institutions might receive a larger credit, a smaller percentage of their costs would be covered. A summary of this bill is attached.

Wrote a young man, "Education is the future of this nation . . . the cost of college has hindered my efforts in establishing a home. A tax credit would be most helpful." Our bright young men and women of today need the opportunity to achieve their potential. Let us make sure they have that chance.

THE FULL MARRIAGE ACT OF 1977

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, since the Humphrey-Hawkins bill guarantees the right of every able American to have a meaningful job, perhaps someone should introduce a bill guaranteeing the right of every American to a meaningful marriage relationship. Herbert Stein has drafted such a bill, The Full Marriage Act of 1977, which sets a national full marriage goal. I submit this article from the Wall Street Journal of December 6, 1977, because the Full Marriage Act of 1977 is as undesirable and unrealistic as the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill:

THE FULL MARRIAGE ACT OF 1977

(By Herbert Stein)

A bill to translate into reality the right of all Americans able, willing and seeking to be married to full opportunity for a meaningful, nondead-end relationship; to assert the responsibility of the federal government to use all practicable programs and policies to promote meaningful relationships, and to clean up the American economic, social and political system in other respects.

This act may be cited as the "Full Marriage and Political Balancing Act of 1977."

GENERAL FINDINGS

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that 7% of the persons in the United States over the age of 16 able, willing and seeking to be

married are not married, and that the unmarriage rate is much higher for persons between the ages of 16 and 21. This high unmarriage rate imposes serious costs upon the nation, including the following:

(1) Many of the unmarried and all of their mothers suffer severe mental anguish;

(2) Some of the married suffer envy;

(3) Unmarriage contributes to unemployment, since unemployment rates are significantly higher among unmarried males than among married males of the same age;

(4) Unmarriage contributes to inflation, since two can live as easily as one;

(5) Unmarriage contributes to the balance of trade deficit, since unmarried persons have a high propensity to buy small foreign cars, drink foreign wine and attend foreign movies.

(b) The Congress further finds that the operation of the free market assisted only by aggregate fiscal and monetary policies is not adequate to reduce unmarriage. The rate of unmarriage has risen as the money supply and the federal deficit have risen.

(c) The Congress further finds that achievement of full marriage requires the establishment of goals by the President and the coordinated use of the powers of all agencies of the federal government, along with such private action as may from time to time be found helpful by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

TITLE I—GOALS AND GENERAL POLICIES

Sec. 101. (a) The Congress declares and establishes as a national goal the fulfillment of the right of all Americans able, willing and seeking to be married to full opportunities for a meaningful relationship.

(b) The Congress further declares that no provision of this act shall be used to exercise mandatory control over any private citizen except as may be necessary to extract taxes from such citizen to achieve the purposes of this act or as it may be necessary to use powers of the federal government previously authorized or hereafter authorized to achieve the purposes of the act.

Sec. 102. (a) The Congress declares and establishes as an interim goal the reduction of the unmarriage rate for Americans over the age of 16 to no more than 4% and for Americans over the age of 20 to no more than 3%, both goals to be achieved by 1983.

(b) For the purposes of this act the terms marriage and unmarriage are defined to mean marriage and unmarriage as defined by the President of the United States.

Sec. 103. The Congress declares and establishes as a goal the equalization of unmarriage rates among the age, sex, and race categories of the population.

Sec. 104. The Congress declares that it doesn't have the foggiest idea of how to achieve the purposes of this act. Therefore, the President shall submit, within 90 days of its enactment and annually thereafter, the Annual Marriage Report of the President, setting forth:

(a) Current and foreseeable trends in births, deaths, marriages, divorces, engagements and disengagements, with an analysis of recent developments;

(b) Annual numerical goals for these variables and others affecting progress towards the interim goal stated in Section 102 (a);

(c) The specific programs and policies which the President deems necessary to achieve the goals.

Sec. 105. The President shall be assisted

in the preparation of the Annual Marriage Report by a Council of Marriage Counselors consisting of three members, one of whom the President shall designate as chairman. The three members shall be chosen to represent equally the division of the American population by age, sex, race, religion, marital status, educational attainment and geographic location.

TITLE II—STRUCTURAL REMEDIES FOR UNMARRIAGE

Section 201. The Congress declares that in fishing around for ways to reduce unmarriage no stone shall be left unturned.

Section 202. Within 180 days after enactment of this act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report evaluating the effects on the unmarriage rate of present legal restrictions on polygamy, with such recommendations as he or she considers appropriate.

Section 203. Within one year after the enactment of this act the President shall submit to the Congress a cost-benefit analysis of divorce by unilateral demand, including an estimate of the extent to which the resulting increase of marriages would exceed or fall short of the resulting increase in divorces, with such recommendations as he or she considers appropriate.

Section 204. Individuals or classes of individuals who consider their marriage opportunities to have been injured by the marriage of American citizens with foreigners may file a claim for relief with the International Trade Commission. If, after a hearing, the International Trade Commission finds that injury has been suffered, it shall submit a report with recommendations for corrective action to the President. Corrective action may consist of:

(a) Limitation of the entry of foreigners into the United States for the purpose of marriage;

(b) Limitation on the departure of Americans from the United States for the purpose of marriage; and/or

(c) Adjustment assistance in the form of a three-week, expense-paid trip for the injured party or parties to the foreign country of their choice.

(d) If the President chooses not to follow the recommendation of the International Trade Commission he shall submit a report to the Congress with an explanation of his decision.

TITLE III—SPOUSES OF LAST RESORT

Sec. 301. It is the purpose of this act to promote marriages in the following order of priority:

(a) Marriages made in heaven.

(b) Marriages arranged spontaneously and directly by the participants,

(c) Marriages arranged through the personal column of New York magazine, and

(d) Marriages arranged by mothers.

Sec. 302. Only if he or she finds that promotion of marriages of the kinds listed in Sec. 301 is inadequate to achieve the purpose of this act shall the President recommend to the Congress legislation authorizing the establishment of a reservoir of spouses of last resort. This proposed legislation shall include the following provisions:

(a) The reservoir shall include not less than 100,000 nor more than 200,000 eligible spouses of last resort. These eligible spouses of last resort shall be full-time employees of the federal government engaged for this purpose in accordance with Civil Service regulations and qualifying for compensation at the rate of a GS-9.

(b) Any unmarried American citizen over the age of 16 shall have the right to claim a spouse from the reservoir, subject to the

limitation in Sec. 302(c). The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall establish regulations to provide appropriate eligibility criteria to determine the order of priority of access of any person to the reservoir.

(c) No person who has rejected a bona fide offer of suitable marriage of the kinds listed in Section 301 shall have the right to claim a spouse from the reservoir within a period of 6 months following that rejection.

(d) Eligible spouses of last resort who have been claimed and married shall be removed from the reservoir but shall be promoted to grade GS-10 and remain employed at that grade for as long as the marriage arranged under this Title shall last.

(e) At the number of eligible spouses of last resort in the reservoir is depleted by marriage, resignation or death the reservoir shall be restored to its initial size by the recruiting of new employees.

TITLE IV—SEPARABILITY

Sec. 401. Whom Congress has put together, let no man put asunder.

Sec. 402. Amen.

ALIEN-SSI PROGRAM ABUSE

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a report of the General Accounting Office, dated February 22, 1978, on the subject of aliens receiving public assistance payments under supplemental security income. The report concludes by recommending that the Secretary of State:

In cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, develop more stringent income criteria for judging the ability of a sponsor to support a visa applicant.

Emphasize to consular officers the importance of screening aliens who may apply for public assistance.

The report further recommends that Congress enact legislation:

Establish a residency requirement to prevent assistance payments to newly arrived aliens, if the condition upon which eligibility is established existed before entry.

Make the affidavit of support legally binding on the sponsor.

Make aliens subject to deportation if they receive Federal, State, or local public assistance because of conditions existing before entering the United States.

Most alarming about this report is the Comptroller's conclusion that restrictions in the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Social Security Act are not preventing newly arrived aliens from receiving public assistance. The report estimates that 63 percent of the newly arrived aliens receiving SSI in the States of California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York were in the United States for 1 year or less when they applied for SSI. Further the report shows that 37,500 aliens who have been in the United States for 5 years or less, in the above-mentioned five States, receive

about \$72 million in SSI benefits annually. Even though present law provides that any alien in the United States can be deported by the Attorney General if, within 5 years after entering, he or she has become a public charge from causes not affirmatively shown to have arisen after entry, only 17 of the 93,009 aliens deported between 1971 and 1975 were deported as public charges.

The report includes examples of obvious abuses of SSI by aliens:

In July 1976 a 64-year-old alien entered the United States. His daughter signed an affidavit of support in which she cited an annual salary of \$25,000 and assets valued at about \$130,000. The alien applied for SSI in November 1976—four months after his arrival and 17 days before his 65th birthday. As of July 1977 the alien and his wife, who had immigrated earlier, were receiving SSI benefits of \$557 per month.

A 68-year-old alien entered in June 1976. She applied for SSI 9 days after her arrival and began receiving benefits of \$220.07 a month in July. Her monthly benefits were later increased to \$257.07, retroactive to July, when a medical examination verified that she was legally blind.

In the Ways and Means Committee in June 1977, I offered an amendment to H.R. 7200 which would have imposed a 5-year residency requirement to prevent SSI payments to newly arrived aliens. The amendment failed by a close vote and was not considered on the floor because the bill was considered on a suspension calendar. Nonetheless, I am hopeful that such an amendment will be attached in the other body and I hope we will accept such an amendment in conference if it so prevails.

I also intend to present legislation to carry out the two other GAO recommendations, for example, making affidavit of support legally binding and making aliens subject to deportation if they receive governmental assistance because of conditions existing before entry.

I hope Congress will quickly implement the thoughtful recommendations of the General Accounting Office. The support of the American people for public assistance programs is unduly strained by media reports that newly arrived aliens are immediately filing for and receiving public assistance.

The United States should continue to be a nation ready to welcome to its shores people in need, and I believe that our liberal immigration policies reflect that commitment. But the SSI program was not designed to be the incentive it has become for the world's aged, blind, and disabled to emigrate to our shores. The Congress should take swift and decisive action to restore this program to its original intent.

PANAMA CANAL TREATIES

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, every one of us has been inundated with letters,

telegrams, and telephone calls from constituents who wanted to express their opinions on the Panama Canal treaties. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues one of these expressions of concern which I have received.

Mr. Errick G. Bridwell of West Columbia, S.C., has sent me a copy of an editorial broadcast which was aired on WEAB Radio in Greer, S.C. I was impressed by this commentary, and Mr. Bridwell has expressed some of my own concerns in a humorous yet effective manner. I ask that this statement be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

It's the year 2023 and the President is angry, very angry. He's about to lose his job. There won't be any united numbers of states left. Therefore the United States of America will disappear. Preposterous you might say.

This story was given to me by a Gypsy fortune teller who viewed this future scene from gazing into her crystal ball.

Turn the calendar back to the year 1978. Americans felt we had unfairly swindled Panama out of their sovereign territory. President Carter got the Senate to give the American canal in Panama back. Of course some opposition developed, but it was weak and divided. Human rights demand we not keep any colonial possessions.

No more controversy developed until 1985. The Soviet Union filed a complaint at the United Nations. They claimed the United States had used fraud and deception in buying Alaska. America paid pennies an acre for land worth thousands. At first President Jerry Brown didn't want to return our 49th state. Yet the Russians threatened war, so we returned Alaska. After all it was on their border and had been part of their territory.

Within the year Canada lodged a request for the return of the "Oregon Territory." After months of debate the United States Senate ratified a treaty that apologized for owning part of Canada.

The Madam, then interrupted her story, to tell me that the crystal ball had become cloudy. I inquired why? She stated that Los Angeles was being given to Mexico. This was around 1990. And Mexico had so many illegal aliens living in California that Congress felt it was part of Mexico. The only people who protested were the residents of Beverly Hills.

No other territory came into question until about the year 2000. At that time France requested ownership of what was formerly the "french territory." A large minority of the public protested this claim. They argued that we had bought and paid for this land and therefore we should keep it. Reason prevailed and France got its property.

Events developed very quickly. A hurricane and volcano eruption eliminated Hawaii. Texas declared its independence which was quickly granted since all the oil had already been pumped out. Florida was returned to Spain.

The United States had gradually returned to the original thirteen colonies. Consistency remained for about 20 years. Then England got all of the colonies with the exception of Florida which was jointly owned by Spain and Walt Disney Industries. The Queen, however, refused to take the city of New York.

This was the year 2022 and the whole United States of America was made up of the city of New York. After about a year the city went bankrupt and was placed at public auction. The island was bought by China to become a garbage dump.

That ended what was finally left of the United States of America. The President and everyone else had to move. The fortune teller then offered to read my palm.

"Forget it," I said. "The crystal ball has already given me a headache. Your story sounds incredible to me." She laughed and told me that in 1970 she predicted the story that a toothy peanut farmer from Georgia would be elected President.

"Wow, your crystal ball must really be good to make a prediction like that," I honestly stated. She replied it wasn't that good, she had predicted that Billy would be the one.

DO NOT RAISE THE BRIDGE, LOWER THE RIVER

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have all seen how complaints or instructions can result in unexpected responses. For example, city traffic planners must be chagrined at the public's response to all those "Walk-Do Not Walk" signs on our city streets. Whenever the light changes from "Walk" to "Do Not Walk," we run.

Much the same chagrin has befallen those who have criticized the administration's natural gas pricing policies and its mishandling of the Mexican Government's offer to sell to the United States badly needed natural gas.

In December, six U.S. gas transmission companies were negotiating to import up to 4 percent of America's natural gas needs from Mexico. The gas would be brought to the Texas border from newly developed gas fields in southern Mexico by a new \$2 billion, 800-mile pipeline. The companies wished to buy 2 billion cubic feet of gas each day. The price was to be \$2.60 per Mcf, which was merely the world price plus a bit extra to help with the pipeline costs.

This deal is now off, due to administration pressure. The Energy Department was afraid that a price of \$2.60 would be too sharp a contrast with its proposed \$1.75 ceiling on the price allowed domestic producers for U.S. gas. But instead of deregulating domestic gas, the administration tried to force down the price of Mexican gas. Mexico broke off negotiations on December 23.

Mexico is a sovereign country not subject to artificial U.S. price controls. Mexico is a poor country which cannot afford to build a \$2 billion pipeline in order to give away its finite natural resources at less than the world price.

In effect, the administration tried to salvage its discredited domestic energy plan by extending U.S. price controls to a foreign country. It must have reasoned as follows:

If we get the gas at \$1.75, it makes our proposal look great. If we don't get the gas, we can cry "shortage" and claim we need the energy bill now more than ever!

The stage was set for this debacle last spring when administration energy planners first made the outrageous claim that no additional gas could be found in the United States at prices above \$1.75. Thus, they reasoned, a price ceiling of

\$1.75 would not cost us domestic production nor force us to increase our imports of OPEC oil or gas above levels which would be needed under deregulation. Therefore, there would be no added costs of expensive imported replacement fuels needlessly imposed on the Nation by the President's energy plan. In fact, there are such costs, and they are so large as to offset all or most of the costs of deregulation.

The first blatant evidence of the higher cost of energy awaiting the Nation under the energy plan came when the administration approved imports of Algerian liquified natural gas (LNG) at prices ranging from \$3.26 to \$4.50 a thousand cubic feet, roughly twice the price the administration is willing to let American producers receive for domestic gas. Not only is this gas from an OPEC nation, but we are to pay a price \$1 to \$2 greater than we would have to pay even under deregulation. How do consumers benefit from buying LNG from Algeria at \$4.50 per Mcf rather than \$2.25 gas from Texas? How do domestic energy workers benefit? How is our balance of payments helped?

These questions are terribly embarrassing to energy officials. Thus, when the American firms began negotiating with the Mexican Government to purchase natural gas at \$2.60 per Mcf, the officials balked. Liquified gas from across the sea is one thing. At least it sounds different from American gas. However, natural gas out of a pipeline just across the border from similar gas and similar pipelines in Texas is another matter. There, the obvious absurdity of the sameness of the products and the difference in the prices too clearly pointed out the folly of the administration's regulation scheme.

And so, the administration responded to its critics. Unfortunately, it responded by running, not walking, to prohibit the importation of this badly needed gas from a friendly nation, rather than by removing price controls to give American producers a green light to increase output.

I suppose that when the public begins to complain about having to freeze in the dark under the national energy plan, the President will order HEW to distribute to every family a supply of hot water bottles and those electronic goggles the Army uses to see at night. I hope there will be enough fuel to heat the water for the bottles and charge the batteries for the goggles.

**NO AMERICAN AID TO NATIONS
THAT PROMOTE TERRORISM**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in this House recently linking the issue of human rights

CXXIV—268—Part 4

to U.S. foreign aid policies. I agree that this issue of human rights should be of paramount importance to us. I submit that the ultimate denial of human rights is the practice of terrorism. Violent attacks on innocent noncombatants cannot be tolerated by the civilized community.

The greatest violators of human rights are the Communist countries. Not only does the Soviet Union and its puppet states deny human rights to their own captive peoples, but they are the primary organizers of transnational terrorism.

This week's terrorist murder of the distinguished Egyptian editor, Youssef Sebai, by Palestine Liberation Organization members horrified the world. The terrorists then took hostages and commandeered an airliner. These incidents took place in Cyprus where the terrorists had every reason to believe that they would have the cooperation of the authorities.

The Government of Cyprus under the late Archbishop Makarios had been a consistent supporter not only of terrorism but of every Soviet international operation. Makarios himself served on the Presidential Committee of the Soviet controlled World Peace Council. The regime of the present Cypriot President Spyros Kyprianou appears to be following the same path.

Some months ago the Government of Cyprus refused the request of the West Germans to allow them to rescue hostages on a hijacked airliner.

We all remember the dramatic and heroic rescue that took place in Somalia with the cooperation of that Government. In the most recent incident, the Government of Cyprus not only refused to help in the rescue, but treacherously ordered its troops to attack the Egyptian commando team sent on an errand of mercy, securing the deliverance of the hostages from the hands of the terrorists.

Fifteen members of the Egyptian anti-terrorist unit were killed, 14 were wounded, and two more are missing. Today's Washington Post reports that a PLO squad joined with the Cypriot troops in this outrageous ambush. That 12-man PLO terrorist group used Soviet-made AK-47 machine guns. The courageous and well-disciplined Egyptian commandos, knowing that their mission was to rescue the hostages, did not fire back at the Cypriot and PLO attackers despite the casualties. The world mourns the loss of these brave antiterrorist fighters.

Cyprus began collaborating with the PLO when it was adopted by the Soviet Union years ago. Cypriot authorities have allowed the island to be used as an arms depot and safe haven for planning terrorist attacks. Late last year Irish police arrested a member of the terrorist Irish Republican Army and confiscated 5 tons of arms that had been smuggled from Cyprus to Ireland. Most of the arms were manufactured by the Soviet Union and some bore inscriptions in Arabic indicating that they had been consigned to the PLO.

Fifteen million dollars has been allocated for American aid to Cyprus this year. An additional \$5 million has been recommended by the agency for International Development for fiscal year 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that countries providing support for terrorism do not deserve any American aid. When the AID bill comes up on the floor, I intend to oppose any assistance to the Government of Cyprus as long as it continues to provide support to the Soviet-organized international terrorist apparatus. Cyprus could show its good faith by turning the two terrorists now in their hands over to the Egyptian Government for trial.

In our own country, terrorist supporters have been organizing activities on behalf of the Palestine Liberation Organization. This past week, the National Lawyers Guild, a 5,000 member Communist legal front, held a miniconvention here in Washington. The meeting passed a resolution reaffirming the organization's support for the Palestine Liberation Organization.

One of those who urged the NLG delegates to pass the resolution was Victor Rabinowitz, a New York attorney who was many years ago identified as a member of the Communist Party in hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. During the 1960s Rabinowitz was president of the National Lawyers Guild and for many years he has been the paid legal representative of the Cuban Communist regime of Fidel Castro.

Material was distributed at the National Lawyers Guild meeting by the Palestine Human Rights Campaign, a support organization for the PLO terrorists. This group is planning a national conference to generate sympathy for this terrorist group whose atrocities are unabated. The sponsors of the conference include Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett and Jack O'Dell (also known as Hunter Pitts O'Dell), both of whom have been identified as members of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The prime movers in the Palestine Human Rights Campaign are National Lawyers Guild member Abdeen Jabara and Dr. James Zogby.

Other sponsors include Jimmie Durham, head of the terrorist American Indian Movement's International Indian Treaty Council office in New York; Eqbal Ahmad, a fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies and its Transnational Institute which continues to have terrorist leaders on their payroll; Marxist lawyer Kenneth Cockrell, recently elected to the Detroit City Council; and self-admitted "small 'c' communist" David Dellinger.

Those performing the organizing details for the conference are listed as Priscilla Norris and Ted Swedenburg. The full list of sponsors are:

Senator James Abourezk, D. South Dakota.
Prof. Eqbal Ahmad, Sarah Lawrence College.

Daniel Berrigan.
Rev. Phillip Berrigan.
Prof. Noam Chomsky, M.I.T.
Kenneth Cockrell, Detroit City Council.
Tom Cornell, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Judge George W. Crockett, Detroit.
 Dave Dellinger, Editor, Seven Days.
 Dr. Frank Maria, Chairman, Dept. of Near East, Antiochian Orthodox Church.
 Jack O'Dell, Director, International Dept., Operation PUSH.
 Prof. Rosemary Ruether, Garrett Seminary.
 Jimmie Durham, International Indian Treaty Council.
 Prof. Irene Gendzier, Boston University.
 Dr. Carlton Goodlett, President, National Black Publishers Association.
 Marianne Hamilton.
 Dr. Edmund Hanauer, SEARCH for Justice & Equality in Palestine.
 Abdeen Jabara, Atty., Assn. of Arab-Amer. Univ. Graduates.
 Rev. Frederick D. Kirkpatrick, National Black Political Assembly.
 Elizabeth McAllister.
 Prof. Marvin Surkin.
 Rev. Humphrey L. Walz, past Middle East Studies Chairman, United Presbyterian Synod of the Northeast.
 Prof. James Zogby, Palestine Human Rights Campaign.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE GREGORY PUMPED-STORAGE HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECT

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have had drafted and will introduce on February 27, 1978, will authorize the construction of a sizable hydroelectric pumped-storage facility adjacent to Lake Francis Case in Gregory County, S. Dak. In addition to valuable peaking power, this project will provide the potential for additional multipurpose benefits, including irrigation and rural, municipal, and industrial water service. Senator McGovern will introduce the bill in the Senate.

The text of the bill follows:

The Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) as amended, is hereby further amended to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct and to hydraulically, electrically and financially integrate with the existing Missouri River Basin Federal power system for operation and marketing of power, an adjacent-type pumped-storage hydroelectric facility with an estimated total capacity of 1,180 megawatts as part of the Fort Randall Dam-Lake Francis Case Project, South Dakota, with multiple-purpose use of forebay waters under conditions which the Secretary of the Army may subsequently determine, at an estimated cost of \$257,900,000.

Justification for this project was addressed in the umbrella study of the Missouri River Basin conducted by the Corps of Engineers. Following are excerpts from their August 1977 report entitled "Missouri River, South Dakota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Montana: Review Report for Water Resources Development":

Uplands adjacent to the existing main stem reservoirs provide nearly unlimited op-

portunities to develop head for pumped storage hydro-power.

At Fort Randall a differential of 700 feet or more between the right bank plateau and the elevation of Lake Francis Case proved to be a feasible location for a pumped-storage hydroplant, which has been designated as "Gregory County." An additional opportunity was disclosed when residents of local communities and rural areas asked that consideration be given to supplying municipal and irrigation water from the Gregory County forebay.

Construction at river mile 918 of the Gregory County pumped-storage hydroelectric peaking plant consisting of three units with total installed capacity of 1,180 megawatts was chosen on the basis of the following criteria:

It offers a more cost-effective response to the region's need for added peaking capacity.

It has the most wide-spread acceptability of the three hydro-plants selected.

Expressed environmental concerns are few and even they are uncertain to occur.

Powerplant discharges may degrade the aquatic environment by increasing turbidity if fine colloidal sediment deposited by the White River should be resuspended. Pumping may cause some fish mortality unless fish screens are installed, in which case there will be some risk of gilling. Approximately 1,500 acres of terrestrial habitat now in corps will be destroyed along with a natural embayment at Lake Francis Case.

Conversion of approximately 2½ sections of land from agricultural production to forebay storage, and relocation of resident families will be necessary. Peak employment will exceed 1,000 during construction, placing a significant additional demand for services and housing on the nine rural communities within 30 miles of the project site. Addition of 50 permanent jobs will contribute to community cohesion and positive community growth. Helps meet regional power needs.

A brief summary of the project is given on pages 72 and 73 of the report:

A 1,180-megawatt pumped-storage powerplant adjacent to Lake Francis Case, located about three miles south of the Platte-Winner bridge in Gregory County, South Dakota. The pumped-storage facility would consist of a leveed-forebay with an active storage capacity of 46,800 acre-feet; a 1.6-mile long, 30-foot diameter, underground power conduit; a powerhouse with three 394-megawatt reversible pump-turbine units; and a 3,000-foot long trapezoidal-shaped tailrace section. The project would develop an average gross head of 711 feet for peaking capacity. Utilization of the reversible turbines to lift water for municipal and agricultural use to the forebay for ultimate distribution to towns and farms in and near Gregory County could be included as an ancillary function of the project. Perhaps one-half percent of the active forebay storage would be required to meet potential daily irrigation and municipal needs. The forebay operating range would be 61 feet per second and the afterbay (Lake Francis Case) operating range would seldom exceed 50 feet per year. Maximum discharge during generation periods would be 24,740 cubic feet per second and pumpback discharge would be 16,490 cubic feet per second.

The forebay levee would be about 49 feet in average height and 30,100 feet in length. The water surface area of the forebay would be 1,155 acres. About 1,630 acres of private land would be required for the project including seven sets of farm buildings.

At the Gregory County pumped storage powerplant, it is expected that fall migrating waterfowl will use the forebay as a resting stop and the operating cycle will cause some circulation of nutrients. However, the project is expected to have little effect on lake temperature and dissolved oxygen content. Construction activities may add temporary increases in turbidity into the lake. The pumped storage powerplant would create three adverse effects. One is associated with construction of the plant and the two others are associated with the operation activities. The impacts from operation may be able to be ameliorated after further study but the construction impact is considered unavoidable. The effects are:

A productive natural embayment will be preempted and its flora and fauna in large measure destroyed, to provide a site for the powerplant and tailrace channel.

Operation of the powerplant in the pumping mode may draw fish into the pump turbines or otherwise inflict death or injury.

Operation of the powerplant in the generating mode may disturb sediment deposited by the White River, increasing turbidity and degrading water quality to the detriment of the aquatic community.

Transmission lines required for marketing of the additional power would:

Disturb the landscape during construction.

Take land from agricultural production for tower structures.

Increase the visual impact of lines at highways and recreation areas.

Reduce vegetation by clearing within rights-of-way.

Reduce some bird and animal populations as a result of collision with lines and clearing.

A survey will be conducted during post authorization design to determine cultural resources affected within the pool areas and the Gregory County pumped-storage project area.

Principal elements of the Gregory County pumped-storage project consist of a forebay, power tunnel, powerhouse, and discharge channel. Forebay storage of 47,100 acre-feet lies within a levee 30,100 feet long and an average of 49 feet high. An impervious liner about 3 feet thick will prevent seepage out of the forebay bottom; alternatively, a slurry trench cutoff to impervious strata may be used depending upon further geologic exploration. The forebay levee has a 15-foot crown width, and side slopes of 1 on 3 for the top 30 feet of height flattening to 1 on 5 and 1 on 7 on the landward side as dictated by topography and 1 on 5 and 1 on 10 on the reservoir side. The reservoir side of the levee is lined with 8-inch bedding material and 20-inch riprap along the 1 on 3 side slope area while the 1 on 5 slopes are lined with 8-inch bedding and 17-inch riprap. An inclined vertical pervious drain and a horizontal pervious drain permit collection and dis-

posal of seepage flows through the structure. Material for the levee embankment will come from tailrace excavation and forebay collector channel excavation. Dependable capacity was established with the forebay at minimum elevation and Lake Francis case at the base of exclusive flood control.

The Gregory County project would require about 5 years time for construction.

Material for the Gregory County forebay embankment would come from the tailrace and forebay excavation areas.

Prior to construction foundation conditions Gregory County will be evaluated for compatibility with designs, and model studies of the Gregory County project will be made to define effects on lake bottom sediment deposits.

The Gregory County pumped-storage project is designed to operate on a cycle, with on-peak generation for 9 hours a day, 5 days a week and off-peak pump-back for about 8.3 hours a day on weekdays and 13 hours each on Saturday and Sunday. It is estimated by the Federal Power Commission that a plant of this type will be utilized about 1,000 hours annually. If needed during a critical period, the project could generate continuously for 23 hours before pump-back operations had to be resumed.

The economic justification of the project is summarized, as follows:

<i>Justification</i>	
(\$1,000)	
Average Annual Benefits.....	\$51,379
Average Annual Costs.....	33,944
Net Benefits.....	17,435
Benefit-Cost Ratio.....	1.5

<i>Benefit summary</i>	
(\$1,000)	
Capacity:	
Dependable	\$22,140,000
Interruptible	1,025,000
Energy	27,864,000
Total Power.....	51,029,000
Area Redevelop.....	350,000
Total	51,379,000

<i>Hydropower investment and annual cost summary</i>	
(\$1,000)	
First Cost.....	\$237,000
Interest During Construction.....	37,553
Investment Cost.....	274,553

Interest & Amortization.....	18,337
Operation & Maintenance.....	950
Major Replacement.....	77
Pumping Energy.....	14,580
Recreation Loss.....	-----
Annual Cost.....	33,944

<i>Hydropower—First cost summary</i>	
(\$1,000)	
Lands and Damages.....	1,372
Dam	113,600
Powerplant	88,210
Roads	4,700
Bldg., Grounds, Utilities.....	350
Perm. Oper. Equipment.....	200

	<i>Pumped storage</i>
Engineering & Design.....	15,300
Supervision & Inspection.....	13,268
Total	237,000

The Chicago Regional Office of the Federal Power Commission confirmed the need for additional generation capacity and agreed with the adequacy of the economics and final analysis contained in this report with respect to hydropower recommendations:

The Bureau of Reclamation, the hydropower marketing agency for this region, has recommended acceleration of design and construction of all hydropower proposals contained herein. It also certified that the investment in the hydro-facilities could be repaid from revenues in a 50-year period.

Comments by the National Park Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation dealt primarily with the need for more investigation of cultural resources.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service concluded that Gregory County pumped-storage facilities appear to be acceptable from a fish and wildlife standpoint provided fish screens and energy dissipaters are used in the afterbay area.

The corps report concludes:

Hydro-power alternatives selected were in every instance more economical than the most likely non-Federal alternative.

A ready market exists for the output from every hydro-power alternative selected.

Pumped-storage hydro-power can be constructed and operated at Gregory County with minimal environmental losses.

In view of the widespread acceptability of the Gregory County pumped-storage project, it should be undertaken first, followed by the additional power units at Fort Peck, then at Garrison.

As Congress moves to consider this legislation, I think my colleagues will come to agree. In view of our critical national energy situation, I urge that we act expeditiously to authorize the Gregory County pumped-storage hydroelectric facilities.

THE FIFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Special Session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs is currently meeting in Geneva, Switzerland (from Feb. 13-24, 1978). The U.S. delegation is ably led by Mathea Falco, senior advisor to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for International Narcotics Matters. Through the good offices of Ms. Falco, I submitted a statement to the commission regarding the efforts of the international community to interdict narcotics trafficking and to eradicate the illicit supply of opium production at its source.

As many of us are aware, the problem

of drug abuse and illicit narcotics trafficking has become a global problem affecting both heroin producer nations and heroin user nations, for both developed and less developed nations. Unless the international community undertakes a commitment to exercise a concerted effort to wage war on drug abuse by pooling its expertise, technology, manpower and funds, this war will not be won and the narcotics traffickers will continue to push their deadly drugs on the citizens of all mankind. No one nation can undertake the herculean task of interdicting narcotics trafficking, eradicating the illicit supply of opium production and treating the untold numbers of citizens that have become dependent upon or addicted to narcotics. No sooner is some progress made in interdicting narcotics trafficking in one part of the world, then it is offset by increased trafficking in another part of the world, and organized with its highly sophisticated operations is very adept at manipulating this illicit traffic from one region of the world to another.

In this regard, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and chairman of the International Relations Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs (Mr. WOLFF), who recently led a congressional delegation on a 10-nation fact-finding mission to Asia and the Pacific, recently reported some of that delegation's findings. The select committee, of which I am a member, has learned that the resurgence of "white heroin" from the Golden Triangle of Southeast Asia (Burma, Thailand, and Laos), that is entering the United States has increased in the last 18 months from about 5 to 10 percent to approximately 30 percent, and that the amount of brown heroin from Mexico entering this Nation has declined during the same period from about 80 percent to approximately 70 percent. Furthermore, Japan, a nation of approximately 100,000 to 200,000 addicts, is a major producer and exporter of more than 500,000 tons of acetic anhydride—a critical ingredient used to refine heroin from opium gum.

In my remarks to the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, I took exception to the view that there has been a decline, first, in heroin availability and drug abuse in the United States, second, in the number of heroin-related deaths and injuries, and third, in the levels of heroin purity. I have also attempted to impress upon the nations attending the U.N. Commission's Fifth Special Session the urgency for nations of the international community to contribute (or to increase their contributions) to the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), for only through a united effort will the war on drug abuse be won.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to alert my colleagues to the magnitude of the drug abuse problem throughout the world and the seeming endless struggle in waging war on drug abuse and the highly organized criminal narcotics traffickers, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD

the complete text of my statement before the Fifth Special Session of the U.N. Commission.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

(Fifth special Session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Geneva, Switzerland, February 13-24, 1978)

Mr. Chairman, Delegates to the Fifth Special Session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, although I am unable to participate directly with you in the important deliberations of this distinguished body, I do welcome this opportunity to convey my greetings to you and to share with you my thoughts and the thoughts of some of my colleagues concerning the efforts by the international community to stamp out the world-wide problem of narcotics trafficking and to eradicate the illicit supply of opium production at its source.

Ladies and gentlemen, as most of you are well aware, the problem of drug abuse is not unique to any one nation or to any particular region of the world. Rather, drug abuse has become a global problem that has reached epidemic proportions for both heroin producer nations and heroin user nations, for both developed and less developed nations. It effects all mankind causing, as you know, physical and emotional damage to the victims of narcotic drugs. No nation is immune to the devastating, debilitating effects that drug abuse causes to its citizens or to the insidious transactions of the sophisticated international criminal syndicates whose operations reach into every continent of the world and into every facet of a nation's society, corrupting public officials and private citizens, undermining the administration of justice and eventually destroying the decency, moral values, and the very roots of that nation's society. These narcotic traffickers . . . these merchants of death whose pockets are lined from the profits of human misery . . . must be checked, but the waging of "war" on drug abuse requires the concerted effort of the entire international community of the scourge of all mankind is to be eradicated from our midst.

Recently, assertions have been made, similar to those presented before this body and in other quarters, that there has been a decline (1) in heroin availability and drug abuse in the United States, (2) in the number of heroin-related deaths and injuries, and (3) in the levels of heroin purity. I must take exception to this view and to the interpretation of the available data upon which this viewpoint is based.

In the Congress, the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, of which I am a member, has been holding hearings on the scope of drug abuse and the extensiveness of prevention and control. From the facts revealed in these hearings, there is every reason to believe that heroin availability and the problem of drug abuse has not declined, but to the contrary, that the problem is escalating rather than decreasing.

Two salient conclusions become apparent from our hearings: (1) that we really do not know the extensiveness of the amount of heroin and cocaine that is entering the United States, and (2) that we do not know the total number of narcotic addicts, since not all cases of heroin dependency and heroin addiction are reported. Even the criteria used in determining heroin purity levels have been challenged by some of the members of our Select Committee. But we do know that narcotics trafficking is big business and that the heroin problem is herculean both in the extensiveness of the money involved in the financial transactions and in the human misery caused by the illicit trafficking.

In the United States alone, it has been

conservatively estimated that narcotics trafficking amounts to an estimated \$10 billion in gross annual sales and results in approximately \$17 billion in drug-related crimes. According to some authorities, the number of narcotic addicts both in and out of treatment has fluctuated between 670,000 and 722,500 in the last four years. Others estimate the range between 500,000 and 800,000 and closer to the 800,000 figure. Several thousands of our citizens . . . mostly our youth . . . annually succumbing to drug overdoses.

Preliminary reports from our Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) indicate that in 1977 U.S. drug law enforcement agencies seized a total of 888 pounds of heroin and 1,624 pounds of cocaine, which I understand is a decline from 1,213 pounds of heroin and 1,676 pounds of cocaine seized in 1976, but an increase over the 682 pounds of heroin and the 1,233 pounds of cocaine seized in 1974.

Mr. Chairman, the fluctuations in the annual seizures of heroin and cocaine do not necessarily mean that the availability of these dangerous drugs for illicit transactions has declined or that we have turned the corner in winning the "war" on drug abuse. To the contrary, it could mean that organized crime has become more sophisticated and skillful in eluding law enforcement detection.

Our drug law enforcement agencies, composed of dedicated men and women who daily risk their lives to interdict narcotics trafficking, are waging a seeming endless struggle to prevent the tide of heroin from crossing our borders and from entering the bloodstream of our citizenry. It would be a grave error to assume that the international criminal syndicates are standing still while law enforcement agencies interdict narcotics trafficking operations or that organized crime is not developing ingenious techniques to evade law enforcement detection. Regardless of the different interpretations pertaining to the amounts of heroin seized, heroin deaths reported, or heroin purity levels sold on the street, one conclusion is inescapable: namely, that we must not be lulled into a sense of complacency by thinking that these statistics indicate that the "war" on drugs has been won.

The "war" on drug abuse is a continuous struggle against highly organized criminal syndicates whose narcotics trafficking business represent billions of dollars in profits. The mere recitation of the amounts of heroin and cocaine seized, the annual estimates of heroin deaths, or the fluctuation of the levels of heroin purity that is sold on the streets throughout the world mask this constant battle between law enforcement agencies and organized crime. For example, last month U.S. drug law enforcement agencies smashed an international narcotics operation in Las Vegas and New York, including the arrest of two individuals for allegedly carrying 45 pounds of Mexican heroin and \$625,000 in cash. Preliminary reports from our Drug Enforcement Administration indicate that in January it seized 164 pounds of heroin and cocaine worth an estimated "street value" of \$36 million. Last January, a major New York drug trafficker, whose international operations annually yielded an estimated \$200 million in heroin and cocaine trafficking, was sentenced to life imprisonment and 10 of his lieutenants received sentences ranging from 15 to 30 years in prison.

The magnitude of this sordid, narcotics trafficking business is further exemplified by the annual report of the United Nations International Narcotics Board. Commenting on heroin trafficking trends originating from Southeast Asia, the 1977 report stated:

World seizures of heroin originating from Southeast Asia in 1976 (more than 1,600 kg) at least equaled total world seizures from all sources in 1975. Eighteen Western European

countries, Canada, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have all reported substantial seizures of heroin of South-East Asian provenance. Reported seizures and Governments' estimates of the size of addict populations in Burma, Thailand, the Territory of Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore show that the area is a major consumer of its own illegal opium products. Nevertheless, sufficient opiates are produced to support a world-wide traffic with an increased impact. All indicators thus point to undiminished opium production in South-East Asia.

Reports of increasing heroin and cocaine trafficking from the Middle East and Latin America to Europe, Canada and the United States indicate a drug abuse epidemic of global proportions and the creation by international criminal syndicates of regional narcotics distribution centers in Amsterdam, Berlin, Miami, New York, Chicago and Vancouver. West Germany's Federal Police Director Erich Strass recently stated that last year 380 citizens from West Germany and West Berlin (mostly that Nation's youth) succumbed to drug overdoses. He estimated that the number of drug addicts in his country at about 40,000 and stated:

Their number [is] likely to increase in the next few years despite the increasing success of police in the fight against narcotics.

In Canada, heroin trafficking represents the fifth largest industry in British Columbia grossing, according to Canadian law enforcement officials, "at least \$255 million a year." According to that Province's attorney general in a report entitled, "A Proposal For Reducing Drug Trafficking and Abuse in British Columbia" (March 1977), British Columbia needs over 365 pounds of heroin smuggled into Vancouver to supply its addict population for a year. The report also stated that "60 percent of the crime in British Columbia is drug-related."

Heroin addiction in Canada and in Western Europe has reached epidemic proportions to such an extent that Canadian, British, French, and Dutch law enforcement officers have joined their colleagues in Thailand, a nation that has an addict population estimated between 300,000 and 600,000, in trying to eradicate the illicit opium production.

Reports from the Middle East indicate an increase in drug abuse and poppy cultivation. Iranian officials acknowledge an addict population of 400,000. Egyptian law enforcement officers estimate that 3 to 6 tons of opium are consumed by 500,000 of that nation's citizens.

Under the leadership of my distinguished colleague, Congressman LESTER WOLFF, who was a member of the U.S. Delegation to the recently concluded U.N. General Assembly and who is the chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the U.S. General Assembly recently adopted a resolution that recognized "the growing threat caused by the spread of drug abuse in many parts of the world" and requested the U.N. Economic and Social Council "to consider convening a session exclusively devoted to all problems related to drug abuse," an activity that I believe is urgently needed in order to focus global attention on the magnitude of the drug abuse problem and one which we should all endorse.

But this distinguished body must do more than pass resolutions. It must become a catalyst to arouse the consciousness of the international community to the horrors of drug dependency and drug addiction. It must exert the urgently needed leadership to wage "war" on drugs on three fronts: (1) The interdiction of narcotics trafficking, (2) the eradication of the illicit supply of opium production at its source and (3) the improved treatment and rehabilitation of the untold hundreds of thousands of citi-

zens throughout the world who have become dependent upon or addicted to drugs.

Last year, at the 27th session of this distinguished Commission, I reported to you that the Congress of the United States was concerned that its contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), which amounted to about 80 percent of the fund's budget, constituted an imbalance with regard to the international community's efforts to commit itself to a concerted effort to wage "war" on drug abuse. I stated then that there is a "feeling in the Congress of the need for a broader, more equitable assumption of the fiscal responsibilities of the world's narcotic problems." Although some financial redress of this imbalance has been achieved in 1977, a "broader more equitable assumption of fiscal responsibility" by nations of the international community still remains to be resolved.

Last year from January 1 through December 7, 38 nations contributed a total of \$8,051,000 to UNFDAC, of which the United States contributed \$4 million or slightly less than 50 percent of the fund's budget. Under the leadership of the fund's executive director, Ambassador J. G. de Beuss, substantial contributions by Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, and from the private sector . . . the Japanese Shipbuilding Industry Foundation . . . totaling \$3,089,000, were received. But 34 nations, many of whom are attending this conference today, contributed only \$962,000 (less than 24 percent of the non-U.S. contribution) or an average of \$28,294 per nation, with many nations making minuscule contributions or no contributions at all.

If more nations would fulfill their responsibility of contributing to the Fund and if the 34 nations that contributed \$962,000 in 1977 would increase their contributions to the Fund, then clearly the work of the Fund could be expanded and its impact in controlling drug abuse would be more pronounced.

Mr. Chairman, as this distinguished body examines its past record, let us bear in mind that only through the concerted action by all of us attending this session, together with other world leaders, can the war on drug abuse be won. Much work remains to be done. We must intensify our efforts to interdict narcotics trafficking, to eradicate the illicit supply of opium production, to reduce the demand for drugs, and to treat and rehabilitate the maimed citizens who have fallen victim to drug abuse.

In this regard, we need to commit more money, manpower and equipment if our concerted mission—victory over drug abuse—is to be achieved. We do not have to be reminded that the narcotics traffickers are not going to stand still while we are waging war. They are not going to stop pushing their deadly drugs onto our cities, towns and in the schools throughout the world merely because our law enforcement agencies have obtained some degree of momentary success in interdicting a few hundred pounds of heroin, or in reducing some of the illicit supply of opium production, or in sentencing a few drug traffickers to prison. The international criminal syndicates are going to continue to conduct their illicit transactions, they are going to persist in feeding upon the human misery that narcotics trafficking brings to our citizens, and they are going to prevail . . . unless we exert concerted action to intensify our efforts by pooling our expertise, technology, manpower and funds in waging war on organized crime and drug abuse.

Ladies and gentlemen, the war on drugs can be won if we collectively take the initiative—if we have the courage to act upon our convictions. Well intentioned words are not enough to do the job. The time to act—to translate our words into deeds—is upon us.

Let us not fail to undertake that task to fulfill our responsibility for making the world a better place for all of us.

THE CANAL'S VITAL DEFENSE ROLE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the continuing need for the United States to control the Panama Canal cannot be overemphasized in today's world of growing Soviet military might and aggressiveness. Instead of becoming less vital, it is more vital, as retired Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Gatsis USA (Ret.) recently pointed out in the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine for January 1978. If one looks at the succession of events such as withdrawal of troops from Korea, abandoning the B-1 bomber, concessions in SALT II, stopping continued production of the Minuteman missile, the trend is ominous. Giving away the Panama Canal appears to make the case that we are becoming a nation of lemmings rushing to sea to destroy ourselves. The article by General Gatsis follows:

THE CANAL'S VITAL DEFENSE ROLE

(By Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Gatsis (USA, Ret.))

Protection of property and defense of the lives of its people are the sole legitimate purpose of government and national defense is the highest order of business when it comes to survival and preserving freedom.

But now, in the name of "morality," our political leaders tell us we must acquiesce in suicide and give the U.S. Canal on the Isthmus of Panama away. This grandiose sellout is cloaked in distorted projections of so-called past crimes committed by the United States against humanity. So to ease the "guilt," we must now purge ourselves and give a sizable chunk of U.S. sovereignty to a nation which is in close collaboration with Communist Cuba and the Soviet Union, nations whose ideology clearly calls for our destruction.

Advocates of the treaty, in addition to arousing a sense of remorse in the American public, are pouring it on about the dire consequences of violence in Latin America in the event their gift-bearing proposal fails. This tactic is aimed at scaring U.S. citizenry into supporting the treaty. Still fresh in their minds is the memory of the Vietnam War which their own government would not let them win.

This same gloom and doom theory which canal treaty proponents are using today was a major factor in the Vietnam defeat. The commander of all U.S. military forces in the Southern Command has clearly stated that U.S. fighting men on the Canal Zone are well prepared to protect American lives and property in the event it becomes necessary. Furthermore, conditions there are entirely different from those in Vietnam. We are closer to the area, with shorter supply lines, and are capable of choking our opponents off from any outside help. If such were not the case, however, are we going to give in continuously to every demand that comes along and refuse to fight until there is nothing left to fight for?

Most of what one hears from the current Administration regarding the military importance of the canal has been slanted to imply that it is no longer the military asset it once was, since supertankers and the

Navy's big combat ships are too large to use the canal.

Contrary to what is said about its declining strategic and economic value, the truth is that this inter-ocean waterway is more important than ever to the United States because of Soviet expansion in sea power.

While the present canal is too small for some ships, hundreds of combatants from submarines to cruisers can be funneled through the transit, as can the vital fleet train needed to sustain the combatants. This ability to shift naval forces from one ocean to another also takes on added importance in view of the reduced size of U.S. Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

As fighting assets become fewer, the demand for flexibility becomes greater. This compensates in part for the inadequacy of fighting ships and enables us to obtain maximum combat effectiveness with what we have. It makes it possible to meet more contingencies, with limited combat elements in reduced time through a stepped up ability for quick reaction. Quick response means shorter routes and greater speed; greater speed means surprise and early engagement. Arriving at the battle early is critical to its outcome, for this is the time victory weighs heavily in the balance.

The canal provides just the flexibility which enables forces to shift quickly from the Pacific to the Atlantic. It enhances the capability for rapid supply to combatant ships and also to fighting ground troops, wherever they might be. Furthermore, fueling requirements to operate sea power forces become less.

It is ironic that we prepare to throw flexibility away when U.S. strategic military plans for the initial stages of a hot NATO war strictly depend upon this flexibility. Specifically, these plans call for strengthening ground forces in Europe with units located in the Pacific and on the West Coast. Rationale for this military concept is inadequate conventional ground forces now positioned in Europe to cope with an all-out Warsaw Pact offensive. A force structure of 16 Active Army and three Marine divisions demands this risky strategy in view of an understrength reserve and insufficient mobilization time for building necessary reinforcements.

To implement such a plan, a rapid throughput capability for shipping military equipment, supplies and combat forces to the area of conflict is needed. Obviously, to accomplish this feat, complete control of the canal by the United States would be of the most urgent nature. Even if the proposed terms of this new treaty to provide neutrality for this critical waterway were feasible, what sovereign power in time of war would allow his enemy to share the same assets in prosecuting a war against him? Requirements of war demand unquestioned denial of every possible resource and geographic area which enhance his capability to pursue the conflict. Effective denial can be accomplished only by possessing full authority and domination over the assets in question.

In the view of the Soviet expansion of sea power throughout the world, coupled with clearly offensive Soviet naval doctrine, we cannot risk losing to the Communists this most necessary defense link. The Soviets freely admit that their offensive doctrine is designed to cut our lines of sea communications. Furthermore, since U.S. naval doctrine is defensive and one of deterrence, we must be able to respond to Soviet initiatives quickly. Limiting access routes would surely slow reaction time to any thrust the enemy might make.

If the canal is of such little importance to us economically and strategically, why are the Soviets so interested in it? Certainly their discussion with the Panamanian government last July about the periphery of

the canal and use of Colon must arouse the curiosity of the most naive person.

Freedom to use the seas at will is vital to U.S. security, both in war and peace. The system of alliances, on which U.S. security depends, cannot endure without the assurance that seabornd transportation will not be interrupted or hampered. We and our allies depend upon the network of world trade not only for our prosperity, but for our survival. The first principle of the defense policy of the United States and its allies is that they must be capable of controlling the seas if their freedom in this area is challenged. Full ownership of the canal makes this possible.

Why then do the top military men in the Joint Chiefs of Staff support this treaty if the loss of the canal imperils U.S. military effectiveness? Officers on active duty do not wish to jeopardize their military careers, particularly the successful ones who have attained their rank through a combination of ability and adherence to the views of those over them. Others rationalize their actions by comforting themselves that they are good obedient soldiers. In fact, many of them will go beyond obeying orders and take new initiatives to hasten implementation in order to impress their civilian superiors with their "can-do" attitude. The Army Chiefs of Staff and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have amply demonstrated this by speaking to the V.F.W. 1977 National Convention and a gathering of retired generals and admirals, respectively, in an attempt to gain their support for the treaty. If the service chiefs are so adamant in scrapping the old treaty for the good of our defense, why did they not seek the same support against eliminating the B-1 bomber?

Certainly, they did not think eliminating the B-1 bomber would strengthen our defense. Anyone who doubts that the top military brass are not under the gun, only need be reminded of the recall of Gens. Singlaub and Starry when they spoke out against the Administration's policy on U.S. troop withdrawal from Korea and prediction of war with Communist China. Prior chiefs of naval operations, who are now retired and have nothing to lose, disagree with all the present service chiefs and vehemently stand on the position that surrendering this vital artery will be extremely detrimental to the effectiveness of military operations. This alone, should make apparent the falseness of the front the senior military leaders are presenting.

These are the issues before us: Do we wish to fritter away our sovereignty and diminish our world prestige and do we want to weaken our capability to defend U.S. national interests when the time comes? No matter what guarantees are written into the treaty, Americans should know better than to expect a country whose only authorized political party is Communist to honor such an agreement. The broken peace treaty of Vietnam is ample proof of that.

As we gradually approach a drawdown in our military fighting power, such as scratching the B-1 Bomber, stopping production of the Minuteman, which is our intercontinental ballistic missile capability, and weakening our defense posture through the SALT agreements, our leaders now attempt to let another military asset vital to our defense go down the drain.

Too many times it is forgotten that history shows the affairs of nations are not determined by almsgiving and good will toward men, but by power and the will to use it. Is America not going to heed these lessons? There is no better way to unite the country than to alert it factually to its real threat. A campaign to restore belief in American prestige could be more than encouraging to those who remember that the lack of concern for American interests resulted in two military and diplomatic blunders, Korea and Vietnam, whose effect on the

destiny of America has yet to be finally determined.

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, February 23, 1978, may be found in Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 24

7:00 a.m.

Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2522, authorizing funds for the Family Planning and Population Research Act through 1983. Until 1:00 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of Agriculture. 1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review the FY 79 authorizations for the Economic Development Administration with a view to making recommendations thereon to the Budget Committee. 4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Civil Service and General Services Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the General Services Administration. 357 Russell Building

Judiciary

Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the Drug Enforcement Administration's efforts to control drug trafficking on U.S. borders with Mexico. 2228 Dirksen Building

Special Aging

To hold hearings on tax forms and tax equity for older Americans. 6226 Dirksen Building

10 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Environment, Soil Conservation, and Forestry Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the FY 79 authorizations for soil and water conservation projects. 322 Russell Building

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the defense establishment. 1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Hud-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Veterans Administration. 1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of HEW. S-128, Capitol

Armed Services

Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee

To receive testimony on deployment of U.S. troops in Korea. 212 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2065, S. 2470, and S. 2546, to protect consumer rights and provide remedies in electronic fund transfer systems. 5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2348, the Domestic Offshore Communities Seaport Development Act. 235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on and to consider pending nominations. S-116, Capitol

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1990, to establish as an executive department a Department of International Trade and Investment. 3302 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

To mark up resolutions requesting funds for activities of Senate committees and subcommittees and to consider other committee business. 301 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 27

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity. 322 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 1895, to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act. 5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs. 1318 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume hearings on the nomination of G. William Miller, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. 5302 Dirksen Building

Finance

To hold hearings on proposed amendments to the Meat Import Quota Act (P.L. 88-482) so as to reduce the amount of such imports and expand the scope of such imports. 2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the progress of the international negotiations to

establish a common fund for commodities, debt releases for developing countries, and other North-South issues.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To resume hearings to reexamine Federal urban policy.

357 Russell Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on the President's economic report.

1202 Dirksen Building

Select Indian Affairs

To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 102, to reevaluate federal policy as it relates to changes which may need to be made to protect and preserve American Indian religious cultural rites and practices.

S-207, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of HEW.

S-128 Capitol

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for public works projects.

S-126, Capitol

FEBRUARY 28

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on the financial conditions of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.

322 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold a business meeting.

235 Russell Building

**Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee**

To resume hearings on S. 2527, FY 79 authorizations for NASA.

318 Russell Building

***Energy and Natural Resources**

Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

***Human Resources**

To hold a business meeting to consider recommendations it will make to the Budget Committee for the FY 79 budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act; S. 2539; the proposed College Opportunity Act; and S. 2452, creating the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Until noon 4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans Affairs

To consider committee budget resolution.

312 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To consider additional funding for items of the Department of the Interior and related agencies, proposed to be included in a second supplemental appropriations, and to hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for Alaska Land Use.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Military Construction Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for military construction programs.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on the nomination of G. William Miller, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To receive testimony from Energy Secretary Schlesinger in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on Soil Conservation Service projects.

4200 Dirksen Building

Finance

To hold a business meeting to consider recommendations which it will make to the Budget Committee on the FY 79 budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To mark up the Tax Convention with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Exec. K, 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Tax Convention with the Republic of Korea (Exec. P, 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Income Tax Convention with the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. C, 95th Cong., 1st sess.); and Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air (Exec. B, 95th Cong., 1st sess.).

S-116, Capitol

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue hearings to reexamine Federal urban policy.

1224 Dirksen Building

Select Small Business

To hold hearings on small business aspects of the Administration's 1978 tax program.

424 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Education, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

Public Works Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for public works projects.

S-126, Capitol

MARCH 1

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.

322 Russell Building

**Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee**

To continue hearings on S. 2527, FY 79 authorizations for NASA.

235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To continue hearings to reexamine Federal urban policy.

5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the proposed extension of programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (P.L. 93-567).

Until 12:30 p.m. 6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and Land and Water Conservation Fund.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for elementary and secondary education programs, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2441, proposed Federal Public Transportation Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.

6202 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to receive testimony from Energy Secretary Schlesinger on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on the President's economic report.

1202 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for school assistance in federally affected areas, and emergency school aid programs, Department of HEW.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for Department of the Treasury, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.

1224 Dirksen Building

7:00 p.m.

Human Resources

Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2523, proposed extension of authorizations for research and study of sudden infant death syndrome (P.L. 93-270).

Until 10:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 2

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.

322 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2234, FY 79 authorizations for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

3110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the reauthorization of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (P.L. 93-567).

Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

*Select Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on budget estimates to provide for the use and distribution of an award granted by the Indian Claims Commission to the Seminole Indian Nation of Florida.
357 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Park Service.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Education Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board.
S-126, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 2441, proposed Federal Public Transportation Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget

To receive testimony from Defense Secretary Brown in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on S. 2420, proposed International Development Cooperation Act, and FY 79 authorizations for foreign assistance programs.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Education, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of the Treasury, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.
322 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works

Resources Protection Subcommittee

To resume hearings jointly with the Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands and Resources on S. 1820, to preserve examples of America's diverse natural ecological resources for classification, identification, and protection.
4200 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2534, authorizing funds for the Health Maintenance Organization through 1983.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings to receive testimony from Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus, on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on spending practices of individual departments (Mission Budgeting) at HEW, and on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 2441, proposed Federal Public Transportation Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Conservation and Regulation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
6226 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Foreign Assistance Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2420, proposed International Development Cooperation Act, and on FY 79 authorizations for foreign assistance programs.
4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of Consumer Affairs, and Consumer Information Center.
1318 Dirksen Building

MARCH 6

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 10 percent of parity.
Environment and Public Works

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2440, proposed Federal Highway Improvement Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on FY 79 authorizations for HUD.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Robert D. Thorne, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Foreign Assistance Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2420, proposed International Development Cooperation Act.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Education, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

6:00 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To resume hearings on a National Academy of Science study of health care for American veterans.
Until 10:30 p.m. 6226 Dirksen Building

MARCH 7

9:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on the financial conditions of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.
322 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2527, FY 79 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building

Human Resources

Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Regional and Community Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Disaster Relief Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume hearings in connection with the protection of human subjects used in experimental research.
Until 12:30 p.m. 357 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Surface Mining.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Human Development and special institutions, Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

Military Construction Subcommittee

To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for military construction programs, and funds for NATO.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 72, to restrict the activities in which registered bank holding companies may engage, and to control the acquisition of banks by bank holding companies and other banks.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold a business meeting on pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

*Government Affairs

Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee

- To hold oversight hearings on the SBA minority business program.
3302 Dirksen Building
- 11:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations from officials of the VFW.
318 Russell Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Human Development and special institutions, Department of HEW.
S-126, Capitol
- Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of the Treasury, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 8
- 8:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1728, the proposed Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Act, and related bills.
Until 11:30 a.m. 457 Russell Building
- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.
322 Russell Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2527, FY 79 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 50, the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To consider pending legislation.
4200 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Endowment for the Arts.
1114 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 72, to restrict the activities in which registered bank holding companies may engage, and to control the acquisition of banks by bank holding companies and other banks.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2420, proposed International Development Cooperation Act.
4221 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources
Education, Arts, and the Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1753, to extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
1318 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearing on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Coast Guard and St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
1318 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 9
- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.
322 Russell Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1318 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.
1114 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of HEW.
S-128, Capitol
- Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for military construction programs.
S-146, Capitol
- Budget
To receive testimony from HEW Secretary Califano and Labor Secretary Marshall in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold a business meeting to consider recommendations it will make to the Budget Committee for the FY 79 budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Administration's request for the economic support fund.
4221 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the U.S. Tax Court and certain functions under the Executive Office of the President, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 10
- 9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on the financial condition of American agriculture, including the impact of 100 percent of parity.
322 Russell Building
- Commerce, Science and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2478, FY 79 authorizations for the National Rail Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
318 Russell Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on vocational rehabilitation and developmental disabilities.
Until noon 4332 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on ICC's price regulation in the motor common carrier industry.
2228 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Environmental Protection Agency and Council on Environmental Quality.
- Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of the Treasury, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2553, FY79 authorizations for the Maritime Administration.
235 Russell Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
To continue business meeting to consider recommendations it will make to the Budget Committee for the FY79 budget in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on contributions to international organizations, and on the administrative and personnel requirements of the proposed new organization which is to administer the aid program.
4221 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 2502, to authorize the States and the Indian tribes to enter into mutual agreements respecting jurisdiction and governmental operations in Indian country.
457 Russell Building
- MARCH 13
- 9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2090, 2081, and 1919, to extend certain programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2354, to provide for equal access to courts.
2228 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings on FY79 authorizations for HUD.
5110 Dirksen Building

- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on FY79 authorizations for the Export-Import Bank.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on FY79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations.
5221 Dirksen Building
- 10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2478, FY 79 authorizations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK).
235 Russell Building
- MARCH 14
- 9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2090, 2081, and 1919, to extend certain programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act.
6226 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Environmental and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed funding of roads on Indian lands.
4200 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To resume hearings on vocational rehabilitation and developmental disabilities.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 27 and S.J. Res. 28, proposed constitutional amendments to limit the number of terms of services for Members of Congress.
5110 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol
- Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
1114 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for military construction programs.
S-146, Capitol
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on FY 79 authorizations for HUD.
424 Russell Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To continue hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Export-Import Bank.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations.
4221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 991, to create a separate Cabinet-level Department of Education.
3302 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2460, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.
357 Russell Building
- 10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2252, proposed Allen Adjustment and Employment Act.
2228 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the U.S. Postal Service, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 15
- 9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Citizens Shareholders Rights and Remedies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2390, the Citizens' Access to the Courts Act.
6226 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To mark up S. 2065, to provide consumer rights and remedies in electronic fund transfer systems.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Budget
To receive testimony from Federal Reserve Board Chairman-designate Miller in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2552, FY 79 authorizations for the U.S. Travel Service.
235 Russell Building
- Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations.
4221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 991, to create a separate Cabinet-level Department of Education.
3302 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for certain functions under the Executive Office of the President, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 16
- 8:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To resume hearings on H.R. 5029, authorizing funds for hospital care and medical services for certain Filipino combat veterans of W.W. II, and S. 2398, to extend the period of eligibility for Vietnam-era veterans' readjustment appointment within the Federal Government.
Until 11:00 a.m. 357 Russell Building
- 9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2527, FY 79 authorizations for NASA.
235 Russell Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2440, proposed Federal Highway Improvement Act.
4200 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S.J. Res. 27 and S.J. Res. 28, proposed constitutional amendments to limit the number of terms of service for Members of Congress.
6226 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-146, Capitol
- Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Smithsonian Institution.
1114 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on FDIC report on preferential bank lending policies.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 991, to create a separate Cabinet-level Department of Education.
3302 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 2460, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.
Room to be announced
- 10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
S-126, Capitol
- Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2252, proposed Allen Adjustment and Employment Act.
2228 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for certain functions under the Executive Office of the President, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 17
- 10:00 a.m.
Budget
To receive testimony from Secretary of HUD Harris in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2444 and S. 2437, relating to a national program of dam inspection.
4200 Dirksen Building
- MARCH 20
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2040, the Comprehensive Drug Amendments Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4332 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Bureau of Mines.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Export-Import Bank.
5302 Dirksen Building

Budget
To receive testimony from Representative Bolling in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the FY 79 congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building

6:30 p.m.
*Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 258, the Children and Youth Camp Safety Act.
Until 10:00 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 21

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2094 and S. 2389, to abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis of jurisdiction of Federal district courts.
5110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2440, proposed Federal Highway Improvement Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
To mark up S. 364, to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions promulgated by the VA, and to allow veterans full access to legal counsel in proceedings before the VA, and S. 2384, the Veterans and Survivors Income Security Act.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
HUD—Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Science Foundation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Bureau of Land Management.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Federal Highway Administration.
S-126, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To continue hearings on FY 79 authorizations for the Export-Import Bank.
5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2420, proposed International Development Coopera-

tion Act, and FY 79 authorizations for foreign assistance programs.
4221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2552, proposed Alien Adjustment and Employment Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, CSC, Federal Labor Relations Council, and the FEC, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building

MARCH 22

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2084, the Administration's proposed welfare reform legislation.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 35, the proposed Civil Rights Improvements Act.
5110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Improvements in Judicial Machinery Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2094 and S. 2389, to abolish diversity of citizenship as a basis of jurisdiction of Federal district courts.
2228 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2440, proposed Federal Highway Improvement Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD—Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Science Foundation and Office of Science and Technology Policy.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2158, to permit the storing of foreign-caught shark fins at U.S. foreign trade zones for eventual exportation to foreign countries.
235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the GSA, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.
Human Resources
To continue hearings on S. 2084, the Administration's proposed welfare reform legislation.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the status of proposed construction of a Federal Interstate Highway near Memphis Tennessee.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for foreign aid programs.
S-126, Capitol

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to receive testimony from Secretary of State Vance on the Administration's proposed arms transfer policy.
4221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2252, proposed Alien Adjustment and Employment Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for certain Independent Agencies, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 3

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 394, proposed Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Endowment for the Humanities.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the condition of the banking system.
5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Foreign Assistance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on FY 79 authorizations for security assistance programs.
4221 Dirksen Building

APRIL 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To resume hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government items, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
S-126, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the condition of the banking system.
5302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Department of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government items, and on supplemental appropriations for FY 78.
S-126, Capitol

APRIL 5

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates

- for FY 79 for the Federal Aviation Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on U.S. programs and facilities designed to increase U.S. exports.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the current status of the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
318 Russell Building
- 10:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations from AM-VETS Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of World War I.
Until 1:00 p.m. 6226 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 6
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the National Bureau of Standards.
235 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Geological Survey.
1114 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK).
1224 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 7
- 11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of Revenue Sharing, and New York City Seasonal Financing Fund, Department of the Treasury.
1318 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 10
- 9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on authorizations for FY 79 for the National Science Foundation.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to consider the reestablishment of housing goals and proposed extension of existing housing programs.
5302 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 11
- 9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Improvements in Judiciary Machinery Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2253, to encourage prompt, informal, and inexpensive resolution of civil cases by use of arbitration in U.S. district courts.
2228 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2040, proposed Comprehensive Drug Amendments Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings to consider the reestablishment of housing goals and proposed extension of existing housing programs.
5302 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 12
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To mark up proposed Federal Aid highway legislation.
4200 Dirksen Building
- Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2040, proposed Comprehensive Drug Amendments Act.
Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings in budget estimates for FY 79 for the Federal Railroad Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings to consider the reestablishment of housing goals and proposed extension of existing housing programs.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on the current status of the reorganization of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
1202 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 13
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for HUD.
1318 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 14
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for HUD.
1318 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 17
- 9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume mark up of proposed Federal aid highway legislation.
4200 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 18
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the competitiveness of high technology U.S. exports in world markets and the potential adverse impact on exports from declining research and development expenditures by the U.S. Government and industry.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2375, to establish guidelines to be followed by the Department of the Interior in response to petitioning Indian tribes seeking an acknowledgement of a Federal relationship.
5110 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 19
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 20
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for NASA.
1318 Dirksen Building
- Select Indian Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 2375, to establish guidelines to be followed by the Department of the Interior in response to petitioning Indian tribes seeking an acknowledgement of a Federal relationship.
318 Russell Building
- APRIL 21
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for NASA.
1318 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 24
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 25
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building
- APRIL 26
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the National Institute of Building Sciences.
1318 Dirksen Building
- Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for ConRail and the U.S. Railroad Association.
1224 Dirksen Building
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 National Transportation Safety Board and the ICC.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MAY 2
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on budget estimates for FY 79 for the Office of the Secretary, DOT.
1224 Dirksen Building
- MAY 17
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To hold hearings in connection with restrictions employed by foreign countries to hold down imports of U.S. goods.
5302 Dirksen Building
- CANCELLATIONS
FEBRUARY 27
- 9:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on U.S. export policy.
6226 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of building codes on housing rehabilitation.
5302 Dirksen Building