

the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1978.

Anita Miller, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1982.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## THE JUDICIARY

Robert W. Sweet, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

## IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning Robert, L. DeMichiell, to be captain, and ending Robert N. Ross, Jr., to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 6, 1978.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 25, 1978;

## IN THE ARMY

Col. Junior Henry Burkhead, ~~XXXX-XXXX~~, for appointment as brigadier general in the Adjutant General's Corps. Army National Guard of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States, Code, sections 593(a) and 3392, which was sent to the Senate on April 6, 1978.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## MEOW

## HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has now been over 1 year since the President sent Congress his energy message. Although much of the program remains bogged down in conference, it is noteworthy that substantial progress has been made in reducing our oil imports without having Government-forced conservation or energy price controls.

Once again, as the following Wall Street Journal indicates, the Federal Government is "a day late and a dollar short" in its energy policies:

## MEOW

Today we celebrate the first anniversary of President Carter's famous MEOW, the moral equivalent of war. His energy proposals remain bogged down in Congress, but even without the benefit of his program a lot has happened.

During the year we now celebrate, the only detectable energy shortage occurred in those sections of the nation overly dependent on American-produced coal. In California, crude oil is a drug on the market. World-wide, the International Energy Agency sees a "temporary" surplus of oil lasting into the 1980s. U.S. oil imports are no longer growing; indeed the American Petroleum Institute reported yesterday that they fell 14% during the first three months of the year.

Over the year, the price of oil has been steady, meaning that it fell after inflation adjustment. The administration felt free to kill a deal to import huge quantities of natural gas from Mexico because it doesn't like the price U.S. companies have agreed to pay. But the President, Czar Schlesinger and the like continue to assure us that the energy crisis is just around the corner.

Actually, the crisis has more-or-less officially been postponed until 1985 at the earliest. If you want to conjure up a big crisis then, you assume: first, that the Soviet Union will swing from an oil exporter to a big importer somehow finding the foreign exchange to foot this bill; and, second, that Saudi Arabia will cap its production because it likes the old values better than the new money. Because the CIA finds this scenario likely, we're told, we need a big new tax on the production of oil in the United States.

What we have been witnessing in the past year is the huge adjustive power of the price mechanism, even when politicians do all they can to hamper it. Stanford's Henry S. Rowen observes that since 1973, real gross national product has increased by about 11% while

energy consumption has increased by only about 3%. This means that even without legislation, a great deal of conservation is going on as a response to the price increases. Prof. Rowen calculates that, holding production constant, consumers are reducing their energy consumption by about 2% yearly.

Higher prices are not only reducing demand but calling forth greater supply. With environmental and legal roadblocks finally overcome, oil is flowing from Alaska and exploration has started off the Atlantic coast. With somewhat higher gas prices and higher prices for "new" oil, drilling and discoveries in the U.S. have both increased, though not yet fast enough to keep up with consumption. But supply incentives are still uncertain, given the government's record of expropriating the returns from new oil with successive tiers of price controls and state or federal taxes.

It is this supply-demand balance called forth by the price mechanism, and not the beneficence of Saudi Arabia, that has kept OPEC from increasing its prices during the past year. Even a cartel is not immune to the laws of supply and demand; at some point higher prices mean lower sales and lower net income.

The improvement in the energy outlook in the past year has come despite government policy, not because of it. Indeed, the U.S. government has been OPEC's biggest economic ally. American oil imports are high because of the government's entitlements program, which in effect taxes the production of domestic oil and uses the proceeds to subsidize imports. Mr. Carter proposes to "cure" this by taxing domestic oil and using the proceeds to subsidize the consumption of home heating oil.

The way to reduce imports would be to end all entitlements and price controls, paying Americans as much for oil as you pay foreigners. This step would increase the price of gasoline by a maximum of seven cents a gallon; some argue that in fact the price would fall because of greater efficiency. Yet the government sees this simple step as an anathema.

The government's record during 1977 scarcely gives reason for confidence in its prescience about 1985. Over the years there has always been a finite supply of energy visible at any one time; the reason is that it is not economic to develop resources too far in advance. Above all, it is risky to invest too much capital in a single source or single technology. You may guess wrong. Huge sums invested in coal will be wasted if there is a breakthrough in producing geopressurized methane.

We do not know where future energy will come from, but we do know that there is a nearly endless list of possibilities, from coal to methane to nuclear to solar. Over the years, market price mechanisms have proven their ability to make such choices and such transitions smoothly. There will be no crisis if we let them do their work. The only way

there will be an energy crisis in 1985 is if the government causes one. While the administration still has not grasped this, the biggest change since MEOW was declared a year ago is that more of the public and more of Congress now understand. ●

## POLISH CLUB CELEBRATES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

## HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, Brooklyn's St. Aloysius Young Men's Catholic Club in Greenpoint, N.Y., has unselfishly served the cultural and spiritual needs of the Polish-American community while actively participating in national events.

The club will celebrate its 75th anniversary during a banquet on April 29. I commend to my colleagues the following brief history and description of St. Al's and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing this truly remarkable group continued success in the years ahead.

The article follows:

## ST. AL'S 75TH YEAR

On February 3, 1903, the St. Aloysius Young Men's Catholic Club (St. Stanislaus Kostka Parish), Greenpoint, Brooklyn, New York, was organized. St. Al's, as it is commonly known today, was founded on three basic principles.

First, the organization of Polish-American youth to aid them in the fulfillment of their religious and moral obligations.

Second, to maintain a characteristic of brotherly love.

And third, to keep alive the Polish language, customs and traditions, while maintaining a continued interest in the affairs of the nation, community and parish.

Needless to say, through the many years that have followed, numerous changes have taken place; however, these three basic principles have remained and have been adhered to by the membership.

On February 5, 1978, the membership, family and friends participated in the celebration of a diamond jubilee Mass in the Parish church, and afterward, all joined together at a collation in the clubrooms.

On April 29, 1978, a 75th anniversary banquet will be held at Rovnak's Princess Manor, also in the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn. ●

## CAMP SAFETY

## HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the administration on rejecting mandatory Federal youth camp safety standards and enforcement, as recommended by the House Education and Labor Committee in its Youth Camp Safety Act, H.R. 6761, and instead embracing a voluntary State approach as provided in my own Camp Safety Incentive Act, H.R. 5167.

On April 3, 1978, HEW Secretary Joseph A. Califano, Jr., transmitted a letter and bill to the Speaker setting forth the administration's Youth Camp Safety and Health Act of 1978. Like my own bill, the administration's bill calls for the Federal Government to develop model camp safety standards. Some grant assistance is made available to the States to develop their own camp safety programs. Specifically, the bill authorizes \$2 million a year over a 6-year period, on a 50-percent matching basis. States wishing to enable camps within their boundaries to advertise compliance with the model Federal standards would have to have federally approved plans which include supervised inspections.

Mr. Speaker I think the approach decided upon by the administration after a year of deliberation is the proper course. While we are all concerned with the health and safety of our Nation's children, especially when they go away to camp, I do not think the problem was so severe as to warrant massive Federal intrusion into this area which has traditionally been considered one of the police powers of the State.

At this point in the RECORD I include Secretary Califano's letter and the text of the administration's bill:

APRIL 3, 1978.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To provide for the development and implementation of State programs for youth camp safety and health". The draft bill is intended to assure that Federal leadership will be provided to the States through the development of safety and health standards and the provision of grants and technical assistance, to assist them in developing programs which can provide assurance that youth camps meet minimum safety and health standards. The States, however, are to retain full responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of effective safety and health regulations.

The draft bill charges the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with responsibility for developing model youth camp safety and health standards. In carrying this out, he must first consult with State officials and representatives of other concerned public and private agencies. Thereafter, but within one year of enactment of the draft bill, he must develop the standards and within the following 30 days, publish them in the Federal Register. These standards are models for the use of the States and have no regulatory effect until their adoption by one or more States.

The Secretary may also make grants and provide technical assistance to States for purposes such as developing new State programs for assuring youth camp safety and health and coordinating existing activities, developing and conducting training programs for State and camp personnel, designing systems for camps to use in reporting accidents or injuries and procedures for the States to follow in keeping records of these reports for later State and Federal use, and for creating or designating a State agency to implement the State's youth camp safety and health programs and, specifically, monitoring the compliance of individual camps with the State's standards. Grants can be made for no more than 50 per cent of the cost of the activity, and are not to replace State money which would otherwise be available for these purposes.

If a State wishes to enable camps within its boundaries to advertise compliance with the model Federal safety and health standards, it must first have an approved State plan. The plan must provide for State supervised inspections of camps and for prohibiting a camp from advertising its compliance with the Federal standards unless it is appropriately certified by the State agency. The plan must also specify sanctions sufficient to deter uncertified camps from advertising that they meet the model Federal standards.

The Secretary is directed to report to the Congress on the administration of the Act after the second and fifth years of the program, and to include a statement of any changes which he is planning to make in the model standards.

The bill would authorize \$2 million for carrying out the Act in fiscal year 1979, and a like amount for each of five fiscal years thereafter.

We urge the Congress to favorably consider this draft bill.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

/s/ JOSEPH A. CALIFANO, JR.,  
Secretary.

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the development and implementation of State programs for youth camp safety and health

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Youth Camp Safety and Health Act of 1978."

## STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to protect and safeguard the health and well-being of young persons in youth camps, by providing for the development of model standards for the safe operation of such camps, and to provide Federal grants, technical assistance, and leadership to the States in developing and implementing safety and health programs for youth camps, thereby providing assurance to parents and interested citizens that youth camps meet minimum safety and health standards. It is the intent of Congress that the States assume responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of effective youth camp safety and health standards and regulations.

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) "Youth camp" means any day camp, primitive or outpost camp, residential camp, travel camp, trip camp, or short-term group camp whether on public or private land, which is designed to be attended by 10 or more campers at the same time who are under 18 years of age. The terms include any program promoted or advertised as a youth camp and shall also include programs conducted on sites or facilities primarily de-

signed for other purposes such as schools, playgrounds, resorts, wilderness areas, and government lands.

(2) "Day camp" means a camp operated for any part (but less than 24 hours) of the day for at least 5 days during a 2-week period. The term does not include day care centers as defined or licensed by the appropriate State agency.

(3) "Primitive or outpost camp" means a portion of the permanent premises of a camp or other site at which the basic needs of camp operations, such as places of abode, water supply systems, and permanent toilet and cooking facilities, are not usually provided.

(4) "Residential camp" means a camp operating on a permanent site at which the same campers remain for a period of at least 96 consecutive hours.

(5) "Travel camp" means a camp which provides care for not less than a 48-hour period and which uses motorized transportation to move campers as a group from one site to another.

(6) "Trip camp" means a camp which provides care for not less than a 24-hour period and which supervises campers as they travel, either on foot or by a transportation mode permitting individual guidance of a vehicle or animal from one location to another.

(7) "Short-term group camp" means a camp which provides care for more than a 24-hour period but less than a 96-hour period for troops, clubs, or groups of campers sponsored by an organization or person.

(8) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(9) The term "State" includes each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

## YOUTH CAMP SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

SEC. 4 (a). The Secretary, after consultation with—

(1) appropriate State officials, and  
(2) representatives of appropriate public and private organizations,

shall, within one year after the enactment of this Act, develop model standards for youth camps directed toward assuring that such camps are operated in a manner which protects the health and safety of the campers and related to matters such as, qualifications for director and staff; ratio of staff to campers; sanitation and public health; personal health, first aid, and medical services; food handling and group feeding; water supply and waste disposal; water activity safety, including swimming and boating equipment and practices; vehicle condition and operation; building and site design; and condition of equipment facilities and density of their use. In developing such standards, the Secretary shall consider existing Federal guidelines, State and local regulations and standards, and standards developed by private organizations, applicable to youth camp safety and health and shall also consider the experience of State, local, and private agencies and organizations in implementing such regulations and standards, and such other information as may be available.

(b) The Secretary shall, within 30 days after development of the standards referred to in subsection (a), publish these standards in the Federal Register. The published standards may be revised from time to time as determined by the Secretary.

## ASSISTANCE TO STATES

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may provide grants or technical assistance to any State planning to develop a comprehensive youth camp safety and health program. These grants or technical assistance may be used for the purpose of—

(1) coordinating existing education and enforcement activities relating to youth camp safety and health;

(2) creating or designating an appropriate State agency which will be responsible for administration of a youth camp safety and health program;

(3) developing and implementing safety and health programs directed toward specific camping activities such as, aquatics, water skiing, arts and crafts, archery, horseback riding, mountaineering, white-water canoeing and rafting, caving, and proper use of firearms;

(4) developing and conducting seminars and other short term training courses for State youth camp safety and health personnel and for camp health, safety, and supervisory personnel;

(5) designing and implementing procedures and systems for reporting of illnesses or injuries in youth camps within a State's jurisdiction and the keeping of State records of such reports; and

(6) developing programs to monitor compliance with State standards and regulations applicable to youth camp safety and health.

(b) The amount of any grant provided under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs incurred by the State to carry out the activities referred to in subsection (a). Federal funds made available under this section for any period will be used so as to supplement the level of State funds that would otherwise be made available for the activities described in this section, and will in no event replace such funds.

#### YOUTH CAMP SAFETY AND HEALTH PLANS

SEC. 6. (a) Any State desiring to authorize youth camps in that State to advertise compliance with the Federal model youth camp safety and health standards, shall submit to the Secretary a plan which provides—

(1) for the creation or designation of a State agency to be the principal agency in the State responsible for administration of its youth camp safety and health program;

(2) for State-supervised inspections of youth camps and certification of those camps found to be in compliance with the model youth camp safety and health standards developed pursuant to section 4;

(3) that camps certified as being in compliance with those standards will be authorized to advertise that fact through the use of the statement "This camp has been certified by (the appropriate State agency) as meeting the model Federal Youth Camp Safety and Health Standards.";

(4) that any camp not so certified will be prohibited, with penalties sufficient to assure compliance, from advertising or otherwise implying that it meets such standards; and

(5) that the State agency will make such reports and provide such information to the Secretary as he determines to be necessary to carry out his duties under this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall approve a plan submitted by a State if he finds that it meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a).

#### FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH STATE PLAN

SEC. 7. In the case of any State plan approved under section 6, if the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency responsible for administering such plan, finds that the plan has been changed so as not to be in compliance with the provisions set forth in section 6(a) or that in the administration of the plan there has been a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 6(a) to be included in such plan, the Secretary shall suspend approval of the plan until he is satisfied there is no longer any such failure to comply, and shall so notify the State agency.

#### PENALTIES

SEC. 8. Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of a youth camp located in a State which does not have a plan approved pursuant to section 6 and who uses or causes to be used any advertisement or

statement which indicates that such camp is in compliance with the model Federal youth camp safety and health standards is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$1,000.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress after the close of the second and fifth fiscal years for which this Act is in effect a comprehensive report on the administration of this Act, including any changes which are planned in the model youth camp safety and health standards.

#### AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and \$2,000,000 for each of the five succeeding fiscal years.●

### A NEW APPROACH AGAINST OVERREGULATION

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, management and labor are often portrayed as being on opposite sides of most issues, and sometimes they are. There is, however, much room where these two great forces can work cooperatively, to their mutual benefit, and the benefit of the Nation.

I would like to call my colleagues attention to a February 17, 1978, editorial from the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram. It cites a proposal made by the president of Dow Chemical Co., Paul F. Orefice, that management and labor form a coalition to fight Government overregulation.

[From the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram, Feb. 17, 1978]

#### TIME FOR JOINT EFFORT

It is so common for business and industry to complain about government overregulation that, although we fully concur, we are afraid a lot of people pay little attention.

Yet it is a problem that affects labor as well as management, and the proposal by Paul F. Orefice, president of Dow Chemical Co., for a labor-management coalition to fight overregulation is an excellent one.

In a recent talk to the Commonwealth Club of California, Orefice said it's time for the American people to call a halt on government regulations which drive up consumer costs and eliminate jobs.

Orefice urged labor to openly support the need for profits as "the only legitimate way to create and maintain jobs," and for management to support labor's "legitimate desires for better working conditions and steady employment."

Labor and management, of course, have conflicting economic interests up to a point—but to both, it is essential that the business or industry concerned is healthy. There must be fair profits for management and fair wages for labor.

In accomplishing these mutual goals, the less government interference, the better.

Obviously, not all government regulations are bad but, as Orefice said in his talk, regulations must be "logical, workable and economically feasible."

"If labor and management together can't reverse the present trend of excessive federal government intervention," he warned,

"American industry will be stifled and American jobs will continue to be lost by the thousands."

It isn't going to be enough just to complain about excessive regulation. Orefice proposed that the labor-management coalition work to elect legislators "who know what it's like to work in a competitive society . . . what it's like to have to meet a payroll."

Labor and management have more in common than many of their members realize. Overregulation costs both of them money—and could cost them their livelihood.●

### IS WASHINGTON AFFECTING SOMOZA'S DOMESTIC POLICY?

#### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, is Alan Riding, New York Times columnist, who is not known as a friend of Nicaragua's Somoza, giving this administration a message about the effects of some of President Carter's policies?

I submit the following New York Times article for my colleagues' information:

#### SOMOZA APPEARS POLITICALLY ISOLATED AS UNREST SPREADS IN NICARAGUA

(By Alan Riding)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, April 24—Three months after the assassination of a leading opposition figure, Nicaragua remains in a state of unrest, with the campaign to oust President Anastasio Somoza Debayle becoming steadily more violent and radicalized.

Although General Somoza seems in no immediate danger of being overthrown, his Government has been unable to restore order in the country since the slaying January 10 of Pedro Joaquin Chamorro, a newspaper editor who was an outspoken foe of the 45-year rule of the Somoza family.

Today General Somoza appears to be politically isolated, sustained only by the 7,500-man National Guard. "Opposition has spread like a brush fire, consuming one sector after another," a foreign diplomat said. "It's like watching a slow-motion revolution."

In an interview with local reporters last week, General Somoza warned that "I believe that while education in word, speech and action does not stop, we can expect a period of greater violence in Nicaragua."

#### STUDENTS OCCUPY SCHOOLS

The immediate crisis for General Somoza involves the occupation of dozens of high schools and churches by militant teen-age students, but he is also under mounting political pressure because of a three-week-old hunger strike by over 100 opponents of the Government.

In addition, clashes between demonstrators and National Guardsmen take place almost daily in cities throughout the country. So far this month, at least five protesters, and, according to well-placed opposition sources, more than a dozen National Guardsmen have been killed.

The latest offensive against the Somoza regime began last October with a series of attacks on National Guard barracks by leftist guerrillas. But it was only after Mr. Chamorro's still-unsolved killing that opposition groups as diverse as conservative businessmen and Marxist students joined forces to work for General Somoza's overthrow.

Late in January, the country's main business organizations called a two-week work

stoppage to demand the President's resignation. Coinciding with the strike, which was supported by labor leaders, moderate and leftist political groups promoted a series of demonstrations and the guerrilla movement, known as the Sandinist National Liberation Front, carried out new attacks on National Guard barracks.

Since then, however, even opposition leaders seemed to have lost control of the anti-Government offensive as it has spread rapidly and chaotically to the country's urban poor.

INDIAN DISTRICT REBELS

"The country is in an insurrectional mood," a moderate opposition leader said. "I would never have believed that the masses could become so politicized so quickly. The masses are now without either democratic or revolutionary leadership. The situation is rapidly becoming anarchic."

For the last two months, the focal point of the simmering rebellion has been the city of Masaya, 20 miles south of Managua, and its Indian district of Monimbo. The National Guard put down a week-long uprising in Monimbo on Feb. 26, killing at least 40 people and losing as many soldiers, but the Indians there have continued arming themselves and last week they resumed their insurgency.

According to well-placed sources, the rebel Indians, who are actively supported by the guerrillas, have developed a powerful homemade bomb and are well armed, in some cases with submachine guns taken from National Guardsmen whom they have killed. "Monimbo is one big bomb factory," one source said, adding that the Government was expected to launch a new counteroffensive soon.

The campaign by high school students also began in Masaya late in March. Although National Guardsmen using tear gas and automatic rifles last week cleared the city's National Institute of students who had seized it, dozens of other high schools throughout Nicaragua are still being held by military youths.

At the Ramirez Goyena Institute in Managua, teen-age students explained that they were striking in sympathy with the 26-day-old hunger strike of Mrs. Albertina Serrano de Jaen, whose 21-year-old son, Marcio, is serving a five-year prison term for guerrilla activities. Mrs. Jaen and more than 100 others who joined the hunger strike are demanding better prison conditions for Marcio Jaen and another guerrilla leader, Tomas Borge, who have been held in solitary confinement for the last 20 months.

But while most protesters make specific demands of the Government, political analysts believe that the campaigns are all essentially aimed at undermining the regime. "If the Government accepted their demands," a foreign diplomat said, "then they would make new demands. Somoza fears this is the case so he feels justified in turning down most of the demands."

In response to political pressure, General Somoza in fact announced two months ago that opposition parties would be allowed to participate in the next presidential elections in 1980 and that the Inter-American Human Rights Commission and the International Red Cross could send inspection teams to Nicaragua.

But these concessions have failed to defuse the opposition and nonviolent groups have stepped up their efforts to form a broad front against the regime.

Eager to avoid a crisis in his relations with Washington, General Somoza has tolerated press freedom and over the last seven months has arrested only opponents involved in the guerrilla movement. "I have to admit that Somoza has been fighting us with one arm tied behind his back," an opposition leader said. "But if he fights us with

two hands, he may also have to take on the United States." ●

MEMORIES OF LINCOLN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Theodore Safine of Peabody, Mass., has recently sent me a poem written in memory and honor of President Abraham Lincoln.

As Mr. Safine requested, I would like to insert his poem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time, during April, the month of President Lincoln's death:

MEMORIES OF LINCOLN

(By Theodore Safine)

To greater heights where joys await,  
Beyond what here he could attain,  
He traveled forth to reach the light  
That led him to a higher plane.

(A lanky lad by the falling light  
Of well banked fires through the quiet night  
In Kentucky hills so long ago,  
Eager to read, to learn, to know.)

Here is a picture, sad but true,  
Of one whose deeds are known to you  
Who in the world of greats has won  
So much of honor and of fame—  
Abraham Lincoln was his name.

(Young Abe Lincoln, a splitter of rails,  
Reader, writer and teller of tales,  
Wrestler, runner and fisherman, too,  
Whatever boys did, young Abe could do.)

Now that his work on earth is done,  
His body rests beneath the sod  
His soul in peace at home with God.  
Where Heaven's joys his sorrows drown.  
There his soul has long since fled  
And all the tears that he has shed  
Have turned to pearls for his crown.

(Captain, postmaster, riverboat hand,  
Lincoln the merchant in prairie land,  
Love in New Salem, Lincoln and Ann  
All were a part of Lincoln the man.)

Pearls for a crown in Heaven he wins,  
Absolved from earthly errors and sins,  
Gems of gratitude, ample measure,  
Grateful prayers that his heart would  
treasure,

Tears turned to pearls day by day—  
Far too many to make a crown,  
Let the others come drifting down,  
And we will cherish them alway.

(Pardon he had for the soldier boy  
Who slept at his post one lonely night,  
Asleep while the silent hours passed by.  
When the dawn crept over the eastern sky,  
He was sentenced to die in the morning.)

In our remembrance ever near  
Lincoln remains, we hold him dear,  
Though far from earthly smile or frown,  
His labor has not been for naught  
For all the deeds on earth he wrought  
Have turned to stars to make a crown.  
Stars! A multitude they measure,  
For his crown a priceless treasure!  
His deeds of mercy, day by day,  
Are bright beside the Milky Way.  
A great memorial display—  
We'll gaze and cherish them alway.

This man of wisdom, kind but keen,  
This man of sorrows, gaunt and lean,  
Trusting in God's almighty hand,  
Planned for the nation, every state,  
And though opposed by doubt and hate  
Emerged victorious as he planned.

(Emancipating a bonded race,  
Giving to all an equal place,  
On him a nation's fate depended,  
His hands its unity defended.)

He had the prayers of many nations,  
Of every creed and every race,  
Enduring with unending patience  
Though lines of sorrow marked his face.

He is remembered in his greatness,  
His loyalty and glorious past,  
He sacrificed his life for freedom,  
Well earned fame, may it always last.

The hidden wounds grew daily greater  
'Till his stout heart would almost fall,  
But he proved himself a giant,  
A heart of gold in body frail.  
A stalwart heart, a master mind,  
Abe Lincoln led a nation brave,  
A leader merciful and kind,  
He'll be remembered in his grave.

(Lincoln the planner left behind  
Standards compassionate and kind,  
Plans that held through the troubled ways  
As peace emerged from war's dark days.)

In April of eighteen sixty-five  
From a madman's bullet Lincoln died  
Leaving behind a mourning nation—  
In every state the people cried.  
Though hushed the voice and gone the face  
(He'd gone to his eternal rest)  
His spirit lingers ever near,  
From north to south and east to west.

President Lincoln gave of his best  
To our land from his White House seat,  
And when he died on that tragic day  
A loving people knelt at his feet.  
Men whom he most had come to dread  
Bowed in sorrow beside his bed.

God took him from us, it was His will  
But in our hearts we love him still.  
His memory is as dear today  
As at the hour he passed away.  
Millions of hearts were crushed and sore  
When Lincoln died and could lead no more. ●

SOLAR ENERGY CONVERSION SYSTEMS

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to continue my presentation of testimony which was presented by three University of Michigan professors on April 12 before the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee.

Dr. John Clark, a professor of mechanical engineering and president of the Central Solar Energy Research Corp., spoke to the subcommittee regarding solar energy conversion systems. Following is his testimony:

TESTIMONY BY DR. JOHN CLARK

My name is John A. Clark. I am a Professor of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and a former Chairman of that Department. I also serve as President of the Central Solar Energy Research Corporation (CSERC) located in Detroit. For the past five years I have been devoting all of my professional efforts in the field of solar energy both as a private consultant to several solar energy manufacturing firms and user groups, in research at the University of Michigan and teaching solar energy courses at that institution.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee and to provide this testimony which I hope will be useful to

your purposes. The focus of my presentation today will be on solar energy conversion systems in general and solar heating and cooling applications in particular.

The resolution of the problem of energy for the United States certainly ranks among its most important current problems. Although this situation is often described as the "energy crisis" it is my judgment that the problem far transcends a situation that can be termed a "crisis". The word crisis implies a temporary situation, the effects of which in the near term will pass. The problems of energy for this nation are so fundamental and deep that it seems probable that our energy problems will persist for the next fifty to perhaps one hundred years. As things now stand, we are importing approximately half of the liquid petroleum consumed in this nation. Because of the clear threat to our social and economic well-being by this condition, it is urgent that all sectors of American society take immediate steps to the development of every possible alternate energy form that appears to have both immediate and long-term chances of being applied.

The first and obvious form of alternate energy sources is, of course, solar energy, the energy from the sun that falls continuously on this country in abundant quantities. Solar energy is at once clean, silent, abundant, widely available, dependable, and essentially inexhaustible. It is sometimes said to be "free". This however, is a fallacy since as any other resource the practical utilization of solar energy requires the investment of considerable capital. Accordingly, solar energy is probably the most expensive form of energy that we have today. It is to this point that I shall direct my principal comments in this testimony.

Although one can identify many barriers to the utilization of solar energy such as social, legal, legislative, political, financial, etc., the principal technological barriers today are those associated with efforts to produce reductions in the cost of solar energy conversion systems of all kinds. The solar energy demonstration programs in the field of solar heating and cooling, while valuable in the sense of bringing to the attention of the general public the possibilities of solar energy, has the undesired effect of freezing the technology, thus not contributing in a meaningful way to the necessary cost reductions in these systems through the development of new technology that is really essential to their widespread and rapid commercialization and application. It is my first recommendation to this Committee that you give serious consideration and every possible encouragement within the Department of Energy and elsewhere to the development of innovative design methods, innovative manufacturing techniques, innovative installation procedures and maintenance methods to all forms of solar energy conversion systems, in particular the solar collection, distribution and control systems for the heating of domestic and service hot water and the heating and cooling of space. These are the systems which will be installed first.

At the present time, there is considerable research being done into the physical behavior of these kinds of systems and components which result in feasibility-type studies. I believe these are important in developing an improved understanding of the technical and economic characteristics that may be expected from these systems. However, usually these studies do not direct their attention at the specific problems of design, manufacture, maintenance and installation, and accordingly are not of much value to the private sector that must manufacture, distribute, maintain and install these systems.

It is my view that, as a round number, the total installed costs of solar energy conversion systems for water and space heating have to be reduced by approximately a factor of two or three in order that these sys-

tems become competitive with those using conventional fuels. Because the basic cost of materials used to assemble these systems has probably reached values as low as they will ever become, it is necessary to look to other aspects of the problem for significant cost reduction. Accordingly, it is the areas of design, manufacture and installation that appear to provide the single greatest hope for significant cost reductions through innovation in design, and innovation in manufacturing methods thus obtaining as much high volume production and simplicity in installation as possible. Our nation is well known for cost reduction through mass production derived from new technology and I am confident that with the right mix of professional efforts such cost reduction can be achieved in the solar energy industries as it has in the automobile industry, the electronics industry and the consumer products industry. The state of Michigan, furthermore, has been a recognized leader in this field.

At the present time, the Central Solar Energy Research Corporation has submitted to the Department of Energy a proposal for a Solar Technology Institute to be located in Michigan, the goal of which is precisely that I have outlined above, namely, cost reduction through innovative design and innovative mass manufacturing. An important part of the STI proposal is the creation of a government-industry partnership through the establishment of an industrial consortium which will assure relevance to the STI program. This proposal was written as part of the planning for the Northcentral regional solar energy activities of the Department of Energy. It is my hope that this proposal, which is now undergoing evaluation and review within DOE, will receive an affirmative response from the Department of Energy. When established the Solar Technology Institute will be able to contribute in a significant way to the rapid utilization of solar energy in this country through cost reductions in the production and installation of solar energy conversion systems of all kinds.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to present these views to the Committee. ●

### IMPORTS KILLING OFF OUR LARGEST INDUSTRY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post on April 18 took a sharp look at why a major manufacturing industry has declined so dramatically in New York City. What the article tells us should be of importance to every Member of this House, because what has happened in my hometown can just as easily happen in your's. The article examines how the increase in imported textile products has decimated the textile industry within our own country. This has brought serious problems to what has long been New York City's largest industry. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD and that an accompanying article by Sol C. Chaikin, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union be included as well.

FREE TRADE AND THE DEATH OF 600,000  
AMERICAN JOBS

(By Michael Sharkey)

The garment and textile industry employs 2.3 million workers in this country.

It is New York City's largest manufacturing employer.

A Burlington Industries study projects that imports will kill 600,000 American jobs between 1978 and 1985.

The impact of this job loss and the associated trade deficit will magnify the total to 1.6-million jobs.

New York City alone has lost 50,000 jobs in this industry since 1970.

Garment and textile imports accounted for one-third of our total trade deficit in 1976.

According to the ILGWU, 80 per cent of their largely minority work-force are women, one third of whom are the sole supporters of their families.

Between 1961 and 1976, imports of some women's garments rose to 125 per cent of American production and men's garments suffered a 39 per cent import infiltration.

During this period, 146,000 potential jobs were not realized in the apparel industry.

The recessionary period between 1972 and 1976 saw imports achieve a 13 per cent growth rate while the domestic garment and textile sector fell 12 per cent and unemployment rode at a steady 8 per cent.

An American garment worker makes as much as \$3.76 per hour, gets fringe benefits and is paid time-and-a-half for overtime past 40 hours.

A worker in one of the Far Eastern or Latin American exporting countries gets few or no benefits and may work up to 60 hours a week at straight pay.

A "cloth" industry worker in Hong Kong makes 62 cents per hour, one in Taiwan 34 cents, and in South Korea 27 cents.

The same shirt that an American manufacturer puts on a store shelf at a cost of \$7.68 would cost the South Korean exporter \$4.50 to deliver, all costs included.

The import flow is regulated through bilateral agreements negotiated separately with each exporting nation.

They were initiated by the Kennedy Administration in 1961 and most of them expired at the end of 1977.

New agreements are currently being negotiated by the office of Special Ambassador for Trade, Robert Strauss.

Critics of the treaties cite several weaknesses:

They allow imports to grow at rates that are sometimes double that of domestic industry.

The import quotas are measured in units rather than total value, encouraging higher grade imports.

The agreements allow import levels to fluctuate from year to year, causing chaos in the American market.

While the government negotiators claim to be sensitive to the needs of the domestic textile and garment industries, they must also contend with foreign policy considerations and the possibility of exporting countries retaliating against what they consider American "protectionism."

The Carter Administration leans toward a "free trade" policy and believes in providing the consumer with some lower priced imports as a hedge against inflation.

Article 807 of the U.S. Tariff Schedules has come under fire for being part of the problem. It allows raw, cut unassembled garments to be shipped overseas, assembled at very low labor cost and sent back into this country at a minimal tariff charge.

In most cases 95 per cent of the work is done on the garment abroad, usually in Latin America.

### IMPORTS KILLING OFF OUR LARGEST INDUSTRY (By Sol C. Chaikin)

A flood of imports is washing away hundreds of thousands of jobs in the American economy, with devastating consequences for the entire nation.

The decline in the number of workers in the manufacture of apparel is not due to any loss of interest on the part of the American woman in being the best dressed in

the world. Apparel purchases in America grow every year.

The workers who have lost their jobs have been displaced by imports. If imports were zero today, there would be another 170,000 people employed in the manufacture of women's garments.

What is happening in the garment industry is happening in the entire textile and apparel trade—the nation's largest factory employer with more than two and a quarter million employees. Were it not for mounting imports, textile and apparel would now be providing jobs to another quarter million workers.

But just as crucial as the number of jobs lost is the kind of people who have lost jobs. They are those who could least afford it. They are the marginal populations who are heavily employed in light manufacture. The displaced persons are disproportionately black Hispanic, low-income whites. For millions of them, light manufacture has been the first rung on the economic ladder. When that rung goes, all hope goes with it.

For a city like New York that has traditionally depended on light manufacture as a prime base of its economy, the flood of imports has been catastrophic. Between 1969 and 1976, the total employment in manufacturing in New York has fallen from 825,836 to 522,878.

We are losing our market to imports not because of any deficiencies in our know-how. But our superiority is of little use because American manufacturers put our technology and skills to work in other lands where they make products for export to the U.S.

Not untypically, a shop in Bangkok will be making blouses exclusively for one American manufacturer who has supplied the style, some initial capital, the sizing and access to the American market. In this distant sweat shop, reminiscent of the garment industry before the turn of the century in the U.S., the young girls who work for a pittance (sometimes just a few bowls of rice a day) stitch the brand names of American outlets into their product. Sometimes, the label is that of an American manufacturer; sometimes it is that of an American chain store. In any case, it is an American company that employs incredibly exploited labor overseas to manufacture products for sale in the U.S.

As if such cheap labor were not sufficient incentive to export jobs to other lands, the U.S. Tariff Code has a special proviso (Item 807) that further encourages American manufacturers to get their work done elsewhere. Under this law, U.S. companies that have American component parts assembled in other lands may import the finished product with the tariff limited to the value added, which in the case of low-wage countries, is very low. Hence, American apparel firms send their work to other lands to be stitched at 30 and 40 cents an hour, and then bring back the end product for sale in this country. So lucrative is this shuttle trade for American producers that Item 807 imports of garments have grown from \$1,730,377 in 1965 to \$292,475,804 in 1976.

Although the labor that goes into imports is very cheap, the American consumer rarely gets a bargain.

Several months ago, I submitted dramatic visible proof that savings in wage costs for products made overseas were not passed on to the consumer. I showed four identical blouses to a Senate Committee—blouses that we had bought in the same store—each carrying the same brand name and selling for the same price. One was made in the U.S. and the other three in other countries where labor was but a fraction of that paid here.

The beneficiaries of low wages were the manufacturer and/or the retailer who could make a larger profit on the cheap import.

One-million jobless costs the Federal treasury \$16 billion a year in lost income and in

money paid out for unemployment insurance, welfare, food stamps, etc. The cost to state treasuries is another \$4 billion.

The import infection is spreading from light industry to heavy industry. We are hit not only by import of commodities but by export of capital and technology as giant multinational corporations close down plants here to open them in other lands to take advantage of cheaper labor, tax laws, and protected markets overseas.

The evidence of the infectious spread is written in our recent trade balances. In 1977, we ended the year with a deficit of \$30 billion—by far the greatest annual loss in our history.

Theoretically, this last deficit should not have happened. Our bad balances have been devaluating the worth of the dollar on the world exchange. This cheapening of the buck should have boosted our exports since people with foreign currencies could buy things cheaply if they were priced in dollars. And, vice versa, our imports should have fallen since it takes more dollars to buy things priced in marks, yen, or francs. But just the opposite happened.

Why? Because every major (and many minor) country shut out our wares with both tariff and non-tariff barriers—the last being a thousand bits of red tape to bar the entry of American goods. We, on the other hand, continue to leave our doors wide open—a free trade island in a protectionist ocean, with our economy eroding under the pounding waves of imports.

"Free trade" is a mischievous myth used by American manufacturers, retailers and importers to promote their profits. The American people pay the price in chronic unemployment that will not be cured by the traditional medicines.

What America needs today is a fair trade policy that is both generous and realistic. Such a policy would not close our doors to imports but would regulate the flow in accordance with our capacity to absorb. Thus, if the American garment market grows by 3 per cent a year, imports should be allowed to grow at the same rate. In that way, both domestic production and imports can grow as the U.S. market grows. ●

#### HOW BUCK LOST ITS BANG

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, recently the media has been filled with reports of the decline of the dollar abroad. These reports have spread the concern to many of our citizens. My mail shows this concern. It also shows that there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding about the issues involved. Some of the mail has equated the decline of the dollar with a decline of America's prestige abroad.

Such confusion is understandable. The international monetary issues are complex and generally not of the common experience of many of our people.

Recently in the March 5, 1978, issue of the Detroit News, Michigan State University Prof. Mordechai Kreinin lucidly explained what the declining dollar was all about. His explanation clearly points out that the dollar decline is cause for some concern but not for panic. He puts the problem in perspective in a way that is readable and understandable. I com-

mend it to my colleagues and their constituents.

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 5, 1978]

HOW BUCK LOST ITS BANG

(By Mordechai E. Kreinin)

On March 1, 1978, the financial press was startled by the decline of the value of the dollar to a record low of less than two German marks. Concern over future foreign-exchange developments, and their effect on the economy, became widespread.

#### THE FACTS

Depreciation in the value of the dollar relative to certain currencies is not new. The U.S. currency has been taking a beating on the European currency markets for quite some time. Over the past 12 months, it lost 15-25 percent of its value relative to three currencies: The Japanese yen, the German mark and the Swiss franc.

But the decline of the dollar was not universal. It gained 12 percent against the Canadian dollar (our major trading partner), as Canadians transferred funds south of the border for fear of secession by Quebec. And it remained almost unchanged relative to the French franc, a currency subject to financial jitters, triggered by fears of a socialist political victory at the polls. The British pound declined relative to the dollar in mid-decade all the way from \$2.40 to \$1.55. But in the last few months it climbed back to \$1.95, as the flow of North Sea oil made the U.K. independent of imported petroleum and freed its balance of payments of that burden. Currencies of smaller countries moved in various directions relative to the dollar.

In sum, the source of public concern is the depreciation of the dollar relative to three currencies: The yen, mark and Swiss franc. The first two represent large and important countries.

#### CAUSES

Under the present international currency system, exchange rates are determined by market forces of supply and demand. Any sizable addition of dollars to the foreign exchange markets depresses their value. Because \$250 billion already there held in deposits in foreign banks (Euro-dollars, a legacy of previous years), even rumors of an impending addition to dollar supply (or decline in demand for dollars) can trigger a large-scale sale of dollars, with an attendant decline in dollar value.

Such additions to dollar supply came about through deficits in the U.S. balance of payments. When we buy more from foreigners than they buy from us, we pay out more than we receive, and that excess expenditure is added to dollar supply on foreign currency markets.

In 1977, the U.S. recorded an unprecedented trade deficit of \$27 billion, and the consensus forecast is for a similar deficit in 1978. These increases in supply depress the dollar. In addition, holders of vast sums of dollars in Europe—fearing a decline in their exchange value—wish to unload their holdings, further contributing to the decline in the dollar value. In doing so, they exchange dollars for "strong" currencies. These are currencies of countries running sizable trade surpluses, to wit: Germany and Japan; hence, the rise in value of the mark and the yen.

But what accounts for the U.S. deficits? Our \$45 billion of oil imports come first to mind. Unlike European countries, the U.S. failed to adopt an energy-conservation and output-expansion program. Even the "Carter nudge" to the market is being held up in Congress. And the prolonged coal strike certainly intensified doubts about the U.S. ability to cope with the energy problem.

But this is only a partial explanation. It certainly begs the question: If oil is the root cause of the problem, why is Japan—100 percent dependent on imported oil—running

huge trade surpluses? A similar question can be asked with respect to Germany. Clearly part of the answer must be sought elsewhere.

This takes us back to the 1974-75 recession—the deepest and most prolonged of the postwar recessions. The Paris-based organization of the industrial countries—the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development—adopted a “game plan” which called for the “three locomotive countries” (the U.S., Germany and Japan) to grow at a 5-7 percent annual rate, and pull everybody up with them. These three giant economies are relatively free of external constraints and can adopt strong measures to stimulate their economies. As their real gross national product grows, they import more from other countries, which are in turn pulled up through expansion in exports.

While the U.S. followed the growth prescription, Germany and Japan did not. The main reason is their intense concern over domestic inflation which is likely to accompany a faster growth rate in real GNP. The U.S., for reasons of its own, preferred faster growth and a reduction in unemployment, even at a cost of higher inflation.

As a result of the differential policy approach, the U.S. has a growth rate in real GNP of nearly 6 percent and an equal rate of inflation. Both rates were less than 3 percent in Germany and Japan.

It is commonplace in economics that the higher the country's income and real rate of growth, the higher its imports. Likewise, the higher its rates of inflation, the less competitive are its products at home and abroad; consequently, high inflation reduces exports and increases imports.

On both the real income and price counts, the U.S. trade balance deteriorated, and that of Germany and Japan moved into large surpluses. Apart from these disturbances, the failure of the Japanese and German economies to grow thwarted the original Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development plan. The European economies are still at a low ebb. So much so, that the organization last week adopted an alternative game plan to “spread the burden.” It calls for faster growth in seven major countries, instead of just the “three locomotives.”

The differential growth and inflation rates, the energy situation, and the absence of unusually high demand for U.S. farm products, go a long way toward explaining the decline in the value of the dollar. Market intervention by central banks to arrest the decline, and special taxes levied upon foreign depositors by Germany and Switzerland to discourage capital inflow, only touch the symptoms of the problems, and not its root cause.

#### EFFECTS

To the average American, the decline in the exchange value of the dollar is of little consequence. If a tourist must go to Germany or Switzerland, their dollar expenditures will rise, as each dollar is converted to fewer francs and marks to defray local expenses. But a tourist usually has an option to switch his destination to Canada or Italy, where the U.S. dollar goes further.

Similarly, if he must purchase a German or Japanese product, these imports would cost more. But for most consumers, this holds out the attractive possibility of switching to American-made substitute products. Indeed, the fact that U.S.-made merchandise, such as autos, are made more competitive is a major benefit flowing from the depreciating dollar.

For the general economy, the depreciation of the dollar raises the price of imports, and thereby contributes to domestic inflation. But if we succeed in holding the price line on most American-made products, the imports, contribution to inflation would be small. After all, imports of goods and services occupy less than 9 percent of gross national product.

Down the road, there is the added possibility that truly international commodities,

such as oil, will no longer be priced in terms of dollars. As members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries sustain losses caused by dollar depreciation, they may opt to switch their pricing unit to an alternative asset such as Special Drawing Rights of the International Monetary Fund. Special Drawing Rights are valued as a weighted average of 16 important currencies. Airlines and shipping companies may do likewise. As a consequence, the dollar would lose some of its value as an international currency, and the cost of our imports may rise even more.

But against these costs, there is the benefit that these goods become more competitive at home and abroad. This is the best way to reduce the share of imports in the U.S. automobile, steel and electronics markets, and expand the share of U.S. exports in the world's chemical, machinery and aircraft markets. But all this requires American manufacturers to hold the line on domestic prices. Certainly the prices of U.S. subcompact cars should not be increased in line with that of the foreign competition.

It is for this reason that Europeans are concerned about the declining dollar, and urge the U.S. government to intervene in the currency markets and arrest the decline. But as long as our trading partners refuse to stimulate their lagging domestic economies, dollar depreciation is the only way to restore balance to our international transactions. This is the way the international system is supposed to work.

Recent developments are not a cause for alarm, much less panic. They do not call for massive U.S. intervention in the foreign exchange markets. They do call for increased vigilance on the domestic inflation and energy fronts. But all steps to control inflation and measures to deal with the energy crisis, involve many trade-offs. The costs and benefits of each measure must be weighed carefully. ●

#### EXPLANATION OF VOTES MISSED ON APRIL 20, 1978

### HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 20, 1978, I had business that required my absence from Washington. Therefore, I was unable to vote during the session on Thursday when the House continued consideration of H.R. 8494, the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act.

On Thursday I traveled to St. Louis, Mo., to address a meeting of the National Association of Van Pool Operators. My speech was on vanpooling and related transportation issues. Thursday evening, back in Pennsylvania, I spoke to the Delaware County Medical Society about medical costs and insurance as well as other legislative topics.

Had I been in Washington, I would have voted as follows on those votes missed:

Roll No. 239—For the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole. Yes.

Roll No. 240—To table a motion to reconsider the previous vote (Roll No. 239). Yes.

Roll No. 241—Amendment to include departments or agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government and the White House Office as organizations that could be covered by this bill. No.

Roll No. 242—Amendment to require registered lobbying organizations to re-

port the name and address of organizations contributing \$3,000 or more during the calendar year and the amount given. Yes.

Roll No. 243—Motion that all debate on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and all amendments thereto end at 5 p.m. No. ●

#### ALDO MORO KIDNAPING DEPLORED BY NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed recently by the New York State Assembly expressing shock over the brazen kidnaping of former Italian Premier Aldo Moro and the killing of his five bodyguards.

The sentiments expressed in this resolution are shared by millions around the world. This act of terrorism has thrown Italy into a state of turmoil. Aldo Moro is certainly one of the most respected public figures in Italy and his fate remains a matter of profound concern to the people of Italy.

World terrorism has reached alarming levels in many areas of the world. The Fascist based Red Brigade have engaged in a ruthless campaign of terror and political murders for much of the past 2 years. The Government of Italy is courageously resisting capitulating to their clearly unreasonable demands while at the same time trying to do everything possible to keep Moro alive. The world community must unite in opposition to terrorism before its impact is felt anywhere else.

I now insert the text of Assembly Resolution No. 217 and commend each of its sponsors.

#### STATE OF NEW YORK LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

Whereas, This Legislative Body is shocked and horrified by the abduction of former Prime Minister Aldo Moro of Italy and the wanton slaying of five of his bodyguards by the terrorists known as the Red Brigades, an urban guerilla group; and

Whereas, This kind of moral malaise internationally is, indeed, a contagion that affects the whole fabric of our world society and breeds a sense of mental and moral ill-being that ought to be eradicated at all costs whatsoever, otherwise we will witness the decline and fall of our Twentieth Century world; and

Whereas, It is the sense of this Legislative Body that it should express its sense of outrage and serve notice on all democratic legislative and parliamentary bodies of the free nations of the world at all levels of government, ranging from local to national, that there should be a concerted effort to eliminate terrorism and its attendant despair, instilling a new sense of survival, by enacting meaningful laws to discourage this dreadful violence; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body pauses in its deliberations and deplores and denounces the kidnaping of former Prime Minister Aldo Moro of Italy and the wanton slaying of five of his bodyguards by the terrorists known as the Red Brigades, an urban guerilla group; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Italian

Ambassador to the United States, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of the United States and to each member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York. ●

## SOYBEANS

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Congress to an article entitled "The Joy of Soy," telling of the many nutritious uses of soybeans. The United States is the world's largest producer of the versatile soybean and we are now striving to increase exports to share nature's bounty with the peoples of the world.

I include the following article from a recent issue of *Vegetarian Times*:

## SOYBEANS

(By Frances Sheridan Goulart)

If you live by soybean alone (as many of the world's peoples do, and have done for thousands of years)—you can have it your way. Soybeans can be the cream in your coffee, the dog in your bun, the chow in your cat, and then some. It is, by far our most versatile food and indeed, has proven to be one of our most nutritious as well.

The U.S. is the world's largest producer of soybeans. We plant some 60 million acres and harvest more than 1.5 million bushels per year. Oddly, despite such statistics we are also the biggest bean know-nots using less than 15 percent of the soybeans we produce for human consumption and virtually hiding most of that in a host of other processed foods.

The primary use of soybeans (known as the "Cow of China" and "Meat without Bones" in the Orient) is for animal feed in the U.S. Over 85 percent of the non-exported soybeans grown in the U.S. (and the U.S. grows 75 percent of the world's soybeans) are fed to animals. In contrast, China—with more than three times as many mouths to feed and the world's second largest producer of soybeans, feeds virtually none of its beans to animals.

It's sad that the un-bean enlightened "average" consumer is so used to paying high prices for a "complete protein" from meat that is loaded with saturated fat, chemicals, uric acid, artificial hormones and worse. The soybean, by contrast is polite and relatively pure pulse protein with a superlative blend of amino acids that gets even better when its protein is complemented with wheat, oats or corn.

Meat is just meat, but a soybean—ah! The versatile bean can "become" scrambled eggs, a soyburger, a soyball, frozen yogurt or just about anything else you'd care to boil, whip, stir, bake or mix it into.

No matter what you have in mind for your mouth, the soya is a pulse (edible pod-bearing seed) that you should and can take often. It provides 40 percent protein (twice as much as other beans) and 50 percent protein in its flour form. (Just adding one tablespoon of soyflour to 4 tablespoons corn flour will increase the protein content 150 percent.)

Although a great deal has been made of soy protein content, it is low in starch (2 percent) richer in potassium than any other food with the exception of brewer's yeast. In addition, it is rich in easily digestible oils.

A great food, highly versatile and inexpen-

sive. So how can you put it to use? In many ways. You can buy it roasted or roast them yourself and save yourself from getting roasted at the checkout counter; you can make it into tempeh (see accompanying article); make it into or buy it as tofu; use it as a sauce, a milk or add it's flour to your baked dishes. Indeed, there are almost as many ways to use it as there are ways to eat and cook. ●

STATEMENT OF SAM M. GIBBONS ON  
MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLAN  
TERMINATION BILL

## HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill intended to strengthen the security of the private sector pension benefits for millions of active employees and present retirees covered by multiemployer pension plans. The first section of my bill accomplishes this through an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which provides a substantial disincentive to the termination of a multiemployer plan maintained in an economically sound industry.

The second section of the bill is essentially unrelated to the first. It "decouples" the maximum termination insurance benefit guaranteed by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) from the social security wage base and freezes the maximum at its current level. This will assist in safeguarding the financial integrity and viability of PBGC's single employer and multiemployer termination insurance programs which were initiated by the Congress 3½ years ago under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA).

Under the terms of the first section of my bill on multiemployer terminations, plan sponsors who terminate a "related" multiemployer plan may not set up one or more new tax qualified plans and trusts covering essentially the same employees or former employees or retain the qualified status of an existing related collectively bargained plan. However, it applies only where the terminated multiemployer plan is determined by the IRS not to have operated in a depressed or declining industry.

In making this determination, the IRS would be required to take into account whether or not: First, a substantial number of the employers required to contribute to the multiemployer plans were operating at an economic loss; second, there was substantial unemployment or underemployment in the industry concerned; third, the sales and profits of the industry concerned were depressed or declining; fourth, and the duration and expected duration of each of the above; fifth, the ratio of active to retired participants in the multiemployer plan; and sixth, other relevant factors. These factors are to be considered on a long-term basis, that is, economic conditions and trends in the industry for at least 10 years before the date of the multiemployer plan termination.

There is also a time limit on the appli-

cation of the provision to affected plan sponsors. Specifically, a new qualified plan(s) could be installed by such sponsors after the expiration of a 5-year period from the date of the termination of the "related" multiemployer plan. The 5-year period seems to provide an adequate deterrent to a nondepressed industry termination.

The rationale for this first section is simple: management and particularly union sponsors of multiemployer plans will be less likely to consent to the termination of their multiemployer plan if they know that a new tax-favored plan or plans (for example, one favoring active employees) could not be set up in its place. Likewise, an existing plan or trust and any plan or trust spun off from these would not retain its tax-qualified status under the Internal Revenue Code if a "related" multiemployer plan or trust were terminated.

Some employers might find it advantageous to terminate a poorly funded multiemployer plan whose benefits have been significantly raised in recent years. Present termination insurance phase-in rules limit the recognition of benefit increases within a 5-year period prior to termination. By reason of my bill, however, union negotiators could no longer be promised that the present employees would be covered by a new plan—or continue their coverage under another existing qualified plan—after the termination of an existing plan. Thus, union negotiators, union-appointed plan trustees and, of course, the rank and file may find it more necessary to resist the termination of an existing multiemployer plan and endeavor instead to improve the financial stability of the existing plan.

Moreover, if the existing plan is preserved, both promised plan benefits—the PBGC will often guarantee less than the full range of promised plan benefits—and the ability of the PBGC to effectively insure multiemployer plan benefits in genuinely troubled industries will be enhanced. Further, the interests of all other multiemployer plans—whose premium dollars support, in the first instance, the multiemployer termination insurance program—and of taxpayers generally—who may in the future be called upon to support multiemployer plan benefits through general revenue financing—will be protected.

I recognize that few unions and employers—the very people who deserve credit for having voluntarily installed and sustained these multiemployer plans through many years—would discontinue these plans absent great business hardships. The great majority of plan sponsors are concerned with the welfare of rank-and-file employees, and do not need added incentives to continue maintaining their multiemployer plans.

Nevertheless, the bill I am offering today is both necessary and appropriate for four basic reasons:

First, the overall likelihood of multiemployer plan terminations now appears considerably greater than it did 4 years ago when title IV of ERISA was being finalized. In fact, the danger of substantial terminations was then argued to be remote. But many factors are now

undermining the stability of many plans: pre-ERISA funding practices tolerated severe underfunding and inadequate catch-up requirements under present funding standards; existing statutory incentives to individual employer withdrawals from multiemployer plans undermine plan stability; the certainty of rising multiemployer premiums. The PBGC has recently reported that some 12 percent of the Nation's existing multiemployer plans—with unfunded liabilities totaling approximately \$4 billion—are in severe trouble. In short, the risk of substantial multiemployer plan terminations in the next 5 years is clearly anything but remote.

Second, some employers required to contribute to plans which have large unfunded liabilities may not be adequately deterred by the PBGC's potential claim under existing law against 30 percent of their assets, and may find plan termination to be in their financial interest after PBGC coverage becomes mandatory in July 1979. The result would be the transfer of the consequences of past irresponsibility to the PBGC. In order to overcome union resistance to such a move, management might well promise that a new plan covering or favoring active employees would be put in place. Clearly, however, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation was not intended to be—and is not capable of being—a multiemployer plan refinancing corporation.

Third, the Congress clearly aimed the termination insurance program at extreme business hardship situations. Thus, early financial danger signs, known as "reportable events," are statutorily required to be reported to the PBGC. To repeat, the PBGC was not intended as a mechanism for public refinancing of plans operating in viable industries, and its existence was not meant to determine, or even influence, a termination decision.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that even a handful of multiemployer plan terminations, carrying with them a large enough unfunded liability, can virtually render PBGC's present self-financing multiemployer program unworkable—or drive its premiums so high that additional terminations would be precipitated—or necessitate turning to general revenues, a taxpayer bailout. If, therefore, my bill contributes to the deterrence of even a single avoidable multiemployer plan termination, it will have achieved its aim—especially if the single termination could have broken the camel's back.

As to the second provision, decoupling PBGC's guaranteed benefits from the social security wage base is clearly appropriate in light of the recent changes made to social security to finance the trust fund. As such, these deductions reflect no congressional judgment as to the appropriateness of these levels for any other purpose. If this decoupling is not effected, we will only escalate the financing problems of another fund—PBGC's. Finally, the maximum benefit level is now set at well over \$900; this level is clearly adequate for several years into the future. PBGC would be required to notify Congress of the need for increases in the future.●

## AFFIRMATIVE ACTION VERSUS NEGATIVE ACTION

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Jim Fitzgerald of the Detroit Free Press is a veteran journalist and commentator who has a keen sense of the double standards that operate in contemporary life.

Affirmative action in the Detroit Police Department has not been working. A recent court decision knocked down affirmative action guidelines in the promotion of Detroit police officers. In a March 6 column in the Free Press entitled "Sins of Our Fathers Must Be Atoned Now," Fitzgerald defends affirmative action as the only workable remedy to the long years of negative action, in which black Americans were denied equal opportunity.

I commend to my colleagues Jim Fitzgerald's commentary on affirmative action and equal opportunity, as follows:

#### SINS OF OUR FATHERS MUST BE ATONED NOW

Seriously, there are two or three things that really make me angry . . .

My Cousin Al was delighted by Judge Fred Kaess' decision against the use of affirmative action in promoting Detroit policemen. Cousin Al is typical of the righteous hypocrites who insist it is as wrong to discriminate against white people today as it was to discriminate against black people yesterday.

But where was Cousin Al yesterday? He is 65 years old. Today he yelps about constitutional rights when a black man is allowed to slip into line ahead of a white man. A few years ago he had no complaints when blacks were not allowed in line at all because it led to a sign saying "Whites Only." In fact, Al thought it was damn pushy of the blacks to suggest they had any right to stand in the same line with white folks.

If only the obvious bigots like Cousin Al were using the Constitution to fight affirmative action, I wouldn't be so dismayed by the hypocrisy. But many supposedly enlightened people, including judges and newspaper editorialists, are taking the same position.

Where was all that grave concern for equal opportunity when the black people needed it?

The opposite of affirmative action is negative action. Blacks were victims of negative action for hundreds of years. They are still victims. As Mayor Young said, if Judge Kaess doesn't think there is discrimination against blacks in the Detroit Police Department, the judge must live on another planet.

It is true, as Cousin Al keeps preaching, that two wrongs don't make a right. But in a society trying to atone for past sins, it is not wrong to give blacks a head start for the first few years they compete in a race that previously they were only allowed to watch—from segregated seating. It is not wrong. It is the fair and decent thing to do.

It's too bad some innocent whites must personally pay the price of atonement, but it's a debt someone must pay. Who could deny that those doing the atoning are suffering far, far less than those who were sinned against?

My sympathy is with the white cop who must let a black cop cut into line ahead of him. I would only ask him to try to understand.

But there is no sympathy here for Cousin Al and the other righteous hypocrites who have suddenly discovered it is unconstitutional to ride in the back of the bus. I would only ask them to get out and walk.

. . . In Cincinnati last month, a judge refused to allow a woman prisoner to be with her three-year-old son while he died in a nearby hospital. The woman's crime was selling marijuana.

At the same time, former U.S. Attorney General John Mitchell was on vacation from prison so he could be treated by the doctor of his choice. You remember what his crime was.

Equal justice. It is a laugh. If you can stop crying long enough.●

## CUTBACKS ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FUNDS HARM TRAINING PROGRAM

### HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are hearing from constituents in ever-increasing numbers about cuts the administration has proposed in the Veterans' Administration medical system. The dollar figures, the number of beds to be taken out of service, the staff cuts—these figures are familiar to us, and I will not repeat them here.

What I do want to emphasize is the irrevocable nature of what is happening to our largest governmental medical system. Closing hospitals beds is one thing; they can be put back into service. But closing out research programs and training facilities is something else. With this deterioration, it will be the beginning of the end. Once placed in motion, there can be no turning back.

In the delivery of health care, research and training programs are essential for the provision of quality medical services. There is no question about that according to all knowledgeable individuals. What is happening now, Mr. Speaker, is that as the result of the administration's threatened cutbacks, medical schools are reevaluating their affiliation agreements with VA hospitals. VA hospitals have grown into excellence as a result of these affiliations; and if they are dissolved, the decline in the quality of patient care will follow as the night follows day.

The dimensions and details of this trend are outlined in an article in the April 15, 1978, issue of the publication, U.S. Medicine. The U.S. Medicine article reads as follows:

#### CUTBACKS THREATEN VA TIES WITH MED SCHOOLS

WASHINGTON.—Affiliations between Veterans Administration hospitals and medical schools may be terminated if the hospitals lose their research funding, the National Association of VA Physicians (NAVAP) has warned.

A survey taken by the organization—one of a series it is conducting to try to stem planned research budget cuts—shows affected medical schools do not want to remain associated with institutions whose care threatens to become "second-quality," NAVAP said.

As part of a budget cut more than \$6 million for medical research programs, VA has made plans to end research programs at 55 hospitals in fiscal 1979. In addition, nine other hospitals already have been notified that their research funding will stop.

There is a chance the situation could be reversed, however. If Congress follows the

recommendations of its House and Senate Veterans Affairs Committees, medical research funding would increase by \$18 million instead of declining.

The issue now is before the appropriations committees in both houses.

NAVAP, through its surveys, hopes to provide evidence of the "disastrous" effects it says such budget cuts will produce.

In its most recent survey the organization contacted staffs at hospitals and medical schools on the list of those whose research funding might be terminated.

Here are the comments from four affiliated hospitals and medical schools on the list:

Northport, N.Y., Veterans Administration hospital and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences Center, State University of New York at Stony Brook; affiliated since 1971:

The chief of nuclear medicine at the hospital would leave; two staff psychiatrists would be lost; acquisition of a nephrologist would not be possible.

Dr. Marvin Kuschner, dean of the medical school, says discontinuing the hospital's research program "would encourage the concept of two levels of faculty, with those stationed at the university hospital being first-class and those at the VA being second-class."

"This is unacceptable to us, and we feel it threatens the viability of our association with the VA hospital," he said. "Should the research program be eliminated, it is my intention to instruct our clinical chairmen to plan an orderly withdrawal from the VA hospital over the next two years."

Newington, Conn., Veterans Administration hospital and the University of Connecticut Medical School, affiliated since 1968:

A statement prepared by physicians at the hospital states:

"The continuation of house staff and faculty input depends entirely on the availability of research support for faculty based at the VA hospital. Therefore, elimination of the support means that the affiliation with the medical school would end and nearly all of the fulltime staff physicians and all of the house staff physicians would leave.

"Newington physicians have calculated that a return to VA rather than university recruitment would lower the cost-effectiveness of patient care and make care at the VA hospital so costly that there would be little justification for maintaining the hospital.

"Newington stands to lose all or most of 12 board-certified internists in the department of medicine. Research programs currently underway at Newington are aimed at finding new approaches in the treatment of infections, cancer, diabetes, heart disease and other problems particularly relevant to veterans. These programs would cease."

Syracuse, N.Y., VA hospital and Upstate Medical Center of the State University of New York:

Dr. William J. Williams, chairman of the department of medicine, states: "The most important dimension of the VA affiliation, in my view, has been the excellence of the faculty recruited for the VA hospital. As a group, they are in every way equivalent to the faculty of any university hospital I know."

"One of the major reasons we have been able to recruit and retain this excellent staff has been the research support available through the Veterans Administration program."

Dr. Norman B. Ackerman, professor and chairman of the department of surgery, says: "I myself will suggest strongly to the new incoming chairman of our department to reevaluate our commitment to the VA in general surgery and to suggest that we consider increasing our program at the private hospitals where the receptiveness to our efforts might be more appreciated."

Dr. Gilbert S. Ross, professor and chairman of the department of neurology, states: "The Upstate Medical Center affiliation with the VA in regards to neurology would terminate within two years and qualified neurological physicians would be extremely difficult to obtain for the VA neurology service."

Dr. S. A. Blumenthal, associate chief of staff for ambulatory services, says: "If the research program at the VA hospital were to be dismantled, I would have absolutely no reason to stay on at the VA hospital and would immediately look for a position elsewhere."

"I doubt, however, that I would accept a position in another VA hospital, even if that position included research opportunities, because my presumption would have to be that all VA research programs were in jeopardy."

Dr. G. F. Reed, dean of the medical center, states: "If the research cuts were to come about, I can assure you that our institution would not be interested in any significant involvement with an institution of poor quality, and I am afraid that our present affiliation, presently so beneficial to both the Veterans Administration and the medical center, would quickly deteriorate to one of no significant importance."

Tampa, Fla., Veterans Administration hospital and the University of South Florida Medical School:

Dr. R. G. Mason, professor and chairman of pathology, states: "Certain diagnostic tests now carried out in research laboratories would no longer be performed for VA patients. The downgrading of the general level of expertise of faculty members is a serious potential problem."

Dr. H. N. Schnitzlein, professor and chairman of the department of anatomy, says: "The transplant program of the department of surgery has benefited from the availability of basic science personnel in the research facility. Loss of this ancillary program would be disastrous for the kidney transplant program."

Dr. J. A. Del Regato, professor of radiology, states: "No education is truly significant unless it is carried out in the light of research."

"A research program is not a luxury, but an indispensable companion of all worthy medical education; it is also the only assurance that medical service is properly invigorated." ●

**MASSACHUSETTS SUPPORTS HUMAN RIGHTS FOR NORTHERN IRELAND**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day, Gov. Michael S. Dukakis of the State of Massachusetts signed an official proclamation declaring March 17, 1978, as Human Rights Day for Northern Ireland. As chairman of the 104-member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I express the committee's warmest congratulations to the Governor.

This is but another in a growing national expression of concern for the ongoing human rights violations which occur in Ireland. I maintain that these violations and deprivations serve as fundamental obstacles to peace and must be ceased.

It is my firm hope that continued activities by States, cities, and counties

will provide the impetus for long overdue hearings to be conducted on the entire Irish question by the House International Relations Committee. This is a multifaceted problem which must be viewed as a critical issue in our foreign policy. Hearings can play an enormously constructive role in getting the main issues discussed, focusing attention and concern on human rights violations and may also lead to a diminution of violence, which we all deplore. The President has stated his interest in possibly providing U.S. foreign economic assistance to Ireland but he wisely tied it to peace being reached. It is to advance the cause of peace that the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs was formed.

We intend to continue our advocacy of this cause and urge more Members to join. The present membership follows:

**MEMBERS, AD HOC CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS\***

Mario Biaggi, Democrat of New York, Chairman.

Peter W. Rodino, Democrat of New Jersey. James J. Delaney, Democrat of New York. John M. Murphy, Democrat of New York. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat of New York.

Joshua Ellberg, Democrat of Pennsylvania. James M. Hanley, Democrat of New York. Robert A. Roe, Democrat of New Jersey. Lester L. Wolff, Democrat of New York.

Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat of New York. William R. Cotter, Democrat of Connecticut.

Edward P. Beard, Democrat of Rhode Island.

Bruce F. Caputo, Republican of New York. John J. Fary, Democrat of Illinois. Jerome A. Ambro, Democrat of New York. Silvio O. Conte, Republican of Massachusetts.

Charles B. Rangel, Democrat of New York. Antonio Borja Won Pat, Democrat of Guam.

Matthew J. Rinaldo, Republican of New Jersey.

Leo C. Zeferetti, Democrat of New York. William F. Walsh, Republican of New York. Gladys Noon Spellman, Democrat of Maryland.

Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of New York. Joe Moakley, Democrat of Massachusetts. Bruce F. Vento, Democrat of Minnesota. Norman F. Lent, Republican of New York. Anthony Toby Moffett, Democrat of Connecticut.

David W. Evans, Democrat of Indiana. Marty Russo, Democrat of Illinois. Herbert E. Harris II, Democrat of Virginia. Lawrence Coughlin, Republican of Pennsylvania.

Raymond F. Lederer, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Berkley Bedell, Democrat of Iowa. Richard Nolan, Democrat of Minneapolis. Daniel J. Flood, Democrat of Pennsylvania. Samuel S. Stratton, Democrat of New York. John P. Murtha, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

George M. O'Brien, Republican of Illinois. Andrew Maguire, Democrat of New Jersey. Clarence D. Long, Democrat of Maryland. James H. Scheuer, Democrat of New York. James J. Howard, Democrat of New Jersey. William Clay, Democrat of Missouri.

Harold C. Hollenbeck, Republican of New Jersey.

Matthew F. McHugh, Democrat of New York.

John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan. Michael O. Myers, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

\*As of March 22, 1978

John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana.  
Robert Garcia, Democrat of New York.  
Walter E. Fauntroy, Democrat of District of Columbia.

Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat of California.

Ralph H. Metcalfe, Democrat of Illinois.  
Bill Green, Republican of New York.

Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Austin J. Murphy, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Phillip Burton, Democrat of California.  
J. Herbert Burke, Republican of Florida.

Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.

Edward W. Pattison, Democrat of New York.

Thomas J. Downey, Democrat of New York.  
Mary Rose Oaker, Democrat of Ohio.

Doug Walgren, Democrat of Pennsylvania.  
Edward P. Boland, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Henry J. Hyde, Republican of Illinois.  
Joseph A. Le Fante, Democrat of New Jersey.

Benjamin A. Gilman, Republican of New York.

James M. Collins, Republican of Texas.  
Margaret M. Heckler, Republican of Massachusetts.

Ronald M. Mottl, Democrat of Ohio.  
Charles J. Carney, Democrat of Ohio.

Robert A. Young, Democrat of Missouri.  
Joseph M. Gaydos, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat of California.  
Ted Weiss, Democrat of New York.

John L. Burton, Democrat of California.  
Joseph G. Minish, Democrat of New Jersey.

John H. Dent, Democrat of Pennsylvania.  
Richard L. Ottinger, Democrat of New York.

Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Republican of California.

Billy Lee Evans, Democrat of Georgia.  
Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Wyche Fowler, Jr., Democrat of Georgia.  
Stewart B. McKinney, Republican of Connecticut.

Paul E. Tsongas, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Morgan F. Murphy, Democrat of Illinois.  
Norman Y. Mineta, Democrat of California.

Robert W. Edgar, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

William J. Hughes, Democrat of New Jersey.  
Fred B. Rooney, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Gus Yatron, Democrat of Pennsylvania.  
Newton I. Steers, Jr., Republican of Maryland.

Thomas A. Luken, Democrat of Ohio.  
Ronald A. Sarasin, Republican of Connecticut.

John J. Cavanaugh, Democrat of Nebraska.  
Elliott H. Levitas, Democrat of Georgia.

William M. Brodhead, Democrat of Michigan.

James J. Blanchard, Democrat of Michigan.  
Paul Findley, Republican of Illinois.

David E. Bonior, Democrat of Michigan.  
Harold S. Sawyer, Republican of Michigan.

Frederick W. Richmond, Democrat of New York.

Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Democrat of Michigan.

Louis Stokes, Democrat of Ohio.  
Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland.

At this point I am proud to submit the Massachusetts proclamation on Human Rights Day in Northern Ireland. I also pay special tribute to the leadership of the Irish National Caucus for their efforts on behalf of this proclamation.

#### A PROCLAMATION, 1978

(By His Excellency Michael S. Dukakis)

Whereas it is the proud tradition of the U.S. to promote international respect for the human rights of all people; and

Whereas each St. Patrick's Day the American people, and especially the citizens of Massachusetts, join with their fellow Americans of Irish ancestry in celebrating Ireland's National Day; and

Whereas the State of Massachusetts owes a special debt of gratitude to the Irish for their magnificent contributions; and

Whereas the on-going violations of human rights in Northern Ireland casts a shadow on our celebration of St. Patrick's Day this year; and

Whereas it would be the hope of the citizens of Massachusetts that the conflicts troubling the people in Northern Ireland could be resolved in an expeditious and peaceful manner;

Therefore, I, Michael S. Dukakis, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim March 17, 1978, as "Human Rights Day for Northern Ireland" and urge the citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this event and to participate fittingly in its observance. ●

#### COMMEMORATION OF ARMENIAN MARTYR'S DAY

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the suffering of millions of Armenians 63 years ago, we note what is properly regarded as the first deliberate genocide in the 20th century the ruthless massacre of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Empire. Since that time, of course, the world has witnessed other incidents of man's savage cruelty to fellow human beings. However, this historic event not only threatened the Armenian people with extinction which was the goal of the tyrants of the Ottoman government, but also set an unfortunate precedent, that of world inaction.

The anniversary of this tragic event must not be allowed to pass without a tribute to the 1,500,000 Armenian men, women, and children who perished during the 1915-18 period. Again this year, we should remember those martyrs who sacrificed their lives and rededicate ourselves to a renewed reverence for human life.

The history of the Armenian people has been marked by long periods of subjugation to foreign rule. As early as the 16th century, nearly the whole country was overrun and held by the Ottoman Turks. Today, the historic Armenian area in what is now Turkey, is totally devoid of Armenian people, while the Soviet Union holds the Armenian people captive in the area known as Soviet Armenia.

Despite the years of subjugation by alien rulers, the Armenian people still manage to retain their national consciousness through their church, culture, and language. The Armenians were the first nation in the world to accept Christianity as their state religion, and were perhaps the oldest of the civilized races in western Asia. Their sense of unity and national aspirations became so intense by the mid-19th century that the Armenians developed a strong desire for attainment of their goal of self-government.

However, at that time, the Turks set out to exterminate the Armenian Chris-

tian population within Turkish borders and attempted to eliminate some 2 million Armenians in the empire through deportation, contrived famine, and large-scale massacres. While many hundreds of thousands were able to flee to neighboring lands, many others, mostly women and children, were forced to adopt the Moslem faith and submit to servitude in Turkish homes. The Armenians paid with their lives for having entertained the idea of human dignity and freedom.

I believe that we should be confident that this historical injustice will one day be corrected and a free and independent Armenia will once again exist. The Armenian people have demonstrated throughout history, their fortitude, stamina and tenacity in maintaining their church, culture, and language. The existence today of this Armenian spirit is the foundation that will lead to the ultimate restoration of a modern Armenian nation.

Therefore, we should be strengthened by the belief that their suffering was not in vain and that a free Armenia will arise despite the shocking indifference of the world at the time of the massacre unleashed by the Ottomans and the various political setbacks that have occurred in the last 63 years. ●

#### VA MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN DANGER

### HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues are aware, the inadequacies of the President's budget request for the Veterans' Administration medical care program are staggering and will adversely affect almost every VA facility in the country.

The President's budget reduces the operating beds in VA hospitals by a total of 3,132. There is no question in my mind that the quantity and quality of medical care and treatment to which veterans are entitled under laws passed by the Congress will be reduced to an unacceptable level.

Aside from the reductions in the number of beds and the loss of personnel, there is another area which concerns me very much—that being the future of our VA medical research programs.

In the VA system there are some 177 hospitals. Eighty of these have medical school affiliations. However, indications are that research funds in medical schools are in short supply and that pressure is being applied on the Veterans' Administration to provide additional funds to those hospitals with medical school affiliation.

Currently, there are 64 hospitals with research budgets of approximately \$120,000 per year. Nine of these are to be terminated and the remainder have been site-visited to determine which programs should be kept and which should be phased out. In any event, those which are recommended for continuation will receive reductions in their programs so

that more money will be available for the hospitals with medical school affiliations.

The situation at the Togus VA Center in Togus, Maine, is perhaps exemplary of circumstances which will occur across the country if these research programs are terminated. At Togus, an additional 12 positions will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, the Maine Department of the American Legion has provided me with some important reasons why clinical and basic research is important at Togus. I am sure these same reasons can be applied to our VA Centers across the country and their research programs. I would like to share those reasons with my colleagues at this point:

**SOME REASONS WHY CLINICAL AND BASIC RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT AT TOGUS**

1. Improves the quality of patient care because:

a. Recruiting staff: Better-trained staff of all types is attracted to a hospital with a basic research program. Our staff has improved as research grew.

b. Education: Goes hand-in-hand with research. An atmosphere of inquiry is essential to good teaching. This helps patient care.

c. Scientific standards: Basic research has the most exacting standards which affects all staff and creates a scientific atmosphere in addition to the clinical aspect.

2. Stimulates other research, clinical, Health Services, biomedical engineering:

a. The fecundity of aggregates operates at Togus where there is a remarkably well-integrated group of investigators developing. There are close, supportive relationships between basic biomedical research, HSR&D, and clinical research in medicine, surgery, psychology, social work and other services. Basic research is essential to these other groups in encouraging high standards, improving communications, supporting new ideas and projects emotionally, financially and administratively.

In recent years, Togus has attracted many new staff members with research interests and with varying degrees of experience. This is probably a microcosm of what is happening all over Maine which is the second fastest growing state (U.S. Dept. of Commerce). It is the only post-industrial state in the Union, and is attracting many competent people who come here because of Maine's unique advantages. All indications are that this trend will continue.

The Jackson Laboratory at Bar Harbor and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute are two examples of excellent research facilities which grew "in isolation" because they attracted creative staff just as Togus is doing.

**3. Affiliations:**

a. Current negotiations with Tufts University School of Medicine are underway for this hospital to serve as a teaching facility for third and fourth year students from Maine attending Tufts. The support of a research facility and its productive use by staff members is important to this affiliation. Furthermore, the research facility which has been constructed permits the acceptance of doctoral degree candidates from the University of Maine whose interest is the investigation of a particular aspect of a human disease, using first an appropriate animal model to perfect experimental procedures and test hypotheses before using human source material. Staff members with research interests will serve as mentors.

b. Approved current affiliations number 20 and include among others Tufts University School of Dental Medicine, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Bangor Community College, University of Maine at Augusta Division of Nursing, Maine Medical Center, Central Maine Medical Center, University of Maine at Orono, and University with accredited doc-

toral training programs in Psychology, e.g., Adelphi.

4. Impact of VA Medical Care Program upon community medicine:

a. To emphasize further the importance of the Medical Research Service to the overall medical care program within the State of Maine, it should be pointed out that in the State's population of nearly one million, 160,000 are veterans. If one crudely estimates that each veteran is married with one child, nearly half of this state's population is service-related. About 11% of the state's veterans seek medical care at this hospital. Obviously, the major portion of medical care is provided by the private sector. To help support this private sector, services such as kidney biopsies diagnosed by electron microscopy have been proposed and enthusiastically endorsed by the pathology departments of these hospitals. This station has developed its electron microscopy facility in research with the view of contractual arrangements to help support its maintenance, technician's salaries and supplies. This is the only hospital-based electron microscope in the state. Funds are to be solicited from the Bingham Fund for a 2-year feasibility study to defray the expense of these services to the areas hospitals prior to making contractual arrangements. Full utilization of the instrument is assured by this arrangement as well as assuring its use for research problems arising from its clinical application. The impact upon patient care is apparent, particularly for the staff at Togus and the staffs of hospitals within this state.

b. Similarly, amino acid analyses as an additional diagnostic service, particularly for pediatrics, has been proposed. Again, this is the only amino acid analyzer available for medicine in the state. Dr. Cuprak who trained Dr. Ampola of Dr. Gellis' staff in pediatrics at Boston Floating Hospital, New England Medical Center Hospital, has also provided the requisite training to technicians here.

c. Regionalization, therefore, does not reach approximately 89% of the veteran population in the state but a medical care facility with a medical research department can influence the excellence of care not only at this station but serve to radiate it to local hospitals where the majority of veteran patients and their families is being treated.

5. Loss of the research service at Togus will jeopardize the affiliations listed in paragraph 3 and will also compromise our ability to continue as a leader in community medical health care including the family practice residencies, surgical residencies and contemplated internal medicine and psychiatric residencies. As one of the leading hospitals in the State of Maine it will be difficult to maintain this position and to recruit a staff able to teach Maine students in medicine at Tufts and Vermont Medical School during their 3rd and 4th year clerkships and to provide an attraction to assist our efforts in recruitment as cited in paragraph 1.

6. Through the years since the Medical Research Service was inaugurated in 1957 many volunteers have served in the laboratory; numerous summer student positions have been filled and student research programs have been completed using the Togus facilities. Many of these students have received their basic inspiration and training which enabled them to continue in medical studies ultimately completing their medical training and returning to the State of Maine as badly needed physicians. Others have pursued health related careers and science oriented endeavors.

7. The contribution of research to patient care in a health care facility is recognized. To discontinue the present Medical Research Service at Togus is to retreat to a secondary care and treatment facility which is not in the best interests of the veterans of the State of Maine.

8. Without the value of research, and fac-

ing all of the above-mentioned problems, what would be left to attract competent doctors to the Togus VA Hospital? No medical school is going to guide their students into a system that lacks adequate training and an economical future.

9. If President Carter's budget clears Congress in present form, you will see the demise of over 50 hospitals almost overnight. ●

**SHCHARANSKY CASE STILL A MAJOR CONCERN**

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, there is no more tragic, dramatic situation of the suppression of fundamental civil liberties in the Soviet Union than the case of Anatoly Shcharansky.

I was pleased to see the letter by the distinguished political scientist, Hans J. Morgenthau, and several others, which appeared in the New York Times recently.

I am submitting it in the RECORD here for my colleagues, who may not have seen it and for the benefit of our friends at the Soviet Embassy, who I know read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD faithfully.

The letter follows:

MOSCOW VS. ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

To the Editor:

Anatoly Shcharansky was arrested on March 15, 1977, in Moscow and incarcerated in the notorious Lefortovo Prison. A Soviet prosecutor announced the launching of an investigation against him on charges of treason and espionage, which could carry the penalty of death.

Soviet newspaper articles accused Shcharansky of spying for the C.I.A. The President of the United States formally declared on June 13, 1977, that Shcharansky had never worked for the C.I.A.

For one year Shcharansky has been held incommunicado, forbidden to see visitors, forbidden to hire a lawyer of his choice and kept in the dark about the specific charges against him, while the state-controlled press and leading Soviet officials have, even before an indictment, judged him guilty and called for his execution.

Anatoly Shcharansky personifies the link between Jews actively seeking emigration and the movement for democratic change in the U.S.S.R. Once refused his fundamental right to leave the U.S.S.R. Shcharansky, a computer scientist, became active in the emigration struggle and helped to write complaints about the lawlessness with which emigration matters are treated by Soviet officials. When the Group of Assistance to the Soviet Implementation of the Helsinki Agreement was formed in Moscow, he joined in the belief that the Helsinki Accords, in which the Soviets committed themselves to promote human rights, could change decisively Soviet handling of emigration.

The Soviet authorities tried to frighten and demoralize Shcharansky. He was arrested four times and jailed on fabricated charges for participating in peaceful demonstrations of would-be emigrants.

From the open letter of Dr. Sanya Lipavsky published on March 5, 1977, in Izvestia, it appears that the Soviet authorities greatly fear the consolidation of persons struggling for human rights in the U.S.S.R., which Shcharansky represents. Preliminary reports indicate that they are attempting to link through Shcharansky, in a show-trial reminiscent of Stalin's days, American intelli-

gence agents, diplomats and journalists in a wholesale plot for the purpose of suggesting that all dissent in the Soviet Union is directed or exploited from the United States.

We, the undersigned, are appalled by this persecution of Anatoly Shcharansky, which could make of dissent or emigration a form of treason. And we urge that the Soviet Union, as a matter of right, release Shcharansky immediately and permit him to leave for Israel and rejoin his wife.

HANS J. MORGENTHAU,  
DANIEL BELL,  
SAUL BELLOW,  
NATHAN GLAZER,  
IRVING HOWE,  
H. STUART HUGHES.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1978.

(Mr. Morgenthau is chairman and the other signers are sponsors of the Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry.)

#### TRIBUTE TO TAIWANESE RELIGIOUS LEADER

### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. LEACH, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and opportunity several weeks ago to meet with one of the prominent Christian leaders and spokesmen in Taiwan, the Reverend H. K. Weng, during his visit to the United States. He has since returned to his duties in Taiwan where he has just been elected to serve as moderator of the General Assembly of the Taiwan Presbyterian Church. His election to this position is a fitting tribute to his uncommon leadership ability and his extraordinary commitment to the church and to the country in which he lives.

Reverend Weng assumes this task at a time when the island of Taiwan faces a future of uncertainty. With the possibility of the United States moving toward normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, the fate of the Taiwanese people is a constant and troubling question. The Taiwanese people clearly sense this and believe that their voice must be heard if their lives, their future, and their homes are to be secure and free.

I am reminded at this point, Mr. Speaker, of the early days in our own country, and the significant role which a religious leader, John Witherspoon, played at a most difficult political time for this Nation. The parallel is striking. A Presbyterian clergyman himself, John Witherspoon served as the moderator of the church's first general assembly in 1789. He also served as a member of the Continental Congress and signed our Declaration of Independence.

Having visited with the Reverend Weng and having gained a new appreciation and understanding of the tremendous responsibility he and his colleagues share as Taiwan moves into a world of new political realities, I am struck by the importance of continued American support and friendship of the Taiwanese people. It would be tragic if that support were to be eroded by the imposition of laws and policies restrictive to

freedom of religious expression. We all hope that political changes in Taiwan will be in the direction of greater freedom and greater democracy, not greater limitations on individual rights and liberties.

#### LOBBY REFORM

### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. Speaker, last week the House began consideration of H.R. 8494, the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act. This legislation is a vast improvement over the existing statute, and I am hopeful our deliberations on H.R. 8494 will proceed expeditiously this week.

However, the majority of our colleagues believed some of the reporting provisions in the bill were deficient, and therefore overwhelmingly adopted three amendments which I firmly believe have improved the bill substantially. I hope H.R. 8494 will now pass the House as it is now written. A number of recent newspaper editorials support the concepts behind these amendments, and for the review of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of these editorials be inserted in the Record immediately following my remarks. I think they will make very clear the broad support that exists in all parts of this country for meaningful lobby reform.

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner,  
Mar. 30, 1978]

#### THE LOBBY LAW

Using a cliché to make a point is not altogether indefensible in some cases, such as lobbyists have been getting away with murder in Washington too many years to remember.

Legislation to replace a 32-year-old federal lobby law will soon be debated in the House. The new bill would expand lobbying coverage, reveal hidden influences and the money involved. The 1946 law has so many loopholes it is virtually unenforceable. Many big lobbyists didn't even bother to register last year.

To stop the lobbyists from getting away with murder, the full House should restore two provisions deleted by its Judiciary Committee. One would require more disclosure about "grassroots" lobbying-getting citizens back home to write members of Congress supporting or opposing certain legislation. The other would spotlight major financial backers.

We agree with Common Cause Chairwoman Nan Waterman that if these two provisions are killed the lobbyists "will once more have pulled down the shades on sunshine."

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News,  
Mar. 10, 1978]

#### REFORMING THE LOBBY LAW

The Feb. 20 issue of the Congressional Record lists all lobbyists registered in 1977 with Congress under the 1946 Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. The list is 55 pages long with, by rough guess, about 2200 names. Though it seems quite extensive, if really isn't.

On closer reading, the list discloses some notable gaps. We looked in vain for General Motors, Exxon, and Mobil Oil. Oh, there were

a few biggies, such as the AFL-CIO, the Teamsters Union, and Getty Oil. But nearly all of those registered were small fry. Moreover, with some exceptions, the list didn't say how much money was spent on lobbying, nor for what purpose.

The reason is that the 1946 Lobbying Act contains some loopholes big enough for a congressman to drive a Cadillac through. For instance, organizations are only required to register under the act if their "principal purpose" is lobbying. This major corporations, such as Ford Motor Co., Exxon, and U.S. Steel—all of which lobby extensively are exempt because their principal purpose is something else, like making steel or producing oil.

A study released by Common Cause last month showed that most of the organizations, including the seven largest oil companies, which lobbied on the energy bill in 1977 didn't disclose their activities under the 1946 law. In fact, only one in 10 organizations that lobbied on energy-related matters last year bothered at all to register. And it is perfectly legal. In the future, hopefully, it won't be.

A bill now before the House (H.R. 8494) is designed to plug some of the loopholes in the 32-year-old lobby law. It already has been weakened, however, in the Judiciary Committee, and unless supporters wage a strong fight, the new law won't be worth much more than the old.

H.R. 8494 would eliminate the principal purpose test and replace it with criteria based on how much money an organization spends on lobbying. It would have to register and report lobbying efforts quarterly if it spent \$2,500 for a lobbyist. This would go far toward the major problem of identifying those organizations which lobby extensively.

It wouldn't touch the problem, however, of identifying the source of lobbying efforts by nondescript sounding groups. For instance, what is the Calorie Control Council—a group of weightwatchers or soft drink manufacturers? Who does the American Rivers Conservation Council represent—boat owners, conservationists, or barge operators?

A provision, since deleted from the bill in the Judiciary Committee, would have gone far to help as know. It would have required disclosure of the identity of every major financial backer of lobbying groups, i.e., those contributing over \$3,000.

Some congressmen have argued that such a provision would impede the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of association. But it would only require disclosure of large contributors. It wouldn't restrict or regulate the amount of contributions in any way.

In the only Supreme Court case to date ruling on disclosure, *U.S. v. Harris* (1954) the Court upheld the requirements of the 1946 Act. Its language would apply equally well today: "Congress has not sought to prohibit (lobbying activities)." It has merely provided for a modicum of information from those who for hire attempt to influence legislation or who collect or spend funds for that purpose.

As a minimum, Congress should return the financial disclosure provisions to H.R. 8494 and pass the bill. The public has a right to know who pressures and cajoles our legislators and the reasons why.

[From the Kansas City Times, Apr. 19, 1978]

#### TEETH BACK INTO LOBBY BILL

Debate is scheduled to begin today in the U.S. House on a lobbying disclosure bill. The turn this legislation takes will reveal a great deal about just how seriously reform is being taken in Washington this spring. Previous action does not bode especially well for a strong bill.

In February the House Judiciary Committee eliminated two key provisions that were in the lobbying legislation as it was intro-

duced. One would have required disclosure of "grassroots" lobbying campaigns in which groups urge citizens to write members of Congress on an issue. More and more interest organizations are turning to this technique because it is an effective way of bringing pressure to bear on lawmakers. Unless this requirement is restored by amendment during debate—as it should be—the American public will be deprived of important information about who is attempting to sway Congress. Generally it is as important to know the source of pressure as it is to know that influence is being brought to bear.

The other requirement that was dropped mandated that lobbying organizations must divulge the names of their financial contributors. Here again is a move by the committee to prevent the citizenry from an opportunity to know precisely who is behind lobbying efforts. This information is absolutely necessary if the legislative process is to be entirely open, as it most certainly should be in a representative democracy.

A legal question has been raised about the requirement on financial contributions, specifically about the right of free association. Nothing in the disclosure provision is intended to limit financial gifts. The objective is to require groups to reveal their large contributors. The present law, weak as it is, requires reports on certain contributions.

The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld this requirement. Part of the decision is persuasive on this basic of a free society. "Congress has not sought to prohibit (contributions)," stated the court in a 1954 ruling. "It has merely provided for a modicum of information from those who for hire attempt to influence legislation or who collect or spend funds for that purpose. It only wants to know who is being hired, who is putting up the money, and how much..."

Supporters of reform, including Common Cause, are backing amendments that would put the provisions on contributors and "grassroots" lobbying back into the legislation. The amendment on disclosure would require the reporting of contributions of \$3,000 or more a year.

Generally the measure to be debated would require lobbying groups to register, file reports on their activities and list names of individuals who are hired to work in their behalf. As matters stand now, only groups with the "principal purpose" of lobbying are covered. This loophole is so large that hundreds of companies and organizations slip by without disclosure of their expenditures and activities.

This legislation reflects an improved attitude in Congress, even though the Judiciary Committee dropped two significant provisions.

The public has a right to the information that would be available through the provision on "grass-roots" lobbying and disclosure of large contributors. Without them the new statute could be more of a sham than genuine reform.

[From the Macon, (Ga.) News, Mar. 27, 1978]  
LOBBY LAW LOOPHOLES OVERDUE FOR PLUGGING

If you want to know who's paying what to pressure your congressman or senator—and often to pressure you—write your representative about House Resolution 8494.

The proposed federal lobby law came out of the House Judiciary Committee late last month with two gaping holes poked in it. These need to be closed, and the rest of the bill protected, as it comes on the floor now.

The present law, 32 years old, has more loopholes than Swiss cheese. It's a joke—on us. Because under it only groups whose "primary purpose" is lobbying have to register and report their expenditures, major corporations that do a lot of lobbying get off unexamined.

As a result huge consumer organizations, the nation's biggest oil companies and an electrical industry body employing 30 full-time lobbyists haven't had to register.

The new law makes a wider net: a lobbyist is any organization that spends \$2,500 in a quarter to lobby.

The 1946 lobby law requires lobbyists to report only their expenditures for communicating directly with congressmen. But the big news in lobbying these days is the "grass roots" technique. The AFL-CIO, Common Cause, the National Rifle Association and business groups all use it.

An organization spends huge amounts on advertising or direct mailings urging citizens to write or phone congressmen. A flood of mail descends. Yet the old law doesn't help a congressman to know who is financing the letters.

H.R. 8494 had a clause designed to close this loophole taken out in the Commerce Committee. It needs to be put back on the floor.

So does another provision which would require lobbying organizations to disclose who their major financial backers are. (The "Calorie Control Council" is financed by soft drink makers to work against the FDA saccharine ban.)

We can't know enough about lobbying—a perfectly legitimate activity which is part of the democratic process. Congress has to be convinced of that. ●

#### A DEFENSE ANALYSIS

### HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of North Canton, Ohio, Mr. Dennis Grady, recently called to my attention a paper written by a student in a political science class the mayor taught at Stark Technical College. He was impressed with the paper.

I agree with the mayor's judgment and find the paper a very interesting analytical commentary by a young American on the state of our Nation's defense.

I believe the following paper, written by Jim Nalley of Bolivar, Ohio, expresses a deep concern for our Nation's safety which deserves the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The paper follows:

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

I've always been an advocate of cutting back on defense spending. I thought by researching this I could cut down our military leaders and advisors who are always begging for more funds. My reasoning being that we should try to solve our other internal problems such as unemployment, Social Security, etc. But, after reading magazine and newspaper articles, portions of books, and selected government publications, I have changed my point of view. Of course, there is still the problem of who to believe, everyone writing their own points of view and using different sources of research. There has been enough written and said though, concerning our military and defensive inferiority to the U.S.S.R. that say the same things with coinciding statistics that I, personally, believe it. It scares me. We won't have our internal problems if we keep on cutting back on defense. The Soviets will have solved them for us.

For fiscal year 1978, 26 cents out of the

budget dollar was set aside for national defense. This was done by President Ford who recommended continuation of the growth in defense effort initiated in 1976 after a review of our defense policy. This included production of the B-1 bomber. Well, President Carter has halted production of the B-1. As an alternative, Carter proposes that existing B-52 bombers be equipped with ALCM's (air-launched cruise missiles). ALCM's are less vulnerable to Soviet air defenses and at a cost of under \$1 million each, we can afford to buy large numbers of them. This means that launching all ALCM's at one time would overload Soviet air defenses allowing many to reach their target.

On the other hand the B-1 costs about \$100 million each and is very vulnerable to Soviet air defenses. But, the B-1 was going to carry the ALCM as one of its weapons. The B-1 is a superior aircraft to the B-52 in every way.

What I'm getting at is, when does playing politics with the people override their safety. The public is critical of any new weapon system because of their memories of Viet Nam which have made them anti-military. But, I think this is caused by the facts necessary for intelligent decisions not being made available to the public. How many people know the real economics behind a weapons system? To make a defensive system against an offensive weapon costs more. The more you can force the Soviet Union to spend on defense the less they have to spend on offensive capabilities. You have to complicate their job of modernizing defense systems. As it is now, the Russians have superiority in every category.

Deterrence seems to be the key. If the U.S. or U.S.S.R. think that by launching a first strike against the other, that a second retaliatory strike would be devastating to their people, then deterrence is intact. But, regardless of the SALT and other agreements, the Soviets have accelerated research and development of defensive and offensive strategic forces.

Detente is effective when both adversaries agree to abide by their agreements and transactions. While we have been telling everyone about detente the U.S.S.R. has been passing us in military superiority. In 1975 the Soviets' armed forces were 109 percent greater than ours.

From 1968 to 1975 our armed forces were demobilized by 40 percent to 2.1 million men, while the Soviets increased theirs 37 percent to 4.4 million. They may have as many as 25 million in the reserves to our 902,000. In total military expenditures the Soviets spent about \$143 billion in 1975 and were likely to spend \$153 billion in 1977. We requested \$101.1 billion for 1977. This doesn't even tell the whole story. 57.3 percent of our defense expenditures was for payroll. The Soviets spent 15 percent for payroll. They can spend 38 percent more on weapons. From 1965 to 1975 Soviet research and development increased 113 percent while ours dropped 26 percent.

In strategic air defense radars the Soviets have 5000 to our 67. In medium range bombers they have 580 to our 66, a 778 percent advantage. In explosive power of nuclear weapons we are behind 2 to 1. In expenditures on strategic forces they were outspending us in 1975 by 60 percent.

I think these statistics have shown what the problem is. The U.S.S.R. has or will have in the very near future the capability of launching an attack on the U.S. without danger of a retaliation that would cripple them. As it is now the Soviets could launch a strike against the U.S., absorb a counter strike, and still have remaining forces sufficient to destroy Chinese and NATO nuclear capability, and attack U.S. population and military targets, and still have explosive pow-

er in excess of ours. All this leads to surrender under such circumstances. Not unconditional but maybe something like staying out of the Middle East and dismantling our remaining strategic forces. It is clear what the end result would be, a totalitarian world.

But, would our leaders even retaliate with the risk of losing tens of millions of lives and the industrial complex? Experts say no, that it would be the most suicidal course to take.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn said in a speech after coming to the U.S., "At one time there was no comparison between the strength of the U.S.S.R. and yours. Then it became equal to yours. Now, as all recognize, it is becoming superior to yours. Perhaps the ratio is just greater than unity, but soon it will be 2 to 1. Then 3 to 1. Finally it will be 5 to 1. With such a nuclear superiority it will be possible to block the use of your weapons, and on some unlucky morning they will declare: "Attention. We are marching our troops to Europe, and if you make a move, we will annihilate you. And this ratio of 3 to 1, or 5 to 1, will have its effect: you will not make a move."

Our policy is to prevent nuclear war. By doing this we are giving in to every Soviet wish. By not building our arms up and antagonizing or threatening them. How many Americans know that we have extended considerable economic aid to the Soviets and are providing them with whole factories, food, and technical scientific aid in their space and satellite programs, among others. The Soviets are being aided and abetted by their potential victims. Many recognize this, but conclude that detente is our only alternative to war. This is wrong.

Throughout history, peace has been maintained by clear purposes, military power, and the will to use it. Peace is preserved when potential aggressors know that the rewards are not worth the costs of war. Detente is putting the U.S. in a position of strategic surrender to the Soviets. Americans may have no choice but to bow to nuclear blackmail. But, how soon.

Soviet objectives are to eliminate capitalism. We are the principal embodiment of that social system, which gives them the motivation for launching a first strike. We have no reason nor ever shown a need to attack the Soviet Union. Our objective is peaceful coexistence with each independent state choosing their own future and social system. In contrast, the Soviets have shown that they regard the world struggle as a fight to the finish between two diametrically opposed social systems. It is a fight, though, the Soviets intend to win.

The Soviet Union does not want to destroy America. Our industries and farmland is much too valuable to them. They just want to cripple us into submission. The Soviets have the capability to launch a first strike against our defenses and military bases that would kill 5 or 6 million people, destroy our strategic forces, and leave 99 percent of the industry undamaged. This is made easy because our military bases are built away from our largest cities.

This brings up civil defense. The Soviets since 1950 have been steadily upgrading and improving their civil defense. They have built enough adequate bomb shelters to save a high percentage of lives important to the administration of the country. These have been and are being stocked with enough food and supplies to sustain them until the fallout has decreased to a safe level. They have built their factories in outlying areas and dispersed them to make it harder for us to destroy them. Civil Defense is a branch of their armed forces which would provide for organization in the event of a surprise attack.

What are our civil defense precautions? Naturally, we can't move all our factories

from the clusters that they now operate. We don't have an organized civil defense procedure to follow. I don't know of any shelters where I could expect to live for an extended period of time. But, I don't know if I would want to survive. What would be facing us upon emerging from the shelter? Would it be complete devastation? Nothing would ever be the same. Would we be overrun by the Russians or just left to try to rebuild? We would have no allies, with Russia threatening annihilation to anyone providing assistance. Naturally, if we wanted to stay alive, we would succumb to the Communists. I would rather be dead.

I guess what I have been trying to show is the delicate balance that exists, or maybe imbalance. This country needs a national defense policy to be adhered to regardless of who or what party is in office. We have the money and technology to reestablish the U.S. as the most powerful nation in the world, and in a short amount of time. I wonder what would happen now if the Soviet Union started building missile sites in Cuba. If our cutbacks are continued, sooner or later there will be no need for a nuclear war. The Communists will rule the world by simply the threat of annihilation and devastation. We need to educate our people of the true facts and objectives of the U.S. compared to Soviet goals. But, and I am sad to say, nothing will be done until a crisis happens. Then it will be too late. Isn't that the American way of doing things?

The End??●

#### SENATOR METZENBAUM OFFERS GOOD ADVICE

#### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I believe it is not a good practice to reprint things that have already been in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

But in the event that some of my colleagues did not read the remarks of Senator HOWARD METZENBAUM in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, I'm taking the liberty of inserting a portion of those remarks.

Senator METZENBAUM very effectively calls into question our whole practice of paying farmers not to produce.

I hope some of my colleagues will read his remarks.

The remarks follow:

GLOBAL FOOD PROBLEMS AND THE TALMADGE FARM BILL (H.R. 6782)

\*\*\* Mr. President, I believe that there is something deeply wrong about paying American farmers not to produce. I believe that it is a tragedy that our farmers are suffering as a direct result of their success in responding to the need of a still-hungry world for additional food production \*\*\*

A few short years ago, in 1974, I attended the World Food Conference in Rome. That Conference, called in response to the potential disasters that confronted the world in 1972 and 1973, seemed at the time to offer the hope that a process could be set in motion to create an effective international approach to a common problem for all humanity \*\*\*

Mr. President, the world food shortage is over, but is only over for now. The bumper crops for the last few years represent merely short-term increases in the food supply. The 2.5 percent annual rate of growth achieved

worldwide in the 1970's falls well below the 4 percent growth rate recommended by the World Food Conference.

Current world food stocks—now about 14 percent of annual consumption—are still well below the 17 to 18 percent designated by the United Nations Food and Agriculture organization as the minimum "safe level". Current stocks are, in fact, comparable to what they were in 1972-1973, when poor weather and massive crop failures in the Soviet Union caused a rapid depletion in world reserves.

In making the steps proposed by this bill (HR 6782), we will remove 31 million acres of American land from production.

These steps are inevitable. They may be necessary. They are certainly sufficient to make a major, positive impact on farm income. But we must face the fact that they involve real and substantial risks for this country and for the poor of the world \*\*\*

Mr. President, I believe that our incomparable agricultural potential can and should be fully harnessed in the cause of ending hunger and malnutrition in our own country and in the world at large. The prospect that people anywhere in the world will go hungry while our farmland lies idle is unacceptable to me, and I am convinced, to the farmers of America \*\*\*●

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO JIM HENSEVELT

#### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are involved in the business of the Federal Government here in Washington know full well the importance of having dedicated and competent officials hard at work in local communities. Many of the most creative pieces of legislation coming out of Washington have their origins in the experiences of smalltown mayors, city councils, and city managers. We depend on input from these officials in order to identify the needs and desires of the people in their communities.

I mention this today because I would like to single out one outstanding official from my hometown of Lexington, Mo., who has recently retired from public life. Jim Hensevelt has just completed his second term as mayor of Lexington. Prior to that, he was a city councilman for 6 years. But cold numbers like that cannot begin to tell the story of what he has done for the community. In 1974, Jim retired at the end of his first term as mayor. However, he had done such a good job that the people just would not let him go. He was reelected in 1975 by a write-in ballot.

Jim Hensevelt is a lifelong resident of Lexington. His father, Ben, still lives in Lexington. In 1946, Jim married Betty Robertson. They have two children, Carol Hensevelt, of Victoria, Tex., and Steven Hensevelt, of Lee's Summit, Mo.

Jim served with the Air Force in World War II as a ball turret gunner in Italy. He answered the call to colors again in the Korean conflict, serving on the island of Okinawa.

As a citizen, Jim Hensevelt has served the community in many capacities. He

served on the State Finance and Revenue Commission for the Missouri Municipal League. Recently he was appointed to the Missouri Housing and Development Commission by Gov. Joseph Teasdale.

This month, Jim Hensevelt stepped down as mayor of Lexington. I am sure that history will prove that he was one of the best mayors Lexington ever had.●

OUR DOOR IS OPEN TO SPIES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

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

OUR DOOR IS OPEN TO SPIES

(By Marvin Stone)

Many people—and too many officials—in this country think of Soviet spying as a bugaboo of the past. That, in our view, is a dangerous mistake. Soviet espionage is not just a bugaboo. Nor is it a thing of the past. It is a present and growing threat to our security.

The fact is: The Soviet Union and its Communist allies are flooding the U.S. with more spies now than ever before—more, even, than in the cold-war days when Communist spying was taken far more seriously than it is today.

This phenomenal increase is occurring at a time when American counterintelligence is a shambles. The Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have been so weakened and their operations so tightly curbed that there is serious concern about their ability to cope with the spying upsurge.

In the last five years, the number of officials from nations of the Soviet bloc stationed in the U.S. has increased by more than 50 percent—up from 1,383 in 1972 to 1,898 this year. No fewer than 1,266 of those are Russians.

That is only part of the story. There also has been an enormous expansion in the number of visitors coming here from the Soviet Union. This is the result of the numerous exchange agreements between the U.S. and Russia that were signed in 1972 with the opening of the era of so-called détente. The number of Soviet visitors has nearly doubled, increasing from 6,344 in 1972 to roughly 12,000 last year.

On top of that, the FBI reports that each year more than 20,000 Soviet seamen are permitted to come ashore in numerous American ports visited by their ships. Intelligence experts are convinced that a large percentage of these Communist officials and visitors act as spies, either on a full-time basis or on special assignments. We are told that there are as many as 5,000 Russians in this country every year who are agents of the Soviet secret service, KGB, or who are somehow connected with it.

Not only has the number of potential spies increased, but the softening of restrictions accompanying détente has made their work easier. Limits on travel of Soviets inside the country have been removed or relaxed. Scientists and technicians here on exchange visits are given access to plants and places from which they would have been barred a few years ago. The laxness of security in American plants handling sensitive defense contracts is described by informed officials as "appalling."

It's not only military secrets the Soviets seek. Industrial, scientific and technological secrets have become major targets. And the

doors have been opened to them by the exchange programs. U.S. officials have compiled a voluminous file of secrets stolen by the Soviets.

Another lucrative area the Soviets are trying to penetrate is Congress. The targets there are the staff members employed by lawmakers and committees. Many of them have access to highly sensitive information. These staffers are routinely given easy "security clearance" by an FBI reluctant to antagonize Congress. There is concern about some staffers' discretion in guarding the information they possess.

What can be done about all this?

One suggestion: Tighten up on the exchange programs, limit the number of Soviet visitors and their access to target areas.

The State Department argues that the exchanges are important in cementing Soviet-American relations. But their real value to American interests is open to challenge. Where is there evidence that they have influenced Soviet behavior?

Another proposal: Deny security clearance—and thus deny defense contracts—to firms that do not take adequate security measures.

But the one thing that is of paramount importance is to quit punishing our counterintelligence agencies for past misdeeds by crippling their ability to cope with spies.

National security is too important to be sacrificed to a spirit of revenge.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS NELLIGAN

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, occasionally in life one has the good fortune to encounter an individual whose character and integrity, perseverance and good will enrich the lives of all he touches to surpass even his greatest contributions. One such individual is Mr. Thomas J. Nelligan of Ansonia, Conn., who will be retiring on April 30 after 44 years of dedicated service to his company, Uniroyal.

Since his early days as mayor of Ansonia, Mr. Nelligan's endless generosity and continuous involvement have left the community with many invaluable contributions for which he will always be remembered. In the course of his 44 years at Uniroyal, the last 8 of which he served as industrial relations manager, his unselfish giving and fine counsel have earned him the respect of all his colleagues. Through his involvement in the church, the hospital, the many redevelopment projects of the city and as member of various industrial councils, he has had a decisive impact on the development of the entire region and its people, improving the quality of life for all. Always determined, always dedicated, and always keeping the interest of his fellow man at heart, Mr. Nelligan has earned the high regard and esteem of the entire community.

It is, therefore, with great pride and pleasure that I commend to my colleagues the many outstanding achievements of this gentleman and join with his community in applauding his years

of selfless efforts to improve living and working conditions for all. I join them in wishing him many years of health and happiness, fully confident that his commitment to community involvement will continue long into retirement.●

"PRELUDE TO HOLOCAUST"

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent newspaper articles of unusual poignancy which, taken together, provide a chilling perspective on issues now confronting Israel and the western democratic world.

An excellent article in the Washington Post of Sunday, April 16, 1978: "Prelude to Holocaust" by Peggy Mann, recounts the now forgotten conference held at Evian-les-Bains, France, at which the free nations of the world failed to stand against the growing wave of Nazi terror in 1938.

During the 1930's and 1940's, the national policy of Nazi Germany was directed toward systematic persecution and extermination of the Jews. That policy resulted in the slaughter of 6 million human beings whose only crime was the fact that they were Jews.

But we must recall, too—painful as those memories are—that the nations of the free world, the United States included, failed to open their doors to the persecuted Jews of Germany and Austria before it was too late.

The purpose of the Evian Conference was to provide asylum for these imperiled people. A temporary haven was all that was required at the time to save virtually all of the 500,000 Jews in Germany and Austria. Acceptance of these refugees was well within the combined resources of the 32 nations attending the Evian Conference.

Whether through bigotry, indifference or political inertia, this critical act of compassion was not forthcoming. At no time during that tragic period in the history of civilization did the world act decisively to oppose the horrors being perpetrated by the Nazis.

Failure to confront and counter Nazi persecution encouraged it to proceed and to increase in scope. The Nazis concluded that "nobody gave a damn about the Jews," and that they were merely working the world's will. The result of silence and inaction in the face of organized evil was to seal the doom of European Jewry.

I commend this article to my colleagues. Its message is clear: Not only must people of conscience speak out against persecution, but free world governments must act against those who would employ terror as an instrument of policy and victimize an entire people by design.

My colleagues will also be interested in a sensitive and powerful article from

the New York Times of March 16, 1978 by Cynthia Ozick, "Letter to a Palestinian Military Spokesman." The writer reflects on the death of Imri Tel-Oren, her 14-year-old cousin, who was brutally slain with over 30 other civilians by Palestinian terrorists near Tel Aviv.

This article brings into stark relief the continuing struggle of the Jewish people against terror and persecution more than 30 years after the fall of the Nazis. Ms. Ozick's telling letter gives us a unique sense of continuity with respect to the tactics of totalitarianism, whether employed by Nazis in the 1930's and 1940's, or by the PLO in the 1970's.

Again, it is imperative that we recognize the need for free people everywhere to stand in forceful opposition to terror and its perpetrators. Today, just as in 1938, silence and inertia—now reinforced by the lure of petrodollars—make it convenient for some to avoid confronting terrorism and the unholy alliance of Arab dictatorships and totalitarian states that instigate, abet and profit by terrorism.

We must remember, as the conference at Evian demonstrated, that indifference in the face of oppression and murder compromises all decent people. It can only increase the likelihood of continuing outrages of the sort that robbed the world of 14-year-old Imri Tel-Oren, and serve as a prelude to even greater abuses of humanity.

PRELUDE TO HOLOCAUST  
(By Peggy Mann)

EVIAN-LES-BAINS, FRANCE.—I stood on a lawn overlooking Lac Lemman where tiny sailboat triangles moved slowly through the evening. Behind me rose the white splendor of the Royal Hotel. It was a setting epitomizing peace, well-being. Yet, this is the place where, in July, 1938, the holocaust—the murder of two-thirds of Europe's Jews—could have been halted.

Here, in the famed French resort, 15 weeks after Hitler annexed Austria, delegates from 32 nations met to determine how they could rescue the Jews of the Greater German Reich, help them to reestablish their lives elsewhere.

Never before in history had nations of the world gathered together for the single purpose of saving a doomed people. "Nations of Asylum" they called themselves.

The conference had been organized by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who appointed Myron C. Taylor, former president of U.S. Steel, as his special ambassador. All of the delegates were important men: three ambassadors, three ministers, 13 envoys and 13 other diplomats of high status. They settled into their luxurious suites at the Royal Hotel buoyed by the aura of expectancy and good will which news of the conference had engendered.

Reporters from the 32 nations attended. Two days before the opening of the conference, Anne O'Hare McCormick wrote in The New York Times: "It is heartbreaking to think of the queues of desperate human beings around our consulates in Vienna and other cities waiting in suspense for what happens at Evian. But the question they underline is not simply humanitarian. . . . It is a test of civilization. . . . Can America live with itself if it lets Germany get away with this policy of extermination, allows the fanaticism of one man to triumph over reason, refuses to take up this gage of battle against barbarism?"

Who were these "Nations of Asylum?" Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, the United States, Great Britain and

her Commonwealth countries, France, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Switzerland, nations of Latin America and Africa. Only two countries, Italy and South Africa, turned down the invitation, but South Africa sent an observer.

There also was a contingent of uninvited observers: Nazis. No one knew quite what to do about this, so they were allowed to remain. They showed up at every session, most of them dressed in mufti. And they took careful notes during all the proceedings.

Also attending were top officials of 39 refugee organizations, including 20 Jewish organizations, who had come to present the delegates with eyewitness accounts, reports, statistics, all of which culminated in one irrefutable conclusion: the Jews of Hitler's Reich were doomed unless they could get out of Germany and Austria.

And they could get out—then. Indeed, the official German policy in 1938 was to make the Reich *Judenrein*—purified of Jews—by getting the Jews out. There was only one problem. Who would let the Jews in?

A sad joke was making the rounds in the Reich. A Jew goes into a travel agent; he wants to take a trip. The agent sets a globe on the counter before him. "There. The world. Choose." Slowly the Jew turns the globe, studying it carefully. Finally, he looks up and says: "Have you got anything else?"

There was, in fact, only one spot in the world where Europe's Jews were welcomed. Palestine. At least they were welcomed by the Jews of Palestine, not by the Arabs of Palestine. And not by the British who held a League of Nations mandate to rule over Palestine. Just prior to the Evian Conference, the deputy head of the British delegation, Sir Michael Palarett, succeeded in winning a promise from Taylor that the world's most eloquent spokesman for increased Jewish immigration to Palestine, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, would not be allowed to speak. Not only was Dr. Weizmann an eloquent spokesman, he also was the most official spokesman the Jewish people had. He was president of the World Zionist Organization and president of the Jewish Agency, the widely recognized government of the Jewish people. A 40-year-old woman named Mrs. Golda Meyerson (Meir) had been sent to Evian by the *Yishuv*, the Jews of Palestine, because of her direct forcefulness as a speaker. But she also was not allowed to speak.

A heated debate took place during the first 2 days of the conference. The subject: which of the three main powers, the United States, France or Britain, should chair the proceedings. It was finally decided that the honor should go to the United States.

Then the representatives of the 39 refugee organizations were heard. All of their presentations were scheduled for a single afternoon. Each representative was given 10 minutes. As the afternoon wore on, the time allocated was cut to 5 minutes. The World Jewish Congress, which represented 7 millions, had 5 minutes. The Association for Aid to German Scientists had 5 minutes. The delegation of Jews of the Reich did not receive any time at all. They were told to submit a written memorandum to be included in the minutes.

HORRORS IN AUSTRIA

In the limited time at their disposal, the advocates of Jewish survival detailed horrors which had been happening for the past 3 months in Austria: tens of thousands of Jews thrown into concentration camps . . . men, women, even small children cornered on the streets, beaten, kicked, whipped by black-booted SS men . . . rabbis sent to clean the SS toilets . . . Jewish women forced down on their knees to scrub the gutters, often with acid added to the scrub water . . . throughout the country civilians "cooperating" with the SS by beating up Jews, evicting them from their flats, breaking into Jew-

ish shops and homes, carting out anything of value. The explosion of terror and sadism even exceeded what had been seen in Germany.

Newspaper reports also were distributed to the Evian delegates. For example, two weeks before Evian, The London Times Vienna correspondent had written about "the constant arrest of the Jewish population. No specific charge is made, but men and women, young and old, are taken each day and each night from their houses or in the streets and carried off . . . There can be no Jewish family in the country which has not one or more of its members under arrest. The state of hopelessness and panic which is engendered can be imagined . . ."

In Austria, it had been happening for 3 months, since Hitler took over that country. In Germany it had been happening for 3 years, starting officially with the Nuremberg Laws of Sept. 15, 1935. The German Jew was not recognized as a citizen. All Jews in the civil service had been fired. Jewish teachers had been fired. Jews were excluded from the entertainment industry, from journalism, radio, the stock exchange, law. Indeed, by 1937, half the Jews in Germany were unemployed. And signs had started appearing throughout the county, signs on butcher shops, dairies, groceries, pharmacies: No Jews Allowed. Thus, in many towns, Jews could not buy milk for their children, medicine for their sick. Jewish children had to attend segregated schools and even kindergartens bore the signs: Jewish Scum, or Cursed Be the Jew.

Meanwhile, a brand new First Reader had been issued for small German Aryans. In the section on religion, for example, the youngsters read: "Remember that the Jews are children of the devil and murderers of mankind. Whoever is a murderer deserves to be killed himself."

A month prior to the Evian Conference, the Great Synagogue of Munich was destroyed on Hitler's personal orders, followed by the destruction of synagogues in Nuremberg and Dortmund. Two weeks before the conference, 15,000 Jews were arrested throughout Germany, sent to concentration camps. In Buchenwald, Jews were whipped, tortured in the daytime. And all through the night a recorded voice kept shouting through the loudspeaker: "Any Jew who wishes to hang himself is asked first to put a piece of paper in his mouth with his number on it, so that we may know who he is."

Today, when asked how many of the 6 million annihilated Jews came from Germany and Austria, most people answer, 3 million, 4 million or more.

The fact is that at the time of the Evian Conference there were only 350,000 Jews in Germany and 220,000 in Austria. The 32 "Nations of Asylum," many of which had vast areas of unpopulated lands, could easily have agreed to save every Jew in the Greater German Reich? How many did they agree to save?

WHAT THE U.S. DID

Taylor was the first to speak on the subject. His words were awaited with great anticipation. Not only had the conference been called by the American president, but, in his opening address, he had exhorted the delegates to uphold "those principles which we have come to regard as the standards of our civilization."

Some delegates wondered whether the United States would agree to accept all the Reich's 570,000 Jewish refugees. (A generation later, the United States accepted 585,000 Cuban and Vietnamese refugees, with no noticeable ill effects on the economic life of the nation.)

Carefully, Ambassador Taylor explained that the United States had its quota system which could not be changed. However, an important new step now would be taken. Al-

though the total German quota was 25,957 per year, it so happened that a total of only 27,000 Jews had been admitted to the United States during the past 6 years. (This had been brought about through a number of factors. They ranged from a "roadblock" set down by President Herbert Hoover in 1932 with the intent of discouraging immigration to the depression-ridden United States to the outright anti-Semitism of certain local U.S. consuls who made the on-the-spot decisions as to who should be granted visas.) Although, said Ambassador Taylor, unused quotas of previous years could not be used in subsequent years, U.S. consuls were being advised that the severe restrictions they had imposed upon Jewish refugees should be lifted for the current year, so that the full quota of 27,730 German and Austrian immigrants would be admitted each year. (This included, of course, any Christians who wished to come.)

There was a stunned silence as the ambassador sat down. This was the great gesture of hope and help offered by the nation populated by immigrants, the nation which for generations had offered asylum to Europe's oppressed?

Why had Roosevelt called the conference if this was the example the United States planned to set? Countless polls had shown that Americans, on the whole, were dead set against any increase in immigration quotas. On the other hand, the Nazi annexation of Austria had brought about increased pressure from many organizations, congressmen and reporters (notably Dorothy Thompson) for a State Department action to aid the refugees. According to an internal State Department memorandum, the Evian conference would enable the United States to "get out in front and attempt to guide the pressure, primarily with a view toward forestalling attempts to have the immigration laws liberalized."

Roosevelt sincerely hoped that at the Evian conference, large underpopulated countries would accept the Jews of the Reich. Indeed, he previously had proposed this idea to Brazil.

The United States was only the first nation to be heard from. There were 31 others, some of them the largest and least populated countries in the world. Surely they would find room for the refugees: Canada, the second largest nation in the world; Brazil, the fifth largest; Australia, the sixth largest. Between them they could easily absorb all the half-million would-be refugees.

The delegate from Canada explained that Canada could accept only experienced agricultural workers. (Columbia, Uruguay and Venezuela, it turned out, also had the same immigration restriction.)

What of the vast and underpopulated nation of Brazil? When inviting countries to the conference, the U.S. State Department had made it clear that no country "would be expected to make any change in its immigration legislation." And just before coming to the conference, Brazil had enacted a brand new law—henceforth, every visa application must be accompanied by a certificate of baptism. So, unfortunately, Brazil could not accept any Jews at all.

The entire continent of Australia had a population of the city of London today. "Populate or perish" was a popular Australian slogan. Politicians were warning that if Australians did not populate their own 3 million square miles, some one else would do it for them. Yet, the Australian delegate, Lt. Col. J. W. White, minister of commerce and customs, explained that Australia could accept only 15,000 Jewish immigrants over a 3-year period. "As we have no real racial problem, we are not desirous of importing one." (Actually, from 1933 to 1943, only 9,000 entered the country.)

The British delegate had similar worries. A rush of Jewish refugees from the Reich

"might arouse anti-Semitic feeling in Great Britain." Nor did the British colonial empire contain territory suitable for the large-scale resettlement of the refugees. (No mention was made of Palestine.)

The French delegate announced that his country had already taken in 200,000 Jews and "had reached the saturation point."

Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Honduras, all classified intellectuals and merchants as undesirable. Unfortunately, half the Jews in Germany and Austria fell into the "intellectual" category: doctors, lawyers, professors; most of the rest were businessmen.

The Swiss delegate spoke about the "inundation" of Jewish refugees after the fall of Austria to Hitler. Three or four thousand had already fled across the border, and unless the flow stopped, he warned, "Switzerland, which has as little use for these Jews as has Germany, will herself take measures to protect Switzerland from being swamped by Jews with the connivance of the Viennese police."

And so it went during the final days of the conference. One delegate after another rose with a similar message: The situation for Jews in the Reich was, indeed, horrendous. Unfortunately, his country's laws prevented any concrete aid. But he was certain that other nations would open their doors.

Three small countries did express willingness to help. Holland, the most densely populated of the Evian nations, with some 800 people per square mile, had already taken in more than 25,000 Jewish refugees, but offered itself as a country of temporary asylum. (The Germans invaded 2 years later, and by the end of the war, 75 percent of the Jews in Holland had perished.)

The Danish delegate stated that his overcrowded country would continue to accept refugees. (And Denmark took in—and protected—1,500 Jews.) The Dominican Republic announced it would settle 100,000 refugees. (However, due to innumerable roadblocks, only 500 found a home there.)

Even the positive proposals put forth by these three small nations at Evian were drowned out by an official resolution passed unanimously on the final day of the conference: "The delegates of the Countries of Asylum are not willing to undertake any obligations toward financing involuntary immigration." In simpler words, only Jews who could afford to pay their way would be accepted. Since it had been clearly brought out at the conference that no Jew was permitted to leave Germany or Austria with more than 10 Reichsmark—less than \$5—that single resolution made every Jew from Germany and Austria officially and automatically unacceptable to "the Countries of Asylum."

Furthermore, at the request of some of the South American delegates, "contentious allusions" to the Third Reich were omitted in the final resolution.

The delegates then appointed a committee to study the matter further: The Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. The director was an American lawyer, George Rublee, a friend of FDR. The committee set up headquarters in London.

#### 1938 GERMAN POGROM

On Nov. 9 and 10, four months after Evian, came the Kristallnacht (crystal night, so-called after the glass that littered the streets from the windows of Jewish homes and businesses), the ghastly government-sponsored campaign of arson, mayhem and terror aimed exclusively at Jews and carefully organized throughout every village, town and city of Germany and the country which had been Austria. Some 267 synagogues and congregational buildings were razed, and 7,500 Jewish shops were damaged, virtually the entire number which remained in the Reich prior to Nov. 9. A few Jews were thrown out of apartment house windows and from moving trains. Some were shot while trying to es-

cape. Nearly 30,000 Jewish men between 16 and 18 were arrested on Nov. 10 and sent to concentration camps, 10,911 to Dachau, 9,845 to Buchenwald and 9,000 to Sachsenhausen.

In the villages, Nazi gauleiters held competitions to see which community should be "purified" of Jews first. Men, women, even small children were dragged from their homes, driven and whipped through the streets. Some were tethered to horse carts, their bodies pulled down country roads. Some were tied up and thrown into rivers. A few were hung. Official German figures listed 33 German Jews killed. But reporters and diplomats counted many more Jews murdered.

The Kristallnacht was the worst pogrom the modern world had, as yet, known, and outrage replaced apathy as tens of thousands of citizens of the Countries of Asylum petitioned their governments to immediately open their doors to the imperiled Jews of the Reich. Britain took in 9,000 Jewish children; Holland took in 1,700; Belgium accepted several hundred more. And George Rublee felt that now, finally, the time had come. Now the 32 nations must act. He put forth a simple plan. Each of the 32 nations should at once accept 25,000 Jews.

If only half the 32 nations had agreed, every Jew in the Reich could have been saved.

None agreed.

Four days after the Kristallnacht, Rublee wired Secretary of State Cordell Hull: "The attack on the Jewish community in Germany on the one hand and the indifference of the participating (Evian) governments to the fate of the victims on the other has brought the affairs of the Intergovernmental Committee to a critical state where, in our opinion, immediate action is required if the president's initiative is to lead to a positive result. . . ."

"With the exception of the United States, which has maintained its quota, and the British Isles, which are admitting immigrants at a current month's rate equal to the rate immigrants are being admitted to the United States, doors have been systematically closed to involuntary emigrants since the meeting at Evian."

Indeed, during the four months since the Evian Conference some of the nations of asylum, including Argentina, Mexico, Chile and Uruguay, had adopted new and even more restrictive immigration regulations, specifically designed to keep out Jews.

On Nov. 15, the day after Rublee's urgent cable to Hull, President Roosevelt held a press conference. His prepared statement on the Kristallnacht included the realization that: "The news of the past few days from Germany has deeply shocked public opinion in the United States . . . I myself could scarcely believe that such things could occur in a 20th century civilization."

When a reporter asked whether the president would recommend a temporary change in the immigration laws so that more refugees would enter the United States, he replied that no such changes were being considered.

Was the United States contemplating breaking trade relations with the Third Reich?

"No," said the president.

Similar reactions were forthcoming from other "Evian nations." Most of the nations of asylum expressed their strong disapproval of the Kristallnacht. But none modified their immigration laws so that the Reich's half-million Jews could be saved.

#### GERMAN REACTION

What if the Evian Conference had proceeded according to the desperate hopes of European Jewry? What if the delegates of the Nations of Asylum had stood up, one after the other, to announce their nation's horror at what was happening to the Jews of Germany and Austria? What if each nation at

Evian had immediately agreed to take in 17,000 Jews at once? Every Jewish man, woman and child in Germany and Austria could have left for a new homeland.

But, as Golda Meir later wrote, "After the conference at Evian-les-Bains, it became chillingly clear that the Jewish people were entirely 'on their own.'"

The Evian Conference took place 8 months before Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia, 14 months prior to the Nazi invasion of Poland and the outbreak of World War II. During all those strategic months, it was only the Reich's 570,000 Jews who were in dire danger. Their lives, in any case, would have been saved.

Could the holocaust have been halted at Evian? No one can second-guess history. But after a staunch expression of world opinion regarding the horrors being perpetrated on the Jews of the Reich—world opinion backed by world action—it seems almost inconceivable that Hitler would have proceeded with his "final solution to the Jewish problem."

What is certainly clear is that, in Hitler's view, the Evian Conference gave him carte blanche to go ahead.

Just prior to the conference, Hitler had said in a speech at Königsberg. "I can only hope and expect that the other world, which has such deep sympathy for these criminals, will at least be generous enough to convert this sympathy into practical aid. We, on our part, are ready to put all these criminals at the disposal of these countries, for all I care, even on luxury ships."

In a speech made immediately after the conference, Hitler derided "the other world" which "is oozing sympathy for the poor, tormented people, but remains hard and obdurate when it comes to helping them."

The Danziger Vorposten summed up reaction in Nazi newspapers in a single sentence: "The Evian Conference serves to justify Germany's policy against Jewry."

After the conference, when French Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet informed Germany Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop that France's great interest in the Jewish problem was "not to receive any more Jews," Ribbentrop replied with understanding, "We all wish to get rid of the Jews. But no country wishes to admit them."

On Oct. 14, 1938, the French wrote an explanatory memorandum to the German Foreign Ministry about the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees which had been born at Evian. This document stressed the purely humanitarian function of the committee, and reassured the Germans that "none of the states would dispute the absolute right of the German government to take, with regard to certain of its citizens, such measure as are within its own sovereign powers."

Hitler then informed the South African defense minister, Oswald Pirow, "We shall solve the Jewish problem in the immediate future. . . . The Jews will disappear."

On Nov. 22, 1938—4 months after Evian—a front page article appeared in *Das Schwarze Korps*, official newspaper of the Gestapo: "Because it is necessary, because we no longer hear the world's screeching and because, after all, no power on earth can hinder us, we will now bring the Jewish question to its totalitarian solution." Steps toward the final solution were outlined, concluding with the sentence: "The result would be the actual and definite end of Jewry in Germany and its complete extermination."

There are few people today who even remember the momentous conference which, perhaps, more than any other single factor underwrote the death warrant for 6 million European Jews. However, when I visited Evian last summer, I did find one man who remembered: Rene Richler, the elderly concierge at the Royal Hotel. He was a concierge then, at the time of the conference.

"Oh, yes," Richler told me, "I remember

the Evian Conference well. Very important people were here and all the delegates had a nice time. They took pleasure cruises on the lake. They gambled at night in the casino. They took mineral baths and massages at the *Etablissement Thermal*. Some of them took the excursion to Chamoni to go summer skiing. Some went riding; we have, you know, one of the finest stables in France. Some played golf. We have a beautiful course overlooking the lake. Meetings. Yes, some attended the meetings. But, of course, it is difficult to sit indoors hearing speeches when all the pleasures that Evian offers are waiting right outside."

[From The New York Times, Mar. 16, 1978]

#### LETTER TO A PALESTINIAN MILITARY SPOKESMAN

(NOTE.—A Palestinian military spokesman in Beirut said the attack had been carried out by members of Al Fatah, the largest guerrilla group in the Palestine Liberator Organization. He asserted that 33 Israeli soldiers had been killed in the attack.)—The New York Times, March 12, 1978.

(By Cynthia Ozick)

Dear Palestinian Spokesman:

When you say that your friends killed 33 Israeli soldiers in last weekend's terror attack on the road near Haifa, do you mean my cousin Imri? Your friends shot him in the throat. He was not a soldier. He was 14 years old, and played the clarinet.

Now I am not sure what the mentality of a terrorist might be, since unlike you, I have never had one for a friend; but it seems logical to assume that if you have murdered someone, you might like—even if only out of idle curiosity, but especially out of ideology—to know something about the life you have taken. So please let me tell you a little bit about my cousin Imri. I promise you it won't occupy much of your time, because if someone is murdered when he is only 14 years old, how much can there be to tell?

In fact, Imri's life was so brief, and there was so little he ever had a chance to do, that I might as well begin with his grandfather and grandmother.

Imri-grandfather is a poet, a lover of the English Romantics. He has won some fine prizes for his work (including the Brenner Prize, named after an early Zionist who vowed that Jews were no longer going to be murdered just for being Jews), and he has translated Walt Whitman into Hebrew; but he is rather elderly now, so these days he mostly sits in his little garden reading Wordsworth and Keats and Shelley and Blake.

The garden is rather special. It is in the backyard of a house not far from the Lod airport (where some of your other friends murdered a group of Christian pilgrims not so long ago.)

When Imri's grandparents built the house—a simple concrete cube filled with volumes and volumes of poetry—it was entirely surrounded by sand. But Imri's grandmother, though very frail, put down seeds and nourished and raised up her "babes"—a whole orchard of flowering fruit trees.

Every morning very early Imri's tiny grandmother climbs a shakily ladder to reach up to each young pear, which she patiently and meticulously wraps in a little paper bag. It looks pretty comical—a paper-bag tree!—but Imri's grandmother will not spray the trees with insecticide; she does not want to kill the insects, who also have a right to live. Imri's grandparents are vegetarians, and so was Imri, and so are his parents and all his brothers and sisters and aunts and uncles. You see, they do not like to take life.

Imri's mother and father are passionate musicians. They play first and second flute in the Jerusalem Symphony—or at least they did until last weekend, because Imri's father may never play again. One of your friends

blew up his hand. In the hospital at Haifa they are trying to patch together some of it with bone grafts; soon they will know whether the nerve will die. (Imri's brother Nir is luckier; it was only his leg that was wounded. He lost a lot of blood but he is all right.)

About two years ago, Imri's father came to America for a time to teach flute at Ithaca College. It was hard to tell which he loved more—music or his students. Tears fell from him when the term drew to an end and he had to say goodbye. When he heard or played music he seemed illuminated: "Isn't this beautiful?" he would murmur. All of Imri's six brothers and sisters are musical. They play all sorts of instruments, and the beauty flies out of their hands.

Imri's oldest sister, Anva, a dancer, just had her second baby, and so what happened was this: Imri and his brothers Nir and Adiel and his little twin sisters Vivi and Cori and their parents all piled into the family car to drive up to Haifa to see the new baby. After the visit, they were on their way home to Jerusalem, just behind a bus, when your friends started throwing grenades and shooting at them, at first on the road itself and then from inside the bus. When Imri's father, who was driving, got hit, Imri's brother Nir managed to grab the wheel and save his family, even though his leg was streaming blood. In the horror of the explosions and the pursuit it was a little while before anyone realized that Imri was dead.

All right, now about Imri himself.

He was mainly a quiet boy, private as some adolescents like to be, and a good student. Until not long ago he was still quite small, but in the last few months his family had begun to marvel at how he was springing up. He was going to be tall, like his father. He was fond of stamp-collecting, and when his mother toured with the orchestra she always brought back interesting foreign stamps for him. His instrument was the clarinet; he was a member of a youth orchestra in Jerusalem. He used to grumble over his clarinet because it was second-hand and somewhat woebegone; but only two days before your friends killed him he had the delight of learning that he was going to get a better clarinet.

And that is about all I can tell you about your victim Imri. I warned you it wouldn't amount to much. The main thing, you know, is that he was never going to kill anyone or anything—not even a fish or a chicken, much less a fellow human being. He was only going to make beautiful sounds on his clarinet.

Imri's grandfather, when he was not much older than Imri during the First World War, used to write pacifist poems; and once after the 1948 war he began a lyric about Bialik, the Hebrew poet, that in the most natural way turned into a prayer for fraternity between Arabs and Jews. And after that Imri's grandmother kept on growing trees and flowers in what used to be sand, and Imri's whole family kept on sending music, one of the languages of peace, up into the Middle East air.

Well, I just thought you would like to hear about one obscure 14-year-old who happened to become a target of yours, because why shouldn't you know who it is you hated enough to kill? And now that your friends have murdered Imri and blown up his father's hand, there will be that much less music in the world, and that much less civilization.

You have made it pretty clear that all of this feeds your pride and your notion of manhood and especially your sense of nationhood. The triumph of guns and blood excites you more than symphonies and poems and clarinets.

It could be, though, that you didn't really tell an untruth when you called Imri a "soldier." On our battered planet there are always, after all, two armies—the army of

guns and the army of clarinets. Death flies out of one and beauty from the other. Imri is a fallen soldier in the army of clarinets, and in the end your most intractable stumbling block, your deepest contest, will have to be not politics, or your Soviet arms suppliers, or land, or your propagandists abroad, or your multiple perversions of the vocabulary of idealism, or your fellow Arabs who have imprisoned and despised and morally crippled and corrupted you for the last 30 years, or your hatred of Jews, or what you call "self-determination" while denying it to another people, or your vow to dismantle Israel, or your putting military uniforms on boys just Imri's age and teaching them terrorism, or even your bloodthirsty bragadocio; or anything like that.

No. You will have to grapple with what you know to be your chosen enemies—rank after rank of the singing clarinets: the army of civilization. Your guns cough in brutal eyeblink blasts and shatter human bones. Your friends, by stealth and ambush, murdered Imri. You are terribly proud of this, and crow it over the airwaves. No matter. Civilization is more tenuous than the death you bring. Paperbag trees, and Keats in a garden near an airport, and the long, long voice of the flute, and the singing clarinets—these are the soldiers you will have to defeat. If you can.

BOY SCOUT EXPRESSES VIEWS ON SALT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young San Diegan—a Boy Scout working on his Citizenship in the Nation merit badge. One of the requirements to be fulfilled is to communicate with a Senator or Representative on an issue of local or national importance.

Neal Engstrom expressed his views on a subject that has been a matter of vigorous debate these past weeks—the SALT negotiations and the neutron bomb. I consider Neal's grasp of the situation and ability to communicate his opinion most impressive for a young man of his years, and believe that all of us can benefit from his assessment.

Neal's letter follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WILSON: I am a Boy Scout, 11 years of age. I am in Troop 1200 in San Diego. I'm working on the Citizenship in the Nation Merit Badge. For this merit badge I was asked to write a senator or representative of my state about a local or national issue. I was glad because I'm interested in the Neutron Bomb.

As I'm sure you know, after World War II and up till a decade ago the U.S. has wondered if there will be a war between Russia and the U.S.A.

Both countries had been (and have been) producing many types of weapons. After awhile the SALT Talks began. This was saying: "If you get rid of this weapon, we'll discard this one." This is all fine except that the U.S.'s goal at the SALT Talks is to get rid of everybody's (both nations') weapons, and end the production of weapons. But the Russian's goal at the SALT Talks is to limit the amount of weapons the U.S. has, and produces, so that Russia will have a stronger force, and have more power.

Recently the Neutron Bomb was about to

be built, and President Carter ordered that it not be. Now this was completely dumb for two reasons. One, because he went against the advice of all his advisors, and our allies in other countries. And number two, you don't just order a weapon not to be made, as he could have traded the Neutron Bomb for a Russian Weapon at the SALT Talks, and then we still wouldn't have to make the weapon, and the Russians would be set further back.

Now Carter realizes this and he's trying to get it changed around but the Russians know that we won't build a Neutron Bomb, so they are not worried by Carter.

My feeling is that we should build a Neutron Bomb. Couldn't this be done by the Congress outvoting Carter? I also think that the bomb should only be built as a device for bargaining at the SALT Talks. Also we shouldn't let Russia rip us off at the SALT Talks.

Thank you for hearing me out.

Sincerely,

NEAL ENGSTROM.●

SOVIET AUTHORITIES IMPRISON ANOTHER UKRAINIAN HELSINKI MONITOR

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to yet another violation of the Helsinki accords by the Soviet Union. Petro Vins, one of the newest members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Watch Group and son of Pastor Georgi Vins—a name well known to this body—has been imprisoned. This young man, who is only 23, was convicted of parasitism, a charge frequently brought against "bothersome" human rights activities, and one that was levied against Vins as he was in the process of applying to emigrate to Canada. With two of its members in prison, the Vins family can hardly leave the Soviet Union now.

Soviet actions against the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitors has been particularly harsh. Young Vins in fact joined the group after four of its leading members had been arrested. The four, Oleksei Tykhy, Mykola Rudenko, Mykola Matusyevych and Myroslav Marynovych, have since been sentenced to especially long prison terms. Vins is thus the fifth member of the Ukrainian group to be imprisoned for his activities, which have included the particularly dastardly crimes of possessing Bibles and calling upon his government to honor its international commitments.

While these actions by the Soviet Government are serious enough in themselves, I am also disturbed by the attitude the Soviets have shown in jailing these men only before and after, but not during, the course of the Belgrade meeting to review compliance with the Helsinki accords. The timing of these trials is a clear indication that the Soviet Government sought to escape well deserved criticism of its human rights record in this international forum. Surely such cynical behavior exposes the falseness of claims that these men are merely common criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me in condemning this most recent Soviet violation of the Helsinki accords.●

TUITION CREDIT

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to discuss my reasons for having voted against the tuition credit legislation reported out of the Ways and Means Committee last week.

In its original form, the bill before the Ways and Means Committee would have applied to tuition paid to send children to elementary and secondary schools as well as to institutions of higher learning. The amount of the credit varied. For elementary and secondary schools, the credit began at \$50 per student, effective August 1 of this year, with the amount to be increased to \$100 in 1979. The credit allowed for tuition paid at the post-secondary level initially would have been \$100 for education furnished from August 1, 1978 to the end of the year, with the credit to rise in 1979 to \$150 per student and then finally to \$250 in 1980. Availability of the credit would have ended December 31, 1980.

During consideration of this bill by the Ways and Means Committee, I voted in favor of an amendment, which failed, that would have provided meaningful financial assistance to families attempting to put their children through college instead of the token relief granted under the bill ultimately reported out of the committee. The amendment would have permitted a taxpayer to defer a maximum of \$1,000 in taxes per student per year, beginning in 1978. This amount would rise to \$1,500 in 1982, and then to \$2,000 in 1986. The taxpayer could defer a maximum of \$10,000 on behalf of any one student. All amounts deferred would have to be repaid by the beginning of the 10th year following the child's graduation from college with interest at a rate of 3 percent per annum accruing on the amount deferred. This tax deferral amounts to a loan at a low interest rate.

Under the tax deferral approach, for example, parents with two children in college could defer payments of as much as \$2,000 in taxes in 1978, compared to a \$200 credit provided under the bill approved by the Ways and Means Committee. This concept represents real relief to the parents with children attending college. It provides needed cash at a time when cash is short and requires payback after the cash crunch of educating children has passed. Moreover, since the tax will ultimately be paid, the cost to the Treasury in terms of foregone revenue would be minimal. In short, I supported the proposal because of the greater relief it provided, coupled with the much smaller revenue loss to the Treasury. Furthermore, the tax deferral approach could not be thwarted, as the

existing government loan guarantee is thwarted, by banks refusing to make tuition loans to students. And this approach would not require singles, marrieds without college-age children, retired persons, and other to pay taxes to make up for the tuition tax credits. Unfortunately, this proposal was defeated by a single vote, 19-18, in the committee, but I hope this result can be reversed when the bill reaches the floor of the House.

Having been defeated on this amendment, I chose to vote against both the credit for elementary and secondary tuition and the credit for tuition paid to post secondary institutions.

However, my reasons for voting against the two credits were entirely different. There are several reasons why I could not endorse the credit for tuition incurred at elementary and secondary schools. First, the constitutionality of a credit for elementary and secondary education is highly suspect under the establishment clause of the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. In a situation analogous to the credit that was before the Ways and Means Committee, the U.S. Supreme Court held in the case of Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty against Nyquist (1973) that a New York State income tax deduction for children attending a nonpublic secondary or elementary school in an amount unrelated to the actual cost of tuition violated the separation of church and state doctrine contained in the establishment clause of the first amendment. Relying upon the Nyquist decision, the Attorney General of the United States informed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on March 17 of this year that the tax credit proposals before the Congress would be held unconstitutional if they involved aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Secondly, as I indicated earlier, the cost of the proposal before the committee would have been considerable and would have increased the budget deficit at a time when the rate of inflation is far too high. Estimates I have seen reveal that the total loss to the Treasury from the credit for elementary and secondary schools plus the credit for institutions of higher learning would exceed \$1 billion in the early part of the 1980's. Since it was primarily the private schools that lobbied for the credit at the elementary and secondary level, I would expect those schools simply to raise their tuition by the amount of the credit, if such a credit should be enacted. If that is the case, the individual paying the tuition would not benefit at all economically, because the reduction in taxes would quickly be offset by an increase in tuition.

Thirdly, the proposal could lead to the public schools charging tuition in order that they could derive a benefit from this form of Federal revenue sharing. This result has been characterized by some as the undoing of our free public schools that have become a significant part of the American society.

When the credit for tuition at the elementary and secondary level was deleted from the bill, I was then faced with the decision of whether to vote for or against

a credit for tuition paid to institutions of higher learning. I decided to vote against the proposal for a number of reasons. First, the amount of the credit was quite small (maximum of \$250 per student) when compared with the spiraling cost of college tuition and would be achieved at a high cost to the Treasury in lost revenues. Moreover, whereas the tax deferral program I discussed earlier would provide meaningful relief to taxpayers at less cost to the Treasury, the proposal before the committee would serve only to encourage colleges to raise their tuition with no assurance that the taxpayer would benefit. Second, the credit approach of \$250 per student for tuition paid does not focus relief on families who truly need it and provides a windfall to families who require no assistance at all.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my remarks will serve to clarify my position regarding proposals that would provide financial assistance to parents with children in school. I am quite sensitive to the financial problem which parents face in trying to find the funds to send their children to college, my wife and I having seven children to educate. For the reasons set out here, I lent my support to an amendment that would have provided substantial relief through a tax deferral assistance program to parents with sons and daughters in college. However, I could not support the tax credit approved by the committee, which merely represents token relief unrelated to actual tuition paid and which would be achieved at a high cost to the Treasury. ●

#### DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS— WELCOME PROGRESS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, legislation fashioned by our esteemed colleague from California, Representative YVONNE BURKE, comes before an Education and Labor Subcommittee this week for markup. The legislation seeks to bridge gaps from the work of homemaking to work in a salary paying job for thousands of displaced homemakers. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I commend to the House an excellent article in the winter 1978 Civil Rights Digest which explains what a displaced homemaker is and outlines the history of Mrs. BURKE's legislation:

DISPLACED HOMEMAKERS—"FORCED RETIREMENT" LEAVES MANY PENNILESS

(By Tish Sommers and Laurie Shields)

Who is a "displaced homemaker"? This woman from a small Midwestern town is one:

In 1974 my husband died suddenly and in a matter of a few horrible hours I became a 55-year-old widow. I spent 33½ years of my marriage making a home for my husband and three children. I have developed no working skills and have been unsuccessful in finding any sort of a job. The opportunities are limited in a small town and are

naturally filled by the young. Consequently, my funds grow smaller along with my shrinking ego.

The 2½ years until I reach 60 stretch interminably. My husband's social security will be no big deal at best. Preoccupation with grief, unexpected responsibility, rejection by potential employers, limited funds have made me feel alone and apart from life. After months of desperation I have lately begun to think of death as an attractive alternative.

Also this woman:

I am still married to a United States Post Office letter carrier, who plans to retire this year. He states he will elect to take the larger pension benefits awarded to himself alone rather than small benefits which would leave some to a beneficiary. I learned this shocking news in 1975 after 33 years of marriage. During this time I worked damned hard as a rural unpaid housewife who raised three kids on his measly salary. We could not have managed without my contributions—at least, not well. I was raised in the "great depression" and learned frugality early. I made all the children's clothes and maintained the home—paint, carpentry, etc., grew and preserved food (most of what we ate), ad infinitum.

Then in 1970, he left me to seek younger grass so I have been forced to live alone. . . . I have held temporary jobs since 1974 and have not yet established minimum social security credits of my own. As a postal worker, no social security was ever deducted from his pay so I am in the position of not having even this. . . .

And another:

I am a 65-year-old Christian lady whose husband, after 32 years of marriage, divorced me 2 years ago to marry his secretary, who was a widow, much younger, and had a great potential for inheritance. The divorce cut me off from our Blue Cross-Blue Shield which my husband had with his government job. Any hospital insurance I have been able to find says they start where Medicare leaves off. But with raising five children I never worked out to establish social security, so am not eligible for Medicare.

Oh, yes, they said I could take Medicare insurance, but how many who are not eligible for social security can afford that? I can't. I now own half of my three-bedroom home. My ex and his wife live across the street from me. I go out to work as baby sitter in their home. That's the only job I could get. He pays the house payments as my settlement, but I have to pay tax on that, since he claims it is part of my income. All this just does not seem very fair to me. . . .

All three of these women and possibly millions more like them are displaced homemakers. Displaced persons are those who have been "forcibly exiled" through social upheavals and war. Displaced homemakers are the victims of a quieter transformation in the structure of the American family. They are primarily older women who have been forcibly exiled from a role, an occupation, dependency status, and a livelihood.

#### HOMEMAKING AS WORK

Despite the oft-reported move of women into the labor force, homemaking is still the fulltime occupation of the majority of married women (and most of the rest are moonlighting). Motherhood, which is the central function of homemaking, usually terminates in the middle years, so that women in this occupation experience the same trauma as persons in other occupations whose jobs are phased out. But because homemaking is not yet recognized as work and not paid, this loss of job is not called mandatory retirement, but given the sociological description of the "empty nest syndrome." Suicide rates peak for women in these years, just as they go up abruptly for men after retirement. Again because homemaking is not paid, no cushions

or benefits aid these workers at this crucial life transition—only psychiatrists' couches and prescription drugs, euphemistically called tranquilizers, dull the pain.

Nor is being fired from homemaking (divorce) seen as comparable to unemployment. Displaced homemakers, like other workers, have lost the sole source of income on which they have been dependent. In their attempts to find jobs they are turned down because they have no recent record of paid employment and also because they are older women. They are ineligible for unemployment insurance because they have been engaged in unpaid labor in their homes. If their children are over 18, they are ineligible for AFDC. Most are ineligible for social security because they are too young, and some may never qualify because of the dependency pitfalls within that system or because, as in two cases cited above, the breadwinners were in other retirement programs.

If the problem is severe, why has it not surfaced before? Precisely because homemaking, not recognized as work, has been seen as outside the economic sphere. As John Kenneth Galbraith has pointed out, the consumption tasks of the homemaker are essential for the well-being and continuing growth of the economy, but the housewife's contribution is systematically ignored. Any accounting of her contribution is scrupulously avoided. On the grounds of complexity of assigning a monetary value to nonpaid work, homemaking is kept out of the realm of statistics.

In 1975, when the Alliance for Displaced Homemakers commissioned a study to determine the actual number of women nationally who would qualify as displaced homemakers, it was found that only a scattering of information existed, much of it lacking conciseness. What wasn't counted as labor obviously wasn't counted at all, and if you are not counted, you don't exist. Even today, there is no definitive socioeconomic profile of this group. The Alliance estimates 2 to 3 million women are displaced homemakers, and potentially 15 million more are women out of the labor market who currently have minor children and will be without benefits when their children reach 18 years of age.

Part of the reason for their invisibility is that homemaking is an isolated occupation, and women who fit the definition tend to think of themselves as victims of circumstances rather than as a social problem. Each believes hers is a unique personal problem.

Despite the absence of good statistics, some idea of the extent of the condition can be deduced from related reports. According to the Census Bureau, in March 1976, 4.4 million divorced women had not remarried. Over 2 million women were separated from their spouses and over 10 million were widows. Demographic studies confirm that women are outliving men and the gap is widening. While it is commonplace for widowers or divorced men to marry younger women, the reverse is relatively rare. There are more than four widows to every widower. No-fault divorce has cut a wide path through the ranks of older women as well. And in a recent report on spousal support by the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, only 14 percent of divorced women are awarded alimony. Of these, only 45 percent get their payment with any degree of regularity.

Most women who are now in their fifties and sixties bought the social contract of man the breadwinner and woman the homemaker. They assumed that their retirement benefits, health insurance, and economic security flowed from their marriage. If they worked outside the home, it was likely to be supplemental, irregular, and often part-time. Most of these women are poorly equipped to compete in today's job market. Their skills

are obsolete or may no longer be in demand. (How many older school teachers can be placed these days?) Not only has the job market changed, but the women have changed too. The many negative messages they receive—from potential employers, family, the media, and elsewhere—tell them they are unemployable, which soon becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is difficult enough for an older man who loses his job to find another one. (Persons over 45 suffer terms of unemployment equal to black teenagers.) But the older unemployed male at least has a work history; the former homemaker has none that is recognized. As one such woman wrote:

I've answered dozens of ads and tried the unemployment office where they send me to the job board. Those jobs are already filled or after I fill out an application I never hear from them again. They say I have no experience. Well, I thought raising six fine children and working on school bond campaigns and electing the right candidates to Congress was experience but I guess not. They look at you like a piece of discarded junk.

Displaced homemakers are in fact a newly emerging disadvantaged group that has yet to be officially recognized. This segment is composed of "old poor" (growing older and poorer) and "new poor," former dependents of persons outside the poverty ranks. Many of these latter are the least equipped for coping with combined age and sex discrimination. As one widow writes:

Four years ago at the age of 48 I was widowed and was so sure I could get a job and take care of myself. What a shock to find out I couldn't and there was no help available anywhere. In these years since, I had to sell my house just to have money to exist. I moved to a little cottage with no running water. I carry wood to heat the place. I'm not complaining, mind you, but what will happen when I am physically not able to do this any more? I have no health or hospital insurance. Small towns have few jobs, but would my luck be better in a big city? The future frightens me.

Another such woman did move to an urban setting and found the going no easier:

I married at 15, I worked in the fields, ran a home, growing gardens, raising livestock so as to live, all the time having children. Many a night I never got to close my eyes, sewing, mending, doing floors, painting, canning, preserving. I'm old, too old to find work and too spent. I have nothing but food stamps. . . . Is that anything to live for? Is that what I've worked all these years for?

These are the women who are caught in the middle. Too young to be considered part of the "aging," they are therefore not eligible for most programs designed for "the elderly." Changing aspirations and expectations of women have left them stranded. While older widows are traditionally an impoverished group, their situation has deteriorated immeasurably through the compounding impact of inflation year by year. Changing laws and mores in regard to divorce have swelled the ranks of older women on their own. The divorced older woman's plight is accurately described by a judge for the Court of Appeals, Fourth District, California, as he held for a 44-year-old wife divorced after 25 years of marriage:

A woman is not a breeding cow to be nurtured during her years of fecundity, and then conveniently and economically converted to cheap steaks when past her prime. If a woman is able to support herself, she certainly should do so. If, however, she has spent her productive years as a housewife and mother and has missed the opportunity to compete in the job market and improve her job skills, quite often she becomes, when divorced, simply a "displaced homemaker."

For these many reasons the authors have focused upon the displaced homemaker as a

new and unrecognized disadvantaged category for whom there has been little official concern and no specific assistance. We have defined her as an individual who has performed unpaid labor in the home, is not gainfully employed and who has had or would have difficulty in securing employment. She has been dependent on the income of another family member or on Federal assistance but is no longer eligible because her children have reached their majority. The personal plight of these women is desperate and, as they are quite aware, they are headed for abject poverty in old age. The psychological toll is enormous.

#### A LEGISLATIVE FOCUS

Older women, trying to move from dependency to self-sufficiency, are not specifically excluded from government-funded programs; such programs are simply not designed with these women in mind. The problem of the older woman who falls through the cracks was brought to public attention in the fall 1974 issue of the *Civil Rights Digest*, among other places, but nothing happened until specific legislation was introduced to address the problem.

In the spring of 1975, a Displaced Homemaker's Bill was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Rep. Yvonne B. Burke of California. Drafted by legal services lawyer Barbara Dudley at the request of the then NOW Task Force on Older Women and members of Jobs for Older Women (a community-based organization in Oakland), the proposed legislation gave a name to the problem, defined it, and suggested remedies. Modestly conceived, it called for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide multipurpose service programs including job readiness, transition counseling, training, placement, and help in recycling of homemaker skills to paying jobs. Its greatest value was conceived to be its potential impact upon other agencies, both public and private, in sensitizing them to a category of persons about whom they knew little.

In order to mobilize effective grassroots support for the legislation, an Alliance for Displaced Homemakers was formed with the sole function of promoting legislative support at both the State and national level. The first State bill to fund one multipurpose service center for displaced homemakers as a pilot project was enacted in September 1975 in California. Support for the legislative drive across the country came from diverse quarters—from traditional women's organizations and from members of NOW and other feminist groups. Church women's organizations, recognizing that their membership included many displaced homemakers, were especially responsive.

In the 2 years subsequent to the passage of California's State bill, 13 other States followed suit: Maryland, Florida, Nebraska, Montana, Texas, Oregon, Illinois, Minnesota, Louisiana, New York, Massachusetts, Colorado, and Ohio. (Anticipation of passage of a Federal bill that would have provided matching funds—90 percent Federal, 10 percent State—spurred passage of many of these bills. But in a number of cases, the bills were more an expression of interest than a commitment of State funds; some appropriations were made contingent upon the availability of Federal money.)

Early in the 95th Congress, Representative Burke reintroduced an amended Displaced Homemaker Act (H.R. 28). An identical version was filed in the Senate by Senator Birch Bayh (S. 418). Refined specifics of the measure called for HEW to establish a minimum of 50 multipurpose service centers for displaced homemakers, mandating the selection of rural as well as urban sites.

Congressional hearings on both bills were held in 1977, and it was clear that members of the subcommittees in both Senate and House recognized that displaced homemakers

as defined in the legislation represented a significant segment of the country's hard-to-employ. But it was equally obvious that since the legislation was intended to open up paying jobs, the program more properly belonged under the aegis of the Department of Labor.

Early in December 1977, Representative Burke therefore filed new legislation (H.R. 10270) to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) to include the entirety of the Displaced Homemaker Act under Title III, which had been created in 1973 to deal with the very hard-to-employ through a special program approach. Representative Burke was joined in the filing by Representative Augustus Hawkins, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunity, as a prime cosponsor. As this article goes to press, it is expected that Senator Birch Bayh will file an identical measure when Congress reconvenes in January.

Considering attitudes toward spending for new public programs and the trend against "categorical programs," this legislation has been swimming upstream all the way. But the issue has caught media attention as America's "number one lady in distress." The National Women's Conference held in Houston spotlighted homemakers' concerns and gave overwhelming support to displaced homemaker legislation as an immediate and concrete step toward addressing the neglected problems of older women.

#### FURTHER STEPS

The legislation, both State and national, includes the following statement: "... homemakers are an unrecognized and unpaid part of the national work force who make an invaluable contribution to the welfare and economic stability of the Nation, but who receive no health, retirement, or unemployment benefits as a result of their labor. . . ." Certainly the sentiment expressed in the first part of that statement is taken for granted (at least on Mother's Day), but the second half has not been addressed in any systematic way. Setting up multipurpose service centers as the bill directs may provide immediate assistance to a limited population but will not address the roots of the problem.

A second small step is written into the bill as well:

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary (of Labor), in consultation with appropriate heads of executive agencies, shall prepare and furnish to the Congress a study to determine the feasibility of and appropriate procedures for allowing displaced homemakers to participate in—

(1) programs established under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. . . .

(2) work incentive programs established under Section 432(b)(1) of the Social Security Act;

(3) related Federal employment, education, and health assistance programs; and

(4) programs established or benefits provided under Federal and State unemployment compensation laws by consideration of full-time homemakers as workers eligible for such benefits of programs. (emphasis added.)

While studies should never be confused with implementation, they seem to be a necessary step in drawing attention to newly recognized problems. Including full-time homemakers under the unemployment compensation laws may seem impossible, but no serious consideration has yet been given to the matter. A well-researched study should provide alternative solutions. It might begin by acknowledging the economic worth of the contribution homemakers make to this Nation.

The process of working in behalf of the

legislation has already raised consciousness in Federal Government circles as to the plight of the displaced homemaker. Most legislators and officials in relevant agencies have at least heard the term and have some idea of the issue. Because the problem crosses all race, class, and political party lines, there is now some willingness to do something about this constituency—as long as the "something" doesn't cost too much or interfere with "more important" considerations.

Already the category of "displaced homemaker" is creeping into some agency programs. In some, the focus on older women has been maintained; in others, the definition of displaced homemaker has been broadened to such an extent that the focus has been lost. The director of a CETA-funded program for displaced homemakers in Montgomery, Alabama, points out in his description of the program that "the project definition of a displaced homemaker differs from the national definition to include women 22 years of age and above and unwed mothers."

The regulations for vocational education programs following passage of the 1976 Education Amendments Act included displaced homemakers as one target population for funded projects. While little evidence exists of implementation for older women under these provisions, the existence of more displaced homemaker centers will eventually assure that this will happen. ACTION is another government agency interested in displaced homemakers. Although Congress turned down ACTION's request for funding of a volunteer-oriented program designed for these women, the establishment of displaced homemaker centers will provide the opportunity for interaction through cooperative programming with ACTION. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, long charged with gathering information on the status of women in and out of the labor market, is interested in the research implications of the legislation.

CETA administrators in Washington have already responded by funding a number of pilot projects in various parts of the country. They range from research to job-related services, but as pointed out above, the absence of official acceptance of the term "displaced homemaker" to mean a person in her middle years has diluted the efforts for older women. With growing pressure from the grassroots on CETA to address the job needs of older workers of both sexes, prime sponsors may begin to identify displaced homemakers at the local level and design programs to fit their needs. Passage of the pending displaced homemakers national legislation will certainly increase their awareness and encourage action.

So, the original intent in sponsoring legislation to draw attention to an invisible problem has already produced significant results. What a difference a name makes! Even though the term was greeted with disapproval and was considered "too harsh" by those who had never experienced the problem, it was quickly adopted by thousands and thousands of women who found it an apt description of their own situation. We who had vowed to make it a household word are, with the collective action of older women across the country, well on the way to our goal.

One more addition to the lexicon of those experiencing discrimination is a limited victory. Nevertheless, there comes a time when the cry of outrage must be translated into legislative language, when the broad basic sweep of reform is broken down into tiny steps forward. A full bill of rights for homemakers may not come in our time, but its time will come. ●

## BRITISH PAPER OFFERS NEUTRON BOMB WARNING

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the magazines which gives me a perspective of how people in other nations view a variety of issues is *Atlas World Press Review*.

The magazine republishes a variety of feature stories and editorials from around the world.

If there are those among my colleagues who do not subscribe, I recommend that they do.

In the most recent issue, they reprinted an article from the *Guardian* of London, by Anthony Tucker, about the neutron bomb that I hope Members of the House and the Senate and their staffs will take a few minutes to read. It will cause us to pause and reflect a little before we move ahead on something which could have a devastating impact.

#### A "CLEAN" BOMB?

THE NIGHTMARE EFFECTS ON THOSE WHO SURVIVE

(By Anthony Tucker)

When the "clean" tactical neutron bomb bursts over the battle salient, those who die quickly will be the lucky ones. Within 450 yards of ground zero, where the blast and burn effects differ little from those of a conventional fusion weapon, the dose levels of fast neutrons and hard gamma radiation will be over 18,000 rads, even for men in tanks. Given a few moments of realization of the meaning of the flash and the extraordinary nausea, then coma and merciful oblivion will intervene until death a day or two later. But only a few will die as cleanly as that.

Most will die slowly, and most of these will know almost from the outset that they are going to die. For there are two related but separate series of symptoms suffered by those exposed to high doses of radiation, quite apart from radiation-induced skin burns (90 percent of victims suffer first-degree whole body burns at 650 rads plus; second-degree burns at 2,600 rads plus).

The first series is called "prodromal," and acutely affects the gastrointestinal and neuromuscular systems: nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, cramps, salivation, dehydration, and anorexia result, say the textbooks, noting that the severity of these symptoms and their duration seem to predict the severity and eventual end point of the radiation injury. These symptoms, and the panic and helplessness they induce, would be better called the "premonition phase."

With it, high-dose levels, come the neuromuscular effects—fatigue, listlessness, exhaustion for some, sweating, headache, behavioral abnormalities, sudden limb paralysis, fever reduction of blood pressure, and shock. All those receiving a lethal dose of radiation greater than a few thousand rads will suffer all these early symptoms, probably associated with cerebral bleeding.

The onset will generally be with five to fifteen minutes of exposure, reaching a peak within about thirty minutes and then merging with the later and ultimately fatal symptoms resulting from massive damage to the central nervous system and the bone marrow. Above 1,000 rads, survival may be five to ten days, but during that time most will die of

massive bleeding through the destroyed surfaces of the gastrointestinal tract.

At these high levels of radiation the cells which make up the brain and the nerves also disintegrate; neither the behavior, the feelings, nor the competence of individual humans can be predicted for this phase of dying. Inability to make valid judgments, paralysis, and gross unpredictability are the probable hallmarks.

At high-dose levels, death will generally intervene before the symptoms of bone-marrow destruction reveal themselves. But at lower lethal doses—the LL or "latent lethality" levels on the military scale, ranging from 200 rads upward to the 1,000 rad level—the bone-marrow symptoms will dominate and may determine the outcome.

The bone marrow is a kind of miraculous factory which manufactures—nobody understands quite how—all the various and highly specialized cells for the blood. When the bone-marrow function is impaired or lost then life is impaired or lost.

With radiation damage, after a latent period of a few days (the "premonition phase" may have receded by then into a misleading phase of apparent well-being), the bone marrow's failure to produce essential blood cells is revealed in anemia, bleeding through loss of the ability to clot, and massive failure of the immune-response system that protects us from disease. Rapid infections, ulceration, internal hemorrhage, and uncontrollable fever lead to death within a few days or weeks.

If, after sixty days, the bone marrow has repaired sufficiently to provide enough blood cells for immune and other functions to return, then the victim may survive for several years. He will, however, be impotent. At about this sixty-day milestone—which separates the "early" effects of radiation from the so-called "late" effects (predisposition toward leukemias and cancers of all kinds, cataract, increased susceptibility to infection and nonspecific life shortening)—the effects of radiation damage to the gonads become apparent. The gonads are probably the most radiosensitive organs of the human body, and both male and female glands are readily and lastingly damaged.

In the male, a radiation dose in excess of fifty rads causes the sperm count to drop almost to zero after a latent period of sixty to eighty days. Doses above 650 rads will certainly produce lasting reduced fertility—and, most probably impotence—because the damaged testicular cells are no longer capable of producing viable spermatocytes, the cells which eventually evolve into spermatazoa.

It seems that anyone within about 1.25 miles of the blast will suffer gonad damage and infertility to some extent, but there are important uncertainties about biological effects of high-energy neutrons at low doses—that is, on the periphery of the radiation area. It is known that neutrons are very much more damaging than gamma rays at low doses and, for different effects, they may be ten, thirty, or 100 times as potent.

Soldiers are, of course, required to perform their duties until they die, and the clean tactical value of the neutron bomb may seem to be that it knocks out the enemy in his tanks, eliminating within two to five minutes a potential breakthrough or breakout. Those are the quick dead (7 percent) and the quick down (9 percent). But what of the 40 percent who either go down and then get up again to function abnormally and unpredictably, or who go down slowly with increasing disability and impairment? They will die, of course, but what will they do with their undamaged equipment before they die when they are no longer responding to commands?

And what about the remainder on the periphery, most of whom will suffer radia-

tion sickness and deep-seated latent damage which will reveal itself in late effects? Is it a "clean" weapon which, where it does not kill, plants the seeds of blindness, cancer, impotence, and early death? Or is it called "clean" only because, to the military mind, that which is not relevant to the course of the battle is of no significance?

#### A GLOBAL CONCERN

(Samplings from a worldwide dialog)

##### FRANCE

If it is acknowledged, which is generally the case, that one of the main dangers for the West is a massive tank attack penetrating our defense lines, it must be agreed that the neutron bomb appears to offer extra security while avoiding the "black marks" of atomic fission bombs—high loss of civilian life, and massive destruction of allied or enemy territory. Opinions can be legitimately divided as to whether the neutron bomb is a positive contribution in the area of deterrence. But for defense the contribution appears to be beyond question.

Whether one wishes it or not, the influence of those in possession of nuclear weapons for the defense of Europe cannot fail to grow.—François de Rose, "Le Monde," Paris (liberal), Feb. 28.

##### THE NETHERLANDS

On March 19 in Amsterdam more than 50,000 people participated in an international demonstration against the introduction and production of the neutron bomb. The march, organized by The Netherlands' "Stop the Neutron Bomb" group, was preceded by an international colloquium of 1,500 representatives from Eastern and Western Europe and eight international organizations.

The demonstration and colloquium marked a climax in the largest antiarmament movement Holland has known since the War. Nearly 1.2 million signatures decrying the neutron bomb have been collected. Several speakers at the final meeting emphasized the need for international action and cited the Dutch movement as an example and stimulus for actions elsewhere.

Rudie van de Velde, nuclear physicist and Communist councilman of Amsterdam, pointed out that those in favor of introducing the neutron bomb are to be found in the military-industrial complex, "where it isn't the insecurities surrounding the N bomb that are taken into account, but the securities at the stock market." Van de Velde argued that peaceful coexistence of the world's nations is the condition *sine qua non* for safeguarding mankind's future.

Holland's churches played a prominent role in the anti-neutron bomb action. Many Amsterdamers were urged from the pulpit to participate in the march.—"De Volkskrant," Amsterdam (Independent), Mar. 20.

##### ENGLAND

European members of NATO are increasingly reluctant to reach a decision on whether the neutron bomb should be deployed on their territories. West German Chancellor Schmidt has already said the neutron bomb will be a useful deterrent until international arms control is achieved. Many politicians in Bonn are strongly opposed to its deployment on West German soil, however.

Although the resolution of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group remains secret, it is no secret that nearly all NATO serving officers would unreservedly want to see the neutron bomb deployed in Europe. They are aware of the emotions the bomb has aroused, but they hope these will calm down in time.

The Dutch Government has refused to let the bomb be deployed on its territory. So, too, has the French Government, which refused to accept NATO nuclear weapons because they are not under French control. But it is likely that France will develop a neutron

weapon of its own. The Greek Government is also strongly opposed to having the neutron bomb stockpiled on Greek soil, even on American bases, while the Norwegians refuse to accept nuclear weapons of any type.

Strong public opposition to any use of the neutron weapon is not continued to left-wing opinion. Some politicians believe that most Europeans are so deeply opposed to the weapon that they will attempt a revolt against the military if they try to deploy it. They fear the two superpowers may try to fight it out on the plains and forests of Germany, whatever the effect on civilians. Clare Hollingworth, "Daily Telegraph," London (conservative), Feb. 27.

##### GERMANY

Bonn Government spokesman Klaus Bölling says that the Government of Germany is in favor of using all opportunities for arms control talks, especially in view of the arms buildup in the East, before actually deploying the neutron bomb in Europe. As to whether the neutron bomb ought to be developed and manufactured, Bonn says this decision rests with the U.S.

The Soviet Union has nothing to rival this miniature hydrogen bomb, which may even help, its ability to launch a surprise attack despite the Warsaw Pact's tank superiority. Even so, the military priority of offsetting the Soviet Union's 3-to-1 tank supremacy in Central Europe must not override strategic and security policy misgivings.

America and Russia were unable to agree on limitation and subsequent reduction of anti-missile systems until they had both spent enormous amounts of money on convincing themselves that ABMs did not live up to expectations. It was much the same with MIRVs. Yet America's decision not to manufacture the B-1 supersonic bomber failed to bring anything tangible as a Soviet counter-concession. Would it be wise to expect the Kremlin to forgo stationing more SS-20 missiles in Western Russia or to reduce its tank strength in East Germany in return for the nonmanufacture of the bomb?

It will take time and effort to find out whether the bomb is sufficient to persuade the Soviet Union to reduce its offensive potential.—Kurt Becker, "Die Zeit," Hamburg (Liberal), March 3.

#### REWRITE OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Communications is undertaking major revisions to the Communications Act of 1934 under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. FREY. In light of that effort I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues to two articles which have appeared recently in the press concerning the issues we are confronting in the rewrite.

The articles follow:

[From Computerworld, Mar. 6, 1978]

IBM, BELL HEADED FOR CLASH IN MID-1980S, ANALYSTS WARN

(By E. Drake Lundell Jr.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A major clash over markets is inevitable between IBM and AT&T in the 1980s, two major industry analysts

agreed here at the recent DataComm '78 conference.

"AT&T is in essentially the same business as IBM, no matter what they say," Charles P. Lecht, president of Advanced Computer Techniques, Inc., said, while Frederic G. Withington, a consultant with Arthur D. Little, Inc., said it was "inevitable" that the two would compete even more than they have to date.

Lecht said the major collision between the two industry giants will come in the mid-1980s after the satellites of Satellite Business Systems (SBS) are launched, but Withington predicted the collision will result more from offerings planned for the late 1980s and early 1990s.

However, both agreed the big question mark in the equation is the threat of government regulation.

Legislators do not realize the significance of the coming clash and are not really equipped to deal with the issues raised, Lecht pointed out, while Withington said he hopes the government will not stop or stifle the innovative growth period ahead.

In reaching their conclusions, the two traveled slightly different paths.

By 1983, 87% of all computers will have some terminal hookups, Lecht noted, adding that computer mainframes that cannot offer a communications capability will end up as "component suppliers to those who do."

IBM's SBS, he said, is breaking the previous lines between computers and communications by placing a computer mainframe maker strongly in the communications business—even if only through a subsidiary.

#### WRITEOFFS FOR AT&T?

At the same time, AT&T could be facing huge writeoffs—in the neighborhood of \$20 billion—if its terrestrial plant is outmoded or leapfrogged by satellite services such as SBS, he noted.

To counter this, AT&T is developing communications systems such as its as yet unannounced Advanced Communications System (ACS) that will handle many communications functions previously handled in a mainframe or front-end-type processor, Lecht predicted.

ACS, he said, will have the capability for data capture and data entry and will provide a host of preprocessing services formerly handled by communications software on a mainframe. The line between the two has always been fictionally drawn, Lecht noted, and it will be even more blurred in the 1980s when it will be impossible to tell whether computers are the slave of communications or vice versa.

With the development of ACS, the battle will really begin, he predicted, because IBM's Systems Network Architecture (SNA) will not be able to coexist with the Bell ACS offerings.

#### IBM PERSPECTIVE

Withington looked at the picture from the IBM perspective, noting that pretending to be president of IBM was one of his favorite fantasies.

IBM wants to keep up its dramatic growth, starting from its base in the data processing and office markets, so the next step is integrating its word processing systems into networks and then having links with its DP base, he said. This will call for the development of both graphics and image processing systems, which will require very wide bandwidth communications systems, such as will be available from SBS, he added.

As these functions get distributed on communications nets, he predicted, IBM will then "have to get into voice," possibly to the extent of even supplying telephones.

Presently, IBM and AT&T compete in the terminal area to a great extent, he said, noting that AT&T's teletypewriter is one of the most popular terminals and that the

Dataspeed 40 gear is actively competing in the market.

Withington also downplayed some of the things people have said might constrain the two from competing.

For example, he said many people have said that the threat of antitrust action against IBM would constrain the firm. But, he noted, IBM has been more aggressive in price cutting against the plug-compatible CPU makers than it ever was against the peripherals firms, even though it is being sued on antitrust grounds now.

In addition, the two firms would not stop being customers for each other's equipment even if they became competitors, as some have predicted.

Withington predicted that the confrontation would start on the equipment front with IBM coming out with more and more terminal equipment, initially specialized for the SBS, and including such things as facsimile, video and audio equipment for teleconferencing, and remote printing devices. In addition, it will get into the business of multifunctional units to provide such services.

Furthermore, IBM is heavily involved in fiber optics research and may offer fiber optics systems for implant use, he said, as well as entering the PBX marketplace with its Carnation unit that has been available in Europe for almost five years but never introduced here.

[From the Washington Post]

#### DO-IT-YOURSELF TELEVISION

If you have been looking at the ads, you know that the prices of those machines known as video recorders have been coming down while the prices of almost everything else have been going up. They're still expensive—\$800 and up. But enough of them are in use (150,000 or so) and their makers are promoting sales furiously enough to suggest that they are more than just another electronic gadget. Like the television sets of a generation ago, the video recorders are capable of producing major changes in the way we live and in the communications and entertainment businesses.

One version of these machines, in case you haven't seen it, takes television signals off the air, records them on magnetic tape and plays them back on command through your television set. Given the right attachments, it will record one channel while you watch another, record programs while you are not at home, or play prerecorded tapes of, say, movies or Broadway shows. Down the technological road are devices to turn home movies into tape, to run programs backward or in slow motion—and who knows what else? Coming into competition soon with these tape systems will be others based on discs like phonograph records. While these systems won't let you record material off the air, the basic set will be cheaper to buy and the cost of prerecorded discs of movies or symphonies or do-it-yourself programs will be substantially lower and the visual quality somewhat higher than comparable tapes.

It doesn't take much imagination to figure out some of the things that come next: movie-of-the-month clubs, rental libraries, discount stores and so on. But no one is quite sure what all this will do to television and the resurgent movie industry. What if most people decide that, rather than watch what the networks offer, they will program their own entertainment from the discs or tapes they can buy, rent or borrow? Will that be the end of network television as we know it? Or what if people decide to tape programs at off hours and play them during prime time rather than watch the network offerings? The ratings game, in which television is so deeply engrossed, could turn into chaos. And what if all those parents who hate the commercials for sugary breakfast foods were to provide their children with a supply, on

tape or discs, of the same cartoons minus the ads? If these or any of several other possibilities occurred, the role of television as the major supplier of entertainment would be sharply changed. In response, the networks might be driven to expand vastly their role as a supplier of news of live events—political, social and athletic—thus beginning to live up to the potential they have never fully exploited.

There are a couple of clouds on this horizon. One is the reverse side of the competitive system that is bringing down so quickly the prices of these new devices; some of the various systems are incompatible, and consumers who buy the ones that lose out in the market may be stuck with obsolete equipment, just as some consumers were in the early days of long-playing records. The other cloud is a lawsuit in which two movie-makers are charging that the federal copyright laws are violated when consumers tape things like movies off the air. They may well be right; the tape-system manufacturers are now telling customers that federal law may be broken when copyrighted material is taped. If so, the solution is to find a way to protect the owners of the copyrights without destroying this new tape industry. That might require some legislation by Congress.

So far, neither Congress nor any other arm of government has gotten into this field. When they do, the principle guiding their action ought to be clear. These new recorders, especially when combined with the coming mini-computers and cheap television cameras, can change that home television set into an information and entertainment center almost beyond belief. The government's role should be to remove any roadblocks and let it happen. ●

#### THE PEOPLE PLAY STRONG ROLE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues share my belief that people are at the center of our foreign policy. It is not difficult to lose sight of this important fact, in this age of rapid change and high technology. I firmly believe that people-to-people exchanges and communication have a far greater role to play in our relations with other countries, than presently is the case.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy O. Christman of Hamburg, Pa., recently returned from a 5-week visit to Pakistan. As participants in the 1978 Farmers and World Affairs Program, they traveled throughout the country, visiting 25 different farms representative of Pakistani agriculture. Later this year, the Christmans will in turn host Pakistani farmers in their home in Hamburg.

On their return to the United States, Mr. and Mrs. Christman were kind enough to visit me in my Washington office to share with me their many experiences. I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, the Christmans' written report to me on their trip to Pakistan. As a member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, I was most interested to read their reflections. Not only is their

report informative about life in Pakistan; it also demonstrates very clearly the understanding which is generated by people-to-people programs like the Farmers and World Affairs exchange. Mr. and Mrs. Roy O. Christman have made an important contribution to United States-Pakistani understanding and I am proud to represent them in the Congress.

Their report follows:

#### FARMERS AND WORLD AFFAIRS PROGRAM—1978

As part of the Farmers and World Affairs Exchange program to Pakistan, we traveled over five thousand miles in five weeks. This F.W.A. program of farm leaders of America and Pakistan to become more informed and concerned by taking an active part in the building of a world of peace and freedom has been in existence since 1959. This annual program calls for a group of 6 or 8 Americans actively engaged in all types of farming to visit Pakistan to observe their agriculture and agribusiness and for a corresponding group to visit America for the same purpose. This year 3 couples, Mr. and Mrs. Roy O. Christman of Hamburg, Penna., Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Jackson of Howell, Michigan and Mr. and Mrs. Mervin Sutter of Sarasota, Florida visited and lived in their counterparts' homes in Pakistan. Later on this year 6 Pakistanians will come to America to be guests of this year's exchanges and former participants on their farms. Since each former participant arranges for programs and recreation typical of his area and his type of farming, the present participants have a varied and enjoyable trip.

This 1978 Farmers and World Affairs Exchange started for us on Feb. 6 at Karachi, Pakistan. We eventually drove 4,500 miles from Karachi on the south, northward through the Indus Valley, to the Swatt Valley in the north. After 5 weeks on the road, traveling in three cars which enabled us to reach nearly inaccessible places on nearly unrecognizable roads, we flew from Rawalpindi to Karachi adding another 900 miles.

Some of the highlights included visits and meals at twenty-five different farms with overnight stays at seven of them. These farmers represented every type of agriculture native to Pakistan and included mangoes, citrus, bananas, sugar cane, rice, wheat, alfalfa, vegetables, mustard for oil and popples. From the sky, Pakistan has a yellow color due to its acres and acres of flowing mustard fields. With very little export and limited storage and processing facilities most of the food is locally consumed, being merchandized by "Poppa" stores and push cart vendors. The many animals of Pakistan, the camel, oxen, water buffalo, donkey, goat and the horse manage to eat up many acres of alfalfa and wheat as fodder. Briefing at the State Dept., Washington, D.C., the American Consulate, Karachi and meetings with various Directors of Fisheries and Agriculture of the Sind, Punjab and North West Frontier Provinces acquainted us with the fundamental facts of Pakistan's agriculture. Visits to 4 research centers, 2 colleges, fish harbors, a sugar mill, an Esso Refinery and the Lahore Vegetable and Fruit Market showed us the utilization of PL 480 funds and the practical, down-to-earth application and results of these facts.

Our impressions are that Pakistan will never really benefit from outside help until it changes its traditions and conditions from within. There are at least three main factors each so intermingled with each other that there is no single solution to their problem. In fact the biggest mistake any aiding country can make is to think money alone pumped into a country can solve their problem. Such money usually ends up aiding the governing class already corrupt and affluent. It never touches the needy lower class.

Politics is the number one unstable factor. Although the country is new as to its creation, it's age old landowner-tenant system will keep the country in a state of upheaval. Whenever you have a very rich educated minority dictating to a very illiterate poor majority there is bound to be political unrest. There has to be some sort of land reform in the land ownership distribution with compensation for the landowner and incentive for the tenant. Taking the land away from the present owner (land that has been in the family for hundreds of years) without payment as the present government has tried to do only creates more corruption and unrest in the already ruling class. There are few incentives for the lowly tenant who exists to support his landlord and his own family or for the professional person who fears governmental reprisals or the industrialist who fears nationalization. Nationalization proved to be a disaster since it suppressed investments by the Pakistanians and discouraged investments from other countries too.

Pakistan needs industry to employ more of the over 80 per cent now in agriculture. Employment in agribusiness such as processing, transportation, packaging, manufacturing of machinery and even research will lead to larger, more economical and mechanized farm units. The saving of food now utilized by the bullocks, who are necessary because of the small farm size worked by the tenant, would make Pakistan self-sufficient.

Education of both sexes will be a giant step forward. Other countries are supplying technology but without education the masses cannot understand it. Importation of sophisticated farm machinery is also not the answer. Self production or practically sized and horse-powered equipment would be a more economical approach. Those achieving an education eventually leave the country for material advancement offered by other countries. Education will solve other problems. The agriculture research centers, the Extension system and other agencies are set up but "politics" and selfish motives block the flow of information and good seed to the right people. Better crops would mean better diets, more income, better standards of living, more uniformity of the classes, more exports and national stability. It is hoped Pakistan will solve its own differences before some outside country will.

At first glance it would seem religion and tradition would be one and the same thing. However on understanding some of both it is not necessarily so. Religion was the reason for the creation of Pakistan. Strict religious belief will hamper the growth and keep progress stalemated. More aggressive sectors tend to take advantage of religious elements.

Tradition (pride in country and people) is something to be commended. In the case of Pakistan it is proving to be a deterrent. The many tribes are partially or wholly independent paying little or no taxes and carrying guns in defiance of national law. Purdah and tradition concerning the position of women in society tend to make Pakistan a male-oriented country. Education and active participation of women in all phases of life would lead to a more competitive spirit and higher standard of living. Polygamy and the belief that large families insure a more secure old age for the parents as well as more manpower tend to perpetuate poverty. Planned or arranged marriages concentrate either wealth or poverty and further divides the classes.

Since Pakistan has all the potentials needed for growth, we are optimistic she will emerge as a self-sustaining nation one day. With her great irrigation system and the improvements such as the Tarabella Dam and others to come, her great manpower, her friendly people, her rich soil and natural resources Pakistan is truly an emerging country. ●

#### SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF MAY— NATIONAL TAVERN MONTH

**HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this decade has been a difficult one for our Nation's small businessmen. Inflation, increased competition from large corporations—and yes—interference and increasingly complex regulations from the Federal and State Governments have contributed to these trying times. Many have survived out of the sheer will power and determination of the owners and many more have been aided by their national trade associations.

For example, the nearly 500,000 on- and off-premise liquor retailers in the United States are well served by the National Licensed Beverage Association. Among other activities, NLBA has for 25 years sponsored an annual program designed to spotlight the history and important role of the American tavern in our way of life, and insure its continuity as an important social institution.

On this, the silver anniversary of May—National Tavern Month, I would like to insert the following brief history into the RECORD as a way of paying tribute to NLBA and the millions of Americans participating in the retail liquor industry:

#### AMERICA'S TAVERNS—YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON: "There is nothing which has yet been contrived by man by which so much happiness is produced as by a good tavern or inn."

The world's first taverns were probably built in Egypt thousands of years ago. And as civilization spread to all the corners of the earth, so has the oldest of all community establishments—the tavern. Spanning the centuries, the tavern is the common link between all nations and all peoples.

As the settlers crossed the Atlantic to find a new home in the New World, they brought with them the tradition of the English pub. Typically the first two structures in any colonial settlement were the church and the tavern. Quite often, tavern licenses were issued on the understanding that the tavern be built near the church.

In these Colonial days, church services often lasted all day in unheated structures. Thus a nearby tavern was required for its warmth, refreshment, and lodging for those who lived at a distance from the church. It was not at all uncommon, prior to the construction of the town church or during inclement weather, for the church services to be held within the tavern itself.

So important were taverns to the early settlements that they were often required by law. While many colonies offered land and tax exemptions to prospective taverners, Connecticut in 1644 levied a fine on any town without its own tavern.

The purpose of such laws was to insure accommodations for travelers and to provide "community centers" throughout the colonies. In these early times, the taverns were the only public buildings, and as such housed the town meetings and gatherings, was the center for news and gossip, served as coach depot and post office in addition to being livery stable and restaurant. These varied functions of early taverns required that their owners be able to perform many jobs. He was commonly not only the post-

master and "coach agent," but also clerk of court, town registrar, magistrate and/or sheriff.

As is the case today, Colonial licensees were subject to rules of good conduct and business practice. In 1672 it was illegal to sell beverages to minors, slaves or servants without the consent of parent, owner or master. Sales were also forbidden to "habitual inebriates" and the daily closing was 9:00 p.m.

There were other requirements upon Colonial tavernkeepers too. Establishments of the day were required to provide food and drink (often at prices set by law) as well as "six good feather beds with sufficient covering for same, plus Indian corn, oats, hay, straw and stabling for 10 horses at least."

Above all, however, the taverner has to be a good citizen and man of honorable character. Since licenses were controlled by a board of town officials, it is not surprising that the town's most respected individual was usually its tavernkeeper. It goes without saying that his continued good citizenship and stewardship were essential to the operations and success of his tavern.

The American tavern has frequently been called the "Cradle of Democracy," since it played such a central role in the struggle for independence. Paul Revere and his patriots held their meetings in Boston's Green Dragon Tavern, while the Montagne Tavern in New York City was headquarters for the Sons of Liberty.

General George Washington's New York headquarters was the tavern managed by Samuel Fraunces. Thomas Jefferson's first draft of the Declaration of Independence was written in Philadelphia's Indian Queen Tavern, while the final version of the Star Spangled Banner was penned by Francis Scott Key in a Baltimore tavern.

The history of the Revolutionary War is rich with tavern lore and legends. Since the taverns frequently provided the only accommodations for miles they were selected as command posts for the opposing armies; on occasion housing the staffs of British and Colonial commanders on alternate nights as the tide of battle changed. And since the tavern was normally located on a main road, or a crossroads, many battles were fought literally on the doorsteps.

During the long war, the American tavern served as headquarters, news center, battle-site and field hospital. But when the war was won and our Independence secured, the tavern was the site of gaiety and celebrations throughout the colonies that were soon to become the United States of America.

As America grew and expanded the tavern took on the coloring of its time and location. The New England tavern, with its decidedly English ambience was a far cry from the Western saloon, as wild and woolly as its surroundings, and from the notorious "pirates' dens" of the Southern port cities like New Orleans.

The mining towns of the West often became as famous for their taverns as they did for the mineral strikes that created them. Tombstone, Arizona, had two claims to fame in the 1870s: the world's largest silver lode and the most ornate taverns outside of San Francisco's Barbary Coast section.

Since the mining camps had only the barest necessities for survival, the work was hard and the days were long, the saloon provided the only "recreation." Locked into this hard life, the miners made any occasion a celebration—which in some cases could continue for days, or until the celebrant's ready cash of nuggets or dust was exhausted.

In Nevada during the late 1800's saloons were similar to clubs as we know them today. There were the "one-bit" houses, where a drink of any kind cost 12½ cents (one bit); and two-bit houses, where drinks were a quarter. Lunches were generally served free

of charge, but were subject to strict local customs. Etiquette dictated that a person could eat as much as he wished, but slowly so as not to draw attention to himself.

As today, Nevada's taverns were proud of their orderliness in the 1870s. They also offered a choice: In Virginia City in 1876, records show there were 100 retail liquor establishments, served by the area's 10 wholesalers and five brewers.

According to early American definitions, a tavern was an establishment offering food, drink and lodging; an "ordinary" was one that served food and drink at prices which were fixed by regulation (usually by edict of the governor); and an inn was a hostelry with a number of rooms which might be secured separately (as opposed to the common bunk rooms typical of the day). Today, of course, the shapes, styles and definitions of taverns have changed to reflect our modern lifestyle.

In today's language, a tavern is any establishment that serves a "licensed" beverage, either distilled spirits and/or malt products or vinous spirits. As procedures of state licensing developed, different classes of taverns have developed reflecting legislative differences from state to state. For example, in some states a "tavern" is a premises licensed solely for malt products and light wines sales; while in others "taverns" or "bars" are those premises that do not or need not sell food along with a beverage sale.

Confusing as these labels might appear, the spirit of America's Taverns remains the same. They are community meeting places in the small towns, and places where "singles" can meet in larger cities. They are places for food, beverage and companionship; places for dining and dancing; places where darts, pool or pinball amusements may be enjoyed. Their variety reflects the diversity of the needs of America's population—but they fill the same essential human requirement today as they did centuries ago, the need for "social" companionship.

Throughout history, as America's social needs changed, so did the American Tavern—changing to meet these needs. While no one can predict the economy, social structure, or recreational habits of America in the coming 25 years, we can be sure that America's tavern owners will change with society to continue to provide Americans with the atmosphere and food and drink they have come to expect from the American tavern industry, in a creative and responsible manner.

## PROFIT IS NOT A DIRTY WORD II

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

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

### PROFIT IS NOT A DIRTY WORD II

Harold Sydney Geneen, who started his business career as a 16-year-old runner on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange and later was responsible for building one of the world's great multinational corporations, says that if he were starting over again, he would go into business for himself.

Just retired as chief executive officer of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., but still chairman of the board, Geneen celebrates his 68th birthday today. Neither the passage of years nor the shedding of burdens has dimmed his vigor—or his habit of speaking bluntly to the point.

U.S. business, Geneen asserted when we

visited his relatively spartan new office at IIT's Park Avenue headquarters in New York, is being shortchanged by the American public, the government and the media, which generally don't understand the importance of profits in making the free enterprise system work.

"The only courage a businessman has got is his profits," Geneen said. "When he has profits, he goes and builds plants, does things, creates jobs. And when he doesn't have profits he pulls in the roof and gets scared. It's just the simple.

"What the hell is wrong with profits? And what the hell is wrong with unconscionable profits? Any business that has profits, generally speaking goes and builds more divisions and has more R. & D., comes up with more products, and does things with it. That creates jobs and creates a standard of living.

"Suppose they have excess profits?" he continued. "Suppose some guy got a big dividend and bought a yacht? What the hell is wrong with that? The guy is going to put someone to work to build the yacht, spend some money while he's got it, and when he's dead, you take it away, anyway.

"Take the oil industry, for example," Geneen added, warming to his point. "Everybody is stifled on this whole energy program because they're scared stiff somebody's going to make a profit. That's really the problem. The oil industry is going to make a windfall profit. And my comment is, suppose the hell they did? They're going to spend it on exploration . . . and if they give it in dividends, it's no great problem. And the stock market would go up, and a lot of things would happen to keep this momentum going that built the kind of country we have.

"Companies ought to be able to make a profit, make a big profit," he said. "I don't think there's anything wrong with a big profit—unless the guy puts it away in a mattress."

Profits are the key, he emphasized. If the businessman gets no profits, or dwindling profits, "his initiative begins to curdle" and the country's growth comes to a halt.

But the government and the public have got to the point, Geneen asserted, "where they're scared stiff to advocate that we should continue an unfettered free enterprise system.

"This comes out of the style and vogue that's been coming on us in the last 15 or 20 years that, somehow nobody is supposed to have more than anyone else," he contended. "This is a sort of egalitarian approach, and the politicians are scared stiff of it. And actually what built the country was just the opposite. Everybody had an equal opportunity, but you needed a wealthy class that earned it—I'm not talking to the guy who inherited it—because that was the incentive for the other guy."

Geneen himself was not born to the purple, nor ever seemed to aspire to it. He was brought to this country from England as an infant, lived with his mother after his parents split up and went to a boarding school. He worked his way through college at night, became an accountant and wound up having more influence on the development of business around the world in the third quarter of the 20th century than any other corporate executive of his generation. He also became one of the most controversial, as IIT became involved in accusations that it improperly tried to influence governments here and abroad.

But Geneen, inflexible through it all, concentrated on building IIT and its profits. He earned close to \$900,000 annually the last two years and the stock and options he holds make him a millionaire several times over.

In his 19 years at the helm, he built IIT into a company with sales of more than \$12 billion a year and businesses in every corner

of the globe. Although he shuns ostentation, Geneen is proud of his achievements and the niche he carved for himself in the corporate pantheon.

And yet, he told us, if he were advising a young college graduate today on how to seek his fortune, he would suggest—to those "who are motivated that way"—that they "get out on their own and have a small company in the end."

He feels that way, he explained, because "my impression is that nobody has any real idea of what the people running large companies do or what they're accomplishing."

Entertainers and athletes are paid huge sums, and nobody questions that, he noted. "But if they pay some guy running a corporation half a million dollars, and he's got 40,000 people working for him, somehow that's wrong."

But, Geneen said, "The economy is supported by big companies, not by small companies." And "99 percent" of the people running them, he added, are "solid American citizens who believe in everything you believe in." ●

FRAUD AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD the final article in the New York Times series on fraud and abuse in Federal programs. This article is a case study on a Detroit computer school which participated in HEW's basic educational opportunity grant program. The president of that school is presently under indictment for submitting bills for students who did not attend classes that were never held.

The amount of money which the Federal Government loses in a year through fraud and abuse is mind-boggling. In this case alone, HEW paid out nearly \$400,000 before investigators stepped in. We simply cannot let this continue. We must augment agency efforts to stop fraud and abuse. The House took a significant step last week in this regard by passing legislation establishing Offices of Inspectors General in various agencies and departments. I hope that the Senate will act expeditiously on this bill. The article follows:

DETROIT COMPUTER SCHOOL IS FOCUS OF CASE ALLEGING CHEATING IN FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS

(By Jo Thomas)

DETROIT, APRIL 17.—Essie Lee Conway, a large black woman in a pink bathrobe who has been down on her luck longer than she cares to remember, answers the door in a grimy housing project shoved up against the railroad tracks of River Rouge.

She is a welfare mother of eight, a grandmother before she turned 40 last December, a woman who says that the time crawls without work and that the medicine prescribed for her depression makes her sleep a lot these days.

A few miles and seemingly worlds away, Harry M. Borcharding walks into his new suite on the 18th floor of an office tower in Detroit's Renaissance Center. The rooms have red shag carpeting and the furniture is black patent leather and Plexiglass.

Mr. Borcharding, 45, white, a college graduate, a former civil servant and now the

proprietor of a computer school, reports that he has been spending a good deal of time lately in a nearby law library. Mrs. Conway is one of the reasons. Mr. Borcharding, who is acting as his own attorney, is under a four-count criminal indictment for fraud.

According to the charges against him, Mr. Borcharding's scheme was a classic example of fraud against the Government—the systematic looting of Federal aid programs, not just by welfare mothers who illegally collect benefits but by relatively well-to-do doctors, pharmacists and businessmen who contract to supply services or goods in such programs.

It is difficult to estimate how many cases there are of fraud or abuse in Health, Education and Welfare Department programs, partly because the mechanisms for detecting them have been so deficient.

"Every time we turned over a rock at H.E.W. we found another problem," said Robert W. Ogren, who until recently headed the fraud unit in the United States Attorney's office for the District of Columbia. But he said there was no way of knowing what percentage of cases were being discovered because "there was no detection mechanism in the whole system."

ANNUAL LOSSES IN BILLIONS

Other sources said that many others, particularly among Federal prosecutors, agreed. Alan Kaufman, an Assistant United States Attorney who handles fraud cases in the Southern District of New York, said that the potential for fraud in many programs was so enormous and the monitoring by the agencies so lax that "to a great extent, it's an invitation to steal."

It is a problem of vast proportions, with some estimates putting the annual loss at \$12 billion to \$15 billion, but its actual extent is unknown. It is exacerbated by a range of circumstances—the widespread conviction that no one is injured because the money in question belongs to everyone; the reluctance of bureaucrats to root out corruption in programs to which their careers are tied; the inadequacy of the Federal effort to detect and prevent fraud and, consequently, the low odds that an offender will be caught.

But it is a problem that has recently begun to generate growing concern in Congress and the executive branch, producing additions to the staffs of inspectors general and other enforcement officials.

The allegations against Mr. Borcharding fit the pattern almost exactly, describing the profitable manipulation of a desperately needed social welfare program by a person with impeccable credentials. Federal and state officials were eager to give him money, and he was, in the end, caught only because he asked for too much.

U.S. WON VERDICT

In a reverse of the usual pattern, the Government has won a civil verdict against Mr. Borcharding, charging that he had submitted false claims under a Federal educational grant program. A jury in October sided with the Government, which is entitled to recover twice the amount of the claims.

No judgment has yet been handed down in the case, however, pending settlement of Mr. Borcharding's counterclaim that the Government interpreted the regulations incorrectly and changed its interpretations long after it was too late for the school to do anything about it.

In January Mr. Borcharding was indicated by a Federal grand jury on four charges that his statements were fraudulent. That trial is pending.

Nevertheless, sworn testimony by students, instructors, and Mr. Borcharding himself in the six-week civil trial last fall described in great detail the way the school, the grant program and Mr. Borcharding operated.

Mrs. Conway and Mr. Borcharding first crossed paths three years ago when Mr. Borcharding's school was selling dreams and

Mrs. Conway was in the market but had no money with which to buy. Mr. Borcharding signed her up to learn how to become a data processing specialist and sent the Federal Government the \$1,050 bill.

SUBMITTED 2,000 APPLICATIONS

In all, under what was then a new Federal program, Mr. Borcharding's school submitted more than 2,000 applications from welfare recipients who wanted to become data processors. The Government paid out \$389,103 before auditors moved in and charged that he was submitting bills for students who did not attend sessions that were not held.

It is likely that the situation might have passed for years as bad bookkeeping, with no Federal or local monitoring, if Mr. Borcharding had not sought to make it quite so profitable. All 2,000 preprinted applications arrived at the same Government contractor's office on the same day.

They were gathered, according to testimony, in welfare offices throughout Detroit in March 1975. The automobile industry was ailing, unemployment hung in the air like a cough and long lines of applicants formed at the mere rumor of a job.

Mrs. Conway had gone to the Wayne County Department of Social Services' southwest office, which had been a supermarket before its windows were smashed in Detroit's 1967 riots.

"They was catching people in the welfare office," Mrs. Conway recalled. "I went up to see my worker. I saw this sign that says you can be a computer operator, and I said, 'Oh that's what I always wanted to be in.'"

TOLD SHE WAS ELIGIBLE

Two women were sitting at a desk taking applications, she recalled, and "they said I was eligible."

What Mrs. Conway and the others applied for was a grant under the Basic Educational Opportunities Grant Program, authorized in 1972 as a way the Federal Government could give needy students money for vocational training after high school.

It was and is, as one Federal official described it, "a pure giveaway program." This year, 4.5 million students will apply for \$1.7 billion to be used at 6,300 educational institutions ranging from universities to beauty schools. Under the program, a student applies for a grant, which he can then take to any participating school. The school, in turn enrolls the student and submits his grant form to the Government for cash.

"There's no way the Government can account for the activities of each and every school participating in the program," Thomas M. Woods, one of three Government attorneys handling the suit against Mr. Borcharding, told the court. The Government must "rely on the integrity of these schools," he added.

SOLE STOCKHOLDER

In 1972 Mr. Borcharding set up the Institute of Computer Technology, a private, profit-making institution of which he was the president and sole stockholder. It operated in a two-story office building he owned in the Detroit suburb of Oak Park. Its quarters were spacious, its furnishings even luxurious, with thick carpeting and silver foil wallpaper. There were only about 100 students at first, but Mr. Borcharding said he hoped to expand.

In August 1974 the institute applied to participate in the grant program, and by October an agreement had been signed. A few months later, Mr. Borcharding said, he approached the Wayne County Department of Social Services with a proposal to train 3,000 welfare recipients for jobs as data processing specialists. He wanted social workers to help him sign them up.

PRINTED SCHOOL ADDRESS

Delois Whitaker of the county department testified that she and others had been eager to help welfare recipients get training that

would lead to jobs. They became concerned, however, when they saw samples of the 10,000 application forms Mr. Borcharding had printed. He would later testify that he had printed his own forms because he could not get enough from the Government.

In the space for the student's home address, Mr. Borcharding had preprinted his school's name and address. He had also preprinted the answer "yes" to whether the applicant was a United States citizen and "no" to whether the applicant had prior training.

Mr. Borcharding explained to the social workers and later to the court that this was a convenience to make it easier for the grants to be collected by the school and to keep an application from being rejected because an answer was overlooked.

But the social workers were also worried that they might not be able to get accurate financial information, for the applicants had to show need. The social workers rejected Mr. Borcharding's suggestion that they simply have the applicants sign the forms and that he would help the applicants fill in the financial information later.

In the end, the Social Services Department did sign an agreement promising to help recruit applicants, but the social workers were busy elsewhere and finally signed up only about 18 students. Mr. Borcharding, using teams of recruiters, signed up about 3,300 in eight days or so.

Mrs. Conway was one of them. Letha Taylor, 57, was another. She had gone to the same office to buy food stamps and saw the same sign.

#### ASKED ABOUT AGE LIMIT

"After I finished getting the food stamps," she testified, "I asked did they have any age limit. I didn't know whether they would accept me or not."

Mrs. Taylor told the court that she wanted to study "library aide." "It's work in the library as an aide to the librarian," she said. "Well, at the present, when I first enrolled, I had to take up computer, this I.B.M."

She testified that after she started classes in key punching she told a staff member, "I was interested in going for the course I had enrolled for. She said 'I had to finish this course first, so I never went into library aide.'"

At a rate of 25 hours a week, the course would take 37 weeks to complete. It included classes in key punching, data control, data library, console operation and computer programming. To qualify for the grants, the Government attorneys would later assert, the school must see that the students attended 24 hours a week, either in class or in supervised laboratory sessions. In fact, the attorneys argued, the students attended class far less time if they attended at all.

Mrs. Conway said she called Washington to complain, but "the lady never called back; the Government don't care."

Unknown to Mrs. Conway, the school was already in trouble. The recruiters had collected about 3,300 applications for the 1974-75 academic year and the same number for the following year. The school had weeded out duplications and sent about 2,000 grant applications to the government contractor who was supposed to process them, American College Testing Program, in Iowa City, Iowa.

#### CONTRACTOR BLEW WHISTLE

They were all hand-delivered on March 14, 1975, a day before the deadline for the upcoming academic year. The contractor, according to court testimony, noticed that the applications were preprinted and contained no instructions for the students. The contractor blew the whistle.

After negotiations, in which the Government insisted on knowing the home addresses of the students getting the grants, more than 650 students were enrolled before the auditors got to the school in May.

Russell L. Allen, who headed the audit team, said he found that out of 25 randomly selected student files, only three contained evidence to verify actual student attendance. A review showed one student had never attended eight started a class but did not finish, two dropped out after one course, and 14 were still in good standing. The dropouts, Mr. Allen said, appeared to be entitled to refunds they did not receive.

On July 1, the Government filed a civil suit in Federal District Court in Detroit, asking for a temporary restraining order to stop Mr. Borcharding and the school from dispersing funds and charging them with "substantial, wholesale violations" of the contract with the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. The suit charged that Mr. Borcharding had commingled funds failed to compute eligibility properly and failed to give refunds.

At the civil trial last fall, their attorney, Gregory Curtner, said, "We will concede that the records were a mess," but laid the blame on the Government. "They couldn't keep records; they didn't know who was where; they didn't send out regulations; they didn't know what the regulations meant," he said.

Since the Government cut off the grant money, the institute has continued to operate, although it moved to much smaller quarters and only a shadow of where its name was taken off the building shows where it once was. ●

state of Alaska, and thereby the mining and logging industry, in control of the bulk of the mineral wealth and land. The mineral interests were not satisfied, however, and have succeeded in getting the House committee to weaken protection of some specific areas and to adopt a provision that would open millions of otherwise protected acres to "mineral processes." If the Alaskan parks legislation is actually to protect wilderness, this nibbling away at the safeguards it provides will have to stop.

If the bill were assured of passage in its present form, it would meet most of the needs of the Alaska wilderness, but it still has another House committee and the full House as well as the Senate to go through and needs to be carefully shepherded. Further weakening of the legislation could well mean inadequate protection for the fragile ecosystems that exist in Alaska.

Contrary to charges by some state officials, the intent is not to lock up Alaska from development; plenty of land will be left after the federal government sets its portion aside. Rather the intent is to insure that the land that is set aside is sufficient for preservation. As Secretary of Interior Cecil Andrus said when he presented the administration's proposals, "If we err by conserving too much this can always be changed in the future." But once wilderness is gone, it can never be brought back. ●

#### MR. COLE BRIDGES

### HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor one of Saratoga's outstanding community leaders, Mr. Cole Bridges, who is retiring from public office after 10 years of service. In appreciation for all his fine work over the years, the Saratoga community is sponsoring a dinner in Cole's honor on Sunday, April 30, 1978.

Cole's community service began in August of 1968, when he helped establish the parks and recreation commission. He was elected the commission's first chairman a year later. In 1970, he was elected to the Saratoga City Council, becoming its vice-mayor in March of 1974. Later in the year he began a term as mayor of Saratoga which ended just last March.

Cole ably represented the city of Saratoga on the Santa Clara County Transportation Commission, on the Inter-City Council of Mayors and as a member of the board of directors for sanitation district No. 4.

He was chairman of the county transportation commission for 3 consecutive years, a tribute in itself to his fine leadership abilities. While he was chairman, the commission made great strides in improving the bus system in the county and investigating alternative methods of mass transit that would better meet the needs of the citizens of the Santa Clara Valley.

Cole is a warm compassionate man, who has often demonstrated his deep concern for people. He encourages a complete airing of all viewpoints on any issue and he is respected by all for his patience and his sense of fairness.

#### NO MORE COMPROMISES ON PROTECTION OF ALASKAN WILDERNESS

### HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported H.R. 39, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The bill as revised represents the results of many months of hearings, briefings, and Subcommittee and Committee debates and mark-up sessions.

I voted for the bill and will support it on the floor. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I have reservations, however about the compromises that have been made, and am apprehensive about the pressures which will be brought to bear in favor of further attempts to weaken the bill's provisions for protection of the magnificent wilderness, wildlife, scenic, natural, and other values of Alaska.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch accurately summarized the status of the legislation when, in a recent editorial it stated that the "Alaska parks bill that has emerged \* \* \* has already been weakened as much as, and probably more than, it should be."

I am entering this editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 18, 1978]

#### SAVING THE LAST WILDERNESS

The Alaskan Parks bill that has emerged from the House Interior Committee has already been weakened as much as, and probably more than, it should be. The administration's proposal provided for setting aside a fair amount of land to benefit the American people as the last thriving example of wilderness in this country. The plan would put the

As mayor of San Jose and as a Member of Congress, I have worked with Cole on many occasions. He understands the concerns of the people in Saratoga and Santa Clara County, and he has provided me with helpful information and advice on how legislation would affect his community.

The city of Saratoga will miss his leadership and guidance in the months to come, but we understand his desire to spend more time with his family and business.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all my colleagues to join with me to thank Cole Bridges and wish him the best of luck in the future. ●

## NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the issue of nuclear waste storage is one of growing concern around the country. The Department of Energy has released a report on the nuclear waste management problem and legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives to deal with storage of these hazardous materials.

One of these bills was first introduced last December by our colleague from Illinois, the Honorable TOM CORCORAN. Entitled "The Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage Act of 1978," this legislation is receiving attention from the Department of Energy, environmental groups, and the nuclear industry. The bill would expedite the decisions concerning the temporary and permanent storage of all radioactive wastes by involving Congress in the formulation of a much-needed national policy in this area. This proposal has already been reintroduced once with a number of cosponsors and the interest among Members is growing.

Additionally, two publications recently cited Mr. Corcoran's bill as a viable solution to the problems of nuclear waste storage. Both articles do a good job of describing H.R. 10301 and its specifics for dealing with the temporary storage of spent fuel and the permanent storage of spent fuel and other wastes. As a cosponsor of this measure, I invite my colleagues' attention to these articles, which follow:

[From the Nuclear Fuel, Jan. 23, 1978]

#### SPENT FUEL SOLUTION DEMANDED BY CORCORAN IN BILL ON INTERIM, PERMANENT STORAGE

Spent fuel storage and waste management solutions—priority issues in both government agencies and in Congress—have found yet another champion, this time in Rep. Thomas Corcoran (R-Ill.). Corcoran's bill, the "Spent Fuel Storage Act of 1978," was introduced on the last day of the session in Congress last month and has been referred to the Committees on Rules, Interior & Insular Affairs and Interstate & Foreign Commerce; "we hope action on the bill begins as soon as Congress gets back," said a source on Corcoran's staff. Under the proposed legisla-

tion, DOE would be required to submit a preliminary report on the interim storage of spent fuel within six months after the enactment of the bill, and a preliminary report on the permanent storage of spent fuel and other high and low-level radioactive wastes within two years after enactment. The bill, as presented to Congress, is intended to "expedite decisions concerning the temporary storage of spent fuel and the permanent storage of spent fuel and other radioactive wastes, including the selection of sites for storage facilities, the determination of whether the federal government should take title to such fuel and such waste, and the amount of storage fees which should be charged."

The bill's scope is wider than that of the spent fuel storage legislation which staffers in the House subcommittee on oversight & investigations say is in final draft in that committee, chaired by Rep. John Moss (D-Calif.). The Moss bill, which the staff expects to report on soon, deals specifically with the spent fuel storage issue; the staff was last week collating the results of a nationwide survey of utilities' spent fuel storage needs for inclusion in the report. Corcoran's bill, a staffer explained, is designed to start the wheels moving on the entire policy question, which has been stagnant—at least publicly—since the original announcement was made that the U.S. government plans to accept spent fuel for storage.

On the temporary storage of spent fuel, the bill calls for DOE, in consultation with the EPA, the Council on Environmental Quality, the U.S. Geological Survey and the NRC to:

Determine the amount of spent fuel which has been generated so far and the amount anticipated in the next five years;

To determine the amount of spent fuel which can be stored at temporary storage facilities in operation or under construction when the act is enacted, the number and design of additional facilities which would be required to store the remainder of such fuel, and the approximate storage capacity of each such additional facility;

Identify five preferred and five alternative sites for such additional temporary storage facilities;

Determine whether the federal government should own such additional temporary storage facilities or whether such facilities should be owned by commercial entities;

Evaluate the appropriateness of transferring to the federal government the title to any spent fuel stored in facilities owned by the federal government and determine the conditions which should be attached to such transfer of title; and

Determine the amount of fee which should be charged.

The bill also provides that within 60 days after the preliminary report on interim spent fuel storage, DOE shall hold at least one public hearing in Washington to provide the governor of any state which has jurisdiction of any property within 100 miles of any site recommended in the report with the opportunity to testify concerning the report. DOE's final report would then be issued 90 days after the hearing, including comments.

Sixty days after the President receives the report, the bill provides that he specify the location of sites to be used, the design and approximate storage capacity. After the plan is submitted to Congress, the President would be able to make amendments or modifications to the plan; the plan would take effect 60 days after submission to Congress unless the two houses adopt by an affirmative vote a concurrent resolution disapproving the plan. The bill has considerable detail on the procedure to be followed in this case, concluding with a provision that Nepa be circumvented because of the urgency of the matter. In other words, Nepa

would not apply to any preliminary or final report or to any plan or action taken to implement such as a plan.

On the permanent storage of radioactive waste, Corcoran's bill provides that DOE will conduct a study to:

Evaluate the methods of providing for permanent storage;

Determine the amount of storage capacity which will be required to permanently store all radioactive waste now existing and which will be generated by 2000;

Determine the type and amount of permanent storage facilities;

Determine the period of time if any during which any spent fuel shall be retrievable from the permanent storage facility in which such fuel was placed;

Determine the conceptual design, possible sites and ownership of such facilities;

Evaluate the appropriateness of transferring to the federal government the title to any radioactive waste stored in permanent storage facilities and the conditions for such transfer;

Determine the fee schedule which should be established by the federal government to cover any costs incurred by the government.

The preliminary report would be submitted to the public; a draft of the environmental impact statement or statements required under Nepa would be submitted as well to the President, Congress, and the governors of each state. Again, public hearings would be provided for under the same provisions as the interim storage report.

[From the Babson's Reports, Feb. 6, 1978]

#### NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Illinois Republican Rep. Tom Corcoran has introduced a bill that is designed to expedite decisions concerning the temporary storage and the permanent storage of spent fuel and other radioactive waste.

The measure (H.R. 10301) would provide for the selection of sites for storage facilities, the determination of whether Uncle Sam should take title to such fuel and such waste, and the amount of the storage fees to be charged.

Corcoran thinks it's time the U.S.—after 30 years of involvement with nuclear power—came to grips with the problem of what to do with waste produced during nuclear reactions.

He points out that the President's decision early in '77 not to reprocess this fuel has increased the severity of the problem in terms of time . . . because the 60 or more reactors around the country that are now in operation continue to produce this spent fuel without adequate on-site storage facilities.

Corcoran also claims there is insufficient off-site space to handle this waste . . . maintains that the only off-site facility currently in operation in the entire nation will be filled to capacity by the early '80s.

He further contends that storage facilities for spent fuel at the individual reactor sites will be filled to capacity before long.

#### OTHER DEADLY MATERIALS

Corcoran's bill also deals with—and attempts to solve—the problem of nuclear waste other than spent fuel.

These wastes will remain radioactive for an indefinite period, probably for hundreds of thousands of years . . . making it imperative to assure ample, safe storage space.

The Illinois solon's bill has been referred to the following 3 House committees: Interior and Insular Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rules.

A House vote during the current session is possible but by no means assured . . . and Senate action is even more problematical. But the process could be speeded up if public support of the legislation were to swell. ●

CATHERINE CURRAN, MARY GAUDIOSE, ELEANOR MARTIN, CATHERINE MCFARLAND, AND CAROLINE PATTON, RETIRING MAHONING COUNTY, OHIO, WELFARE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES, TO BE HONORED

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Youngstown, Ohio, will be honoring five Mahoning County Welfare Department employees on their retirement at a banquet on May 5, 1978. The retirees—Catherine Curran, Mary Gaudiose, Eleanor Martin, Catherine McFarland, and Caroline Patton—have more than 200 years cumulative service among them. All are natives of Youngstown, and all have attained supervisory status in their special areas of expertise within the Welfare Department.

Catherine McFarland is the daughter of the late Thomas and Mame McFarland, and was educated at Ursuline High School. After earning her college degree in education at Kent State University, she started her career with the Welfare Department in 1935. Prior to her promotion to supervisor of the Intake Department in 1954, she held a variety of positions, including caseworker, social worker, and income maintenance worker. In 1972, she became supervisor of the general relief unit, a position which she held until her retirement.

Catherine R. Curran, the daughter of the late Mary Veronica and Joseph Lawrence Curran, graduated from Rayen High School and attended Youngstown College prior to starting her public service career in 1935.

Initially serving with the aid to the aged agency in Youngstown, Miss Curran became a Mahoning County Welfare Department supervisor as a result of 1966 social security legislation consolidating local agencies. At the time of her retirement, she was an income maintenance worker III, supervising the nursing home unit.

In addition to her career, Miss Curran has been active in professional, community, and church groups, including casework practitioners, ladies of charities, and the Catholic Daughters of America. Although she plans to do some travelling, Miss Curran intends to remain active in church and community groups.

Mary Elizabeth Gaudiose, the daughter of the late Youngstown-area pharmacist, "Doc" and Ella Mae Dusseau O'Linn, majored in education at Youngstown College prior to starting her career with the county welfare department. She started with the department as a clerk in 1939, and has held positions such as caseworker I, III, IV, executive I, and administrative specialist II. At the time of her retirement, Mrs. Gaudiose was a supervisor in the aid to dependent children eligibility unit.

Along with her career, she also attended many work-related seminars, workshops, and study courses, as well as continuing her education at Youngstown College. She is a member of St. Christine's Church and several religious organizations, including the Altar and Rosary Society, Infant Jesus of Prague, and the Charismatic Movement Bible Study Course.

Since 1949, she has been married to Martin Gaudiose, who is the principal of Struthers Fifth Street School. Two of their sons, Brian and Martin, are involved in drug counseling and rehabilitation in the Youngstown area. Their third son, Michael, is a doctor in Akron. Mrs. Gaudiose will use her retirement to travel and to increase her involvement in church and civic organizations.

Eleanor Martin, retiring clerical supervisor of the assistance control unit, has served in the welfare department for 39 years. Prior to agency consolidation in 1966, she held a variety of positions with the division of aid and the former aid for the aged agency.

A graduate of Old Market Street Elementary School, Mrs. Martin majored in secretarial studies at the Youngstown College Business School. In addition to participating in work-related seminars and workshops, she has also taught Sunday school at the Pilgrim Collegiate Church, and has been an active junior business woman of the YWCA.

Mrs. Martin is married to Richard Thomas Martin, a teacher and principal of North Elementary School in Girard. She will use her retirement to pursue her knitting, bridge, and sports hobbies.

Caroline Patton leaves the welfare department after 45 years of service. A graduate of South High School, she earned a B.S. in education from Wilberforce University, and has done graduate work at the University of Pittsburgh and Case Western Reserve University.

Her career started in 1933, when she was employed as a social worker with the Allied Council. Before working for the Mahoning County Relief Agency in 1936, she also worked briefly for the Federal Emergency Relief Agency. In 1940, she became involved with the aid to dependent children office, which was later merged into the Mahoning County Welfare Department. Within the department, she has served as a caseworker, casework supervisor, social worker II and IV, administrative specialist IV, and her current position of income maintenance supervisor I.

Mrs. Patton has remained active in a variety of religious and community organizations, including the Heroines of Jericho, the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, and the Youngstown Negro Business and Professional Women's Club. She has served as secretary and matron of the Order of Eastern Stars, and is a former president of the Youngstown Chapter of Links, Inc. She is also a member of St. Andrews A.M.E. Church, and serves on the stewards board. Her husband, Felix A. Patton, is retired from the Erie Lackawanna Railroad.

In retirement, Mrs. Patton intends to

remain active in her many community and social groups.

Mr. Speaker, these retiring women are to be commended not only for their years of dedicated service with the welfare department, but also for their sustained community involvement. Each woman has given of herself not only professionally, but also in religious and community organizations. Their dedication to bettering the Youngstown community—both on and off the job—deserves the praise of all of us. They can all take pride in a job well done.

I want to join the many friends, co-workers, and family members of Catherine Curran, Mary Gaudiose, Eleanor Martin, Catherine McFarland, and Caroline Patton, in congratulating them on their many years of fine work in the Mahoning County Welfare Department, as well as in the varied church and civic organizations, and in the Youngstown community in general.

In addition, I wish these wonderful women good health and happiness in their retirement. They will all be missed, and certainly not forgotten.●

### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT ACT OF 1978

### HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1978

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Chairman, I was gratified by yesterday's overwhelming endorsement of H.R. 11504, the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978, which revises the farmer loan program of FmHA, initiates an emergency loan program for farmers and ranchers, and extends the Emergency Livestock Credit Act.

The bill increases the limits on farm ownership loans from \$100,000 to \$200,000 for direct and insured loans, and to \$300,000 for guaranteed loans. Farm operating loans are increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000 for insured loans and \$200,000 for guaranteed loans. The total indebtedness limit on farm ownership is raised from \$225,000 to the value of the farm and other collateral. These increases are commensurate with the increased cost of farming today, where the cost of land, machinery, fuel, and borrowing, have seriously threatened our agricultural segment of the economy.

I was also glad to see the adoption of the Glickman amendment, which I had supported by cosponsoring a rural housing bill which contained this provision. The amendment requires that mortgage guarantees offered by FmHA be subject to conditions no less favorable than those governing mortgage guarantees offered by HUD. Other provisions of the bill, such as the establishment of a direct and insured program of loans with reduced interest rates for low income, small or beginning farmers; the increase in the maximum grant for rural water and sewer systems from 50 to 75

percent of program cost; and the initiation of a new emergency loan program for farmers under financial stress, all serve to unburden somewhat the heavy loan borne by our farmers. This bill does not foment dependence, but utilizes the self-reliance and initiative of the farmer through loans. I commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. FOLEY, and his committee for their fine work in making these programs more responsive to the current needs of our farmers. ●

#### EIGHTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

### HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, each spring since my first election to the Congress in 1970. I have asked my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of New York their opinions on important issues facing the Congress and our Nation. Each year the response has been most impressive, and has given me valuable insight into the grass roots opinion of my district.

This year marked my eighth annual questionnaire. I was highly gratified by the fact that more than 13,000 persons responded to the questions. I found the results highly significant in relation to economic affairs and to our current international situation.

The tabulation of the results confirmed that there is a growing concern over the state of our Nation among my constituents. Especially is this true in regard to economic conditions. In response to the question: Do you expect the economic situation of most Long Islanders to improve during 1978, 80 percent replied no. Only 15 percent of the more than 13,000 persons responding thought the economic situation would improve this year.

Mr. Speaker, this pessimistic result reflects the heavy impact on Long Island of the increasing rate of inflation, higher social security taxes, and the prospect of higher energy taxes.

Economic concerns are reflected also in the 70 percent support for an across-the-board reduction in Federal income taxes, in preference to the Carter tax cut program which provides reductions mainly for lower income taxpayers. This near 3-to-1 margin of support for an across-the-board income tax cut shows that we who advocated the Roth-Kemp bill have strong grass roots support for this 3-year program of reductions in the Federal income tax rate averaging 30 percent for all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues these two results of my questionnaire. I trust this call from the grass roots will help persuade them of the necessity for a real reduction in Federal income taxes, rather than the mislabeled "tax cut" plan of the Carter administration, which, with the reforms

the administration insists must be part of the package, would result in virtually no tax reductions for nearly half of the Nation's taxpayers, and even higher income taxes for many.

Concerning international affairs, results from my questionnaire showed negative feelings among my constituents as to President Carter's policies. Asked whether they thought President Carter's actions and statements are helping chances for a Middle East peace settlement, 58 percent said no. Only 36 percent responded favorably. Even stronger sentiment was registered on the Panama Canal treaties. Sixty-seven percent opposed the move to give the Panama Canal to Panama, only 30 percent supported it. This strong grass roots opinion encourages me to see through to completion the legal challenge the treaties now before the U.S. Supreme Court, and should encourage my colleagues to insist upon the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to vote on the transfer of property involved in the treaties.

I trust that President Carter and his aides will also note the near 2-to-1 margin against U.S. trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba. This reflects the grave concern in my district over the new role Cuba has assumed in providing modern-day Hessians to fight for Russians causes in Africa.

Another strong expression of grass-roots opinion came from the 71 percent who voted for stronger liability and safety standards for oil tankers and offshore drilling. I am sending this result to Senators HENRY M. JACKSON and EDMUND S. MUSKIE with a renewed request that they end delay in action on two vital bills in this area, the Outer Continental Shelf Act, and the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act. These two bills should have been enacted into law by now. Further delay, with more and more offshore drilling operations planned for the Atlantic Ocean coastal areas near Long Island, is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, in calling the attention of my colleagues to the results of my eighth annual questionnaire, I wish also to express my gratitude for the heavy response, and to extend my thanks to each and every one of the more than 13,000 persons who took the time and trouble to answer the questionnaire. They have faithfully carried out their responsibilities as citizens of our Nation, in expressing their opinions on issues of the day.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis once wrote an opinion in a case concerning citizen participation in government in which he said:

The greatest menace to freedom is an inert people . . . public discussion is a political duty . . .

I am proud that so many of my constituents have demonstrated their interest and have contributed to public discussion of important issues.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD the complete tabulation of results from my eighth annual questionnaire:

#### TABULATION OF RESULTS, CONGRESSMAN LENT'S EIGHTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you approve of the proposed treaty giving the Panama Canal to Panama?  
Yes 30.5 No 67.2 Undecided 2.3
2. Do you believe President Carter's actions and statements with respect to the Middle East have helped chances for a peace settlement?  
Yes 36.3 No 58.1 Undecided 5.6
3. Do you favor phased withdrawal of all remaining U.S. ground forces from South Korea as proposed by President Carter?  
Yes 47.5 No 48.7 Undecided 3.8
4. Should the United States resume trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba at this time?  
Yes 35.2 No 61.0 Undecided 3.8
5. Should Congress require stronger safety and liability standards for oil drillers and oil tanker operators, although this may mean slightly higher fuel prices?  
Yes 71.3 No 25.2 Undecided 3.5
6. Do you favor an extension of the March 1979 deadline for states to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment?  
Yes 38.0 No 58.2 Undecided 3.8
7. Different approaches to reductions in federal income taxes are being proposed this year. Do you favor an across-the-board cut for all taxpayers, rather than tax cuts mainly for lower income taxpayers?  
Yes 70.4 No 26.7 Undecided 2.9
8. Do you feel federal income tax cuts should be deferred by Congress until a comprehensive tax "reform" package is agreed to?  
Yes 38.8 No 56.7 Undecided 4.5
9. Do you expect the economic situation of most Long Islanders will improve during 1978?  
Yes 15.3 No 80.0 Undecided 4.7 ●

#### STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS A. LUKEN ON THE CASE OF JESSICA KATZ

### HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring the very serious case of Jessica Katz to the attention of my colleagues.

Jessica Katz is an infant from the Soviet Union who is reportedly suffering from malabsorption syndrome, a disease which makes her incapable of absorbing vital nutrients. She was born on October 3, 1977, but has gained very little weight since birth. Her situation has become extremely serious, as she has shown very little stability in recovering from this disease.

In Cincinnati we have one of two facilities, both in the United States, which are best adapted and best equipped to treat and possibly cure Jessica Katz. One of these, Cincinnati Children's Hospital has written Soviet Minister of Health Boris Petrovsky, offering the facilities of the hospital in treating Jessica.

However, in order to give Jessica this essential medical care, we must first get her out of the Soviet Union, from where her parents have repeatedly been refused permission to emigrate. I have circulated a letter to all Members of the House requesting their support in securing permission for Jessica to emigrate and come to this country.

I am hopeful that, in this case at least, the Soviet officials will listen to our voices and allow Jessica Katz to come to this country. It is essential that we expedite this procedure to get treatment for this very sick infant.

Thank you.●

#### VOTING RIGHTS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

### HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

● Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, as chairman of an education subcommittee of the California State Assembly, I investigated a situation in Paradise, Calif., in which a great teacher was being harassed and threatened by a few self-appointed anti-Communists who accused her of teaching communism. They conveniently left out the preposition "about" in front of the word.

Today, of course, the climate of fear in the Nation has passed, but that great teacher still teaches. Last week she was in our Nation's Capitol with a group of bright and capable young people under the sponsorship of the fine Close-Up program, and I had a chance to renew our friendship of 15 years.

The students of her school, in San Rafael, Calif., in Representative JOHN BURTON's district, have asked me to introduce a constitutional amendment which would allow all persons eligible to vote in the November election by reason of age, to be eligible to vote in the primary election for the same office. The idea is a good one, and should be swiftly enacted. I am proud to be the author of a bill which was conceived by these students from San Rafael High School and their teacher, Dr. Virginia Franklin.

In 1944, in the Smith against Allwright case, the Supreme Court ruled that the primary was an integral part of the entire election process. All Federal officials should be elected similarly so that no one segment can be denied a crucial vote in the primary. Although the State controls its own primary, it is up to them to supply equal protection of the law, and for this reason Congress should set the example. Ten States, including Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia already have corrected this shortcoming, thus magnifying the existing inequity.

The experience of voting is the ultimate field trip for students who have merely read about government, and this early involvement in the election process will more likely become a lifetime habit. With the passage of this bill, young people will be more involved in the political campaigns of the future

and will increase their interest in government. And if we continue to discriminate against new voters, their initial contact with elections will be a negative one. Past experience has shown that many young people do not carry on and pick up their electoral duties after high school because they never had the actual opportunity while in school. This amendment will change that. Those who assisted in initiating what must become a nationwide movement among young people are as follows:

Becky Ablin.  
George Afremow.  
Gregg Bigliri.  
Ron Braithwaite.  
Sven Buggeland.  
Heidi Carter.  
Laurie Cerf.  
Elise Couvillion.  
Dana Dowdy.  
Erin Fleming.  
Nancy Gamble.  
Rina Guidice.  
Kent Godwin.  
Betsy Harris.  
Brian Hecht.  
Peter Heinlein.  
Katie Hoffman.  
Lisa Ives.  
Ann Kelly.  
David Kupfer.  
Mike La Fave.  
Julie Lavezzo.  
Laurie McCandless.  
Anne Miskimen.  
Doug Mitchell.  
Katie Palches.  
Mary Phillips.  
Bill Posner.  
Jeff DuBois.  
Kathy Read.  
Pat Robertson.  
Tyler Rose.  
Craig Rossi.  
Diane Soldavini.  
George Spongberg.  
Sharon Stark.  
Jack Texiera.  
Karen Tremewan.  
Jeff Walter.  
John Wick.  
Liz Withershoven.  
Phil Wolfe.  
Beth Yoffee.

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote in any election to nominate any candidate for any Federal office to citizens who will be eighteen years of age or older on the date of the election for such office

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of final passage of this joint resolution:*

#### "Article —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States, who will be eighteen years of age or older on the date of any election for the office of President or Vice-President of the United States or for the office of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, to vote in any election to nominate any candidate for such office shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of age.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."●

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTORS IN MINNESOTA SUPPORT OBERSTAR BWCA PROPOSAL

### HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area is an issue with which my colleagues in this House are daily becoming increasingly familiar. In the past week, my colleagues have been visited by many of my constituents who have come to Washington to express their great concern over the issue.

The House Interior Committee has recently reported legislation on the BWCA authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. PHILLIP BURTON).

The House will very likely consider that bill within the coming month.

The people of my district are strongly opposed to the Burton-Fraser-Vento bill because of its unreasonable and unnecessary restrictions on recreational use in the BWCA.

The committee bill will severely curtail the existing recreational use within the BWCA. It will reduce access to the BWCA by handicapped Americans and older Americans.

Recently, the special education directors of Minnesota passed a resolution in support of my proposal for the BWCA.

I very much appreciated their support because one of the essential purposes of my bill is to enable people with special needs to continue to enjoy the BWCA.

I would like to share with my colleagues the resolution adopted by the special education directors in Minnesota, cited in the letter I received from Mr. Duane Googins of Minneapolis, president of the Minnesota Administrators of Special Education, informing me of the directors' action:

MINNESOTA ADMINISTRATORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION,  
April 11, 1978.

HON. JAMES OBERSTAR,  
House of Representatives, Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBERSTAR: At a recent meeting of the Special Education Directors of the State of Minnesota the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states that, "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States . . . shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance," and

Whereas, legislation regarding the Boundary Waters Canoe Area as proposed by Congressman Phillip Burton, Bruce Vento and Donald Fraser, tends to limit the accessibility for handicapped people; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Administrators of Special Education go on record as supporting the Oberstar proposal which will

allow more liberalized use of motorboats and snowmobiles into the peripheral lakes of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area.

Sincerely,

DUANE GOOGINS,  
President of the Minnesota Administrators of Special Education.  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. ●

RHODESIA: WHY, WHY, WHY?

## HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, while Ian Smith of Rhodesia proceeds with his timetable on majority rule in Rhodesia, our State Department and President Carter continue to play footsie with the bought and paid for in Moscow leaders of the so-called Patriotic Front, Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe. What the United States is supposed to gain from this insanity has never been made clear. What the Soviet Union and the Communist World will gain is abundantly clear. Again, the Washington Star recently ran another fine editorial on this matter in their April 19, 1978, edition which I commend to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 19, 1978]

RHODESIA: WHY, WHY, WHY?

The road to Dar es-Salaam, like a more famous road, is paved with good intentions. And is it really less treacherous?

There, in the capital of Tanzania, an Anglo-American diplomatic team (Secretary Vance, Ambassador Young, and Dr. Owen, the British foreign secretary) met again with Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe, the fire-eating leaders of the Rhodesian Patriotic Front.

Afterwards, the parley was pronounced a success, inasmuch as Messrs. Nkomo and Mugabe said they might join an "all-party" conference on Rhodesia's future. If this is success, what would failure consist of? The two guerrilla leaders haven't given an inch on the tough program they outlined at Malta some weeks ago. In fact, they have toughened it. They still want a single-party dictatorship on Marxist lines in Rhodesia. They still demand control of the army and the police, and a "predominant" role in the transitional government. As for the future, Mr. Mugabe now denounces political variety—that is, the toleration of any political parties other than his own—as a "luxury."

These views are unacceptable to the new government in Salisbury, where Prime Minister Ian Smith and his National Front have set in motion a plan for majority rule, adopted a new constitution, and released political prisoners.

So what is the gain? The aim of the Anglo-American plan, supposedly, is to avoid a civil war. But its effect may ultimately be otherwise. The other day in Nigeria, President Carter subscribed to a communique describing the new internal government in Rhodesia as illegal. We are not sure what that means. It may be illegal in the sense in which the Continental Congress was illegal in 1776, for whatever ice that cuts.

The heart of the matter, however, is that Bishop Muzorewa and the other black leaders inside Rhodesia have a far larger political constituency than either Mr. Nkomo (who has a slight one) and Mr. Mugabe (who re-

portedly has next to none). The hope of the latter two for power in Rhodesia—other than by shooting their way in—is kept alive today by an unholy collaboration between the U.S., Great Britain, and their arms suppliers in the Soviet Union.

If the issue is, as advertised, democratic rule in Southern Africa, will someone please explain to us how that objective is advanced by continuing to abase ourselves before those who spout anti-democratic and authoritarian demands? ●

## MONARCHY AND MEDICINE

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, with National Health Insurance proposals blooming in every legislative garden this spring, the bureaucratic gardeners in HEW are busily working away drafting proposals and implementing plans. Not to add to the proposals but to shed a little light on the matter, I would like to insert a timely and excellent article by Mr. William Simon, former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury and now a financial consultant with Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. Instead of examining the NHI proposals, Mr. Simon dedicates the vast part of his article to examining the basic premise under which these health plans have been formulated and dismantles all the arguments put forth by those who would want the Federal Government to take over our health care system:

The article follows:

PREVENTING MEDICINE

(By William E. Simon)

Although he remains relatively calm about welfare and unusually silent on the subject of education, Mr. Carter's ebullient HEW secretary, since the moment of his appointment, has issued an incessant stream of complaints about the system of American health care.

"We perceive health care in America today," says Joseph Califano, "as a vast, sprawling, highly expensive, and virtually non-competitive industry . . . a unique system of economic relationships that are commanding, and controlling, an ever larger share of our nation's resources." That is the essence of Califano's complaint. And his solution? "National Health Insurance to protect all Americans from the crushing burden of medical expenses is essential."

Perhaps the first thing to note here, in both Califano's statement of the problem and his proposed solution, is the striking lack of logic. There is little competition in the health care industry, Califano charges. Therefore, nationalize it. But this is rather like saying that the way to solve the problem of the Imperial Presidency is to establish a Monarchy. The concept of the divine right of kings would do little to democratize the White House. Nor would the socialization of the health care industry, no matter what else it accomplished, increase competitiveness. Further, to imply that Americans now burdened with medical bills would be miraculously relieved of those burdens if their bills were first recycled through Washington is not only illogical, but downright dishonest.

True, there is a cost problem. In 1976, the

national health care bill came to just under \$140 billion, a difficult figure to come to grips with. But the answer, surely, is not massive federal intervention. As even the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability (COWPS) admitted in 1976, after years of avoiding the issue: "It is all too apparent that right now with current reimbursement programs and the ubiquitous and often conflicting morass of regulations, the Federal government, instead of being part of the solution, is part of the problem of rising health care costs."

Nor are the analyses which occasionally issue from Califano's own bailiwick much more reassuring. Hard and fast federal figures on the subject are difficult to come by, but according to one recent HEW estimate, a comprehensive "sperm-to-worm" program, such as that being proposed by Senator Edward Kennedy, could boost the nation's health care tab to \$248.3 billion by 1980. Other proposals before Congress are little better. One, favored by the American Medical Association, could raise the nation's health care bill to \$243.8 billion by 1980; a plan favored by the insurance industry would increase the cost to \$234.5 billion.\*

Logical? According to most measures and nearly every honest estimate, a federal takeover of the health care system would push prices up very near the outer limits of our ability to pay them. Partial federal intervention is now driving prices skyward, as COWPS points out; total federal intervention would accelerate the process. When the problem is discussed as the solution, we may be right in feeling that things are just a bit out of whack.

But logic seems to play no role in the discussion. Califano and his health-care planners simply skip around the figures, never taking them seriously, even when the government itself puts them out. Occasionally, when pinned down, they will acknowledge the figures, but argue that they are inaccurate. Such estimates cannot be accurate, they say, because they do not take into account the basic cost-cutting theories now espoused by the government.

One such theory involves the practice of preventive medicine, and runs this way: If financial barriers to access are eliminated on the primary level (doctors' offices, clinics, etc.) through a comprehensive health insurance program, then minor health problems will be arrested before they develop into major problems, thereby reducing the cost of treatment.

On the face of it, this is an attractive theory. But on reflection it makes little sense, for the vast majority of our health problems are not problems that early care can prevent. How many of us, when we think back over the past year, have been to see a doctor about a problem that an earlier visit would have prevented? In general, the answer is precious few. A cracked rib, an infected eye, an infected ear, bronchitis, viral afflictions of all kinds, a sprain, a strain, a fall, a broken arm, a broken leg—these ailments and others like them form the bulk of the problems that we take to our doctors. None of them would be prevented by early visits.

There are, of course, extremely effective preventive procedures. Hypertensive medication for high blood pressure comes to mind, as do certain methods of cancer

\* The tendency for such federal programs to grow tremendously should not be overlooked. Medicaid was supposed to cost \$200 million per year when it was proposed in 1966. By 1968 the annual cost had jumped to \$1.9 billion. In fiscal year 1977 Medicaid cost \$10.3 billion.

screening. But cost alone is seldom the barrier which prevents us from seeking such treatment. On the whole, the diseases involved here are of such consequence that those fearful of being afflicted would not find a relatively modest doctor's fee in any way a cause for procrastination. True, there may be people both genuinely concerned and genuinely unable to pay. But they are already covered by Medicaid or Medicare. For those not so covered, with marginal medical budgets, there are thousands of free clinics. For the rest of us, the fact that we procrastinate springs from something infinitely more complex than a physician's fee, and abolition of that fee would make the prospect of a visit to the doctor no more seductive.

Human nature presents a profound problem for the proponents of preventive medicine. We cause most of our own basic health problems by eating too much, smoking too much, and drinking too much. We refuse to exercise, we drive our cars unsafely, and some of us won't even use seatbelts. All this, say preventive medicine proponents, is the result of our "life-styles." Change those life-styles, and there would be far fewer health problems. All of which, of course, is true. But the advocates of preventive medicine run into trouble when they attempt to explain just how free medicine would effect a significant life-style change. Indeed, it might be argued that a government which encourages us to put total responsibility for our health into its hands could end by making us even less responsible for our own health. Some day, of course, they may have us all out at lunch hour, exercising in the parking lots to the tune of loudspeakers. But until then, if Califano actually believes that a socialized system would compel us to trot obligingly into our doctor's office so that he can tell us to stop smoking so that we can then go home and do so, his view of human nature is hopelessly muddled.

Nor does his view of the basic human condition seem much clearer. The most important preventive techniques are those that detect and prevent major medical problems. But to characterize such techniques as "money saving" is surely to miss an important point—we all die anyhow, and few of us die healthy. Save us from one thing, and we will eventually suffer from and die from another. And a great deal of money will be spent on us in the process. Consider: A man found to have operable prostate cancer at 40 may be saved to enjoy the benefits of a pacemaker at 65. Or a woman whose hypertensive problems are brought under control at relatively little expense at 60 may at 70 suffer from advanced senility and be placed in a nursing home. In each case, a great deal more money will be spent on such patients than would have been spent had the preventive techniques not succeeded.

This is as it should be, for that is what American medicine is all about. But here again, in the government's characterization of such techniques as "money saving," we run into one of those great reversals of logic. Such techniques by definition must cost, rather than save, money. The only real way to save money on that man with the prostate cancer is not to treat him at all. That, of course, is something no American doctor would think of doing. But, public statements about preventive techniques as money savers aside, there are hints that the idea has occurred to high HEW officials. In public, they continue to take the approved line on preventive medicine. In private, however, they are saying things that suggest a radical redefinition of the preventive concept, one which more nearly squares with logic but violates every precept of American medicine.

Recently, for instance, a storm briefly swirled through HEW when an internal memo was leaked to the press. The memo,

from Robert Derzon, director of HEW's newly created Health Care Financing Administration, suggested that Califano consider a number of ways to bring costs under control. Among Derzon's suggestions: discourage the use of sophisticated medical technology; limit the supply of doctors; slap controls on doctors' fees; encourage welfare mothers to get abortions; and persuade the states to adopt "living wills" by threatening to withhold federal funds.<sup>1</sup>

Abortions would be beneficial, explained Derzon, because "every unwanted birth prevented saves about \$1,000 annually in welfare payments and another \$100 in Medicaid funds." Too many kids, costing too much? Simple. Abort them. Too many old people? "Over one-fifth of Medicare expenditures are for people in their last year of life," Derzon observes pointedly. The solution? Living wills, an approach which encourages oldsters to acquiesce in euthanasia. Neat. Not everyone quite appreciated the simple beauty of Derzon's approach, however. As Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times* pointed out, "Mr. Derzon likes euthanasia. . . ." Such a predilection on the part of the high HEW official who will probably be tapped to run any system of national health insurance is something less than reassuring.

Derzon, in typical bureaucratic fashion, has since denied meaning what he said. But as Schwartz points out, "what is irrefutable is that these and related ideas have recently been actively discussed at the highest policy levels of HEW."

Closely tied to the theory of preventive medicine is the assault on what Califano and the federal planners call "runaway medical technology." Right now their argument is that what needs controlling most are costs at the upper level. Give them the power to pay the total health care bill, they say, and they will hold down those costs by refusing to pay for certain procedures and types of treatment. But do we really want that? Most of us, when someone close becomes very sick, will seek out the very best treatment money can buy. To this end we shop for private insurance policies which guarantee that we will be able to pay for it—and if we do not have such insurance, we will go deeply in debt to pay for that treatment. But now the government is talking as though it intends to save us from those urges—whether we want saving or not—by denying us certain kinds of services and treatment.

What would that mean? It might mean, for instance, that a child with a brain tumor would not have access to a sophisticated brain scanner that could pinpoint the tumor's location. It might mean that the hospital nearest to the heart attack victim would not have a cardiovascular unit. With the government firmly controlling the purse strings and determined not to pay for such equipment, it would not be purchased.

Increasingly, national health insurance proponents are depicting hospitals as luxury playgrounds for medical dilettantes, and breathtaking medical technologies as expensive toys for grownup boys. (One HEW expert, at a recent meeting in Washington, referred to some of the most important technological devices of the century as "whatsy-dusy machines.") Get rid of all that frivolous technological stuff, the attitude seems to be. It just drives up costs, and if we all practice preventive medicine, we won't need it anyhow. What is seldom acknowledged is that hospital improvements and medical technology aim either to preserve life or to

<sup>1</sup> A "living will" spells out the conditions under which a person would not want to continue living—e.g., dependence on a life-support system.

enhance its quality. When the time comes for each of us, we would probably prefer to have had our money spent in this manner. But, again, perhaps the unstated argument is that the single best way to save money is to prevent life from lingering.

Here, as in so many other cases, Califano has things backwards. If he and his peers truly wanted to hold down costs and enhance the quality of care, they would start at the other end and attempt to eliminate services on the primary level. As any physician will tell you, this is where health care expenditures are truly wasted. As matters now stand, doctors are plagued by a horde of patients with self-treatable or nonexistent afflictions. There is the patient with the scratchy throat, the patient concerned with excessive or inadequate body hair, the patient who sometimes gets a funny feeling in his right shoulder, the patient who simply enjoys the attention of a physician and finds his office a satisfying social center. And as third-party payments increase—and with them the illusion of free medicine—so do such patients increase proportionately.

Califano, however, is working from the other end. He intends to encourage more utilization on the primary level by providing free and unlimited access to services, while at the same time limiting access at the upper level. With unlimited access, concludes a Rand Corporation study of National Health Insurance, treatment in doctors' offices would increase by 75 percent. This increase would take place precisely where it is needed least; and what's more, it would dramatically siphon off dollars essential to our care.

In effect, the Califano approach consists of taking resources from those who genuinely need them and distributing them among those who do not. If he were to take a similar approach to education, he might end by funding postgraduate courses for cafeteria help and janitors, while denying them to all students with an I.Q. over 125. Were the same approach taken to welfare, able-bodied bachelors might be encouraged to go on relief, but disabled women with dependent children would be discouraged.

National Health Insurance is simply not the most effective way to guarantee the nation's good health, nor is its method on allocating the health care dollar either wise or just. Nor is its current rationale in any way logical. Health care costs are soaring we are told. Therefore, we must institute a system that by the most conservative estimates could add \$16 a billion a year to those costs. If Califano and his colleagues really believe that, they're bananas.

But they're not, of course. At least not all of them. Most of the HEW planners are simply doing their jobs. And this is especially true of Califano. He is a hired gun, and a good one, the quintessential Washington operator, totally loyal to whoever happens to be paying his fee. He has been told to pave the way for a system of National Health Insurance, and that is what he is doing. His method is an effective one. He looks for whatever apparent weaknesses appear in the present system and he shoots holes in them, and it is irrelevant whether or not his charges are untruthful or exaggerated. And because he does it well, it occurs to few that his facts are frequently either distorted or simply wrong. But they are.

Take his most basic assertion—health care costs are spiraling out of sight. Califano would have us believe that the increase in these costs is outstripping the increase in the costs of all other commodities. But this is not the case. In fact, according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI), medical costs over the past decade have not risen nearly as rapidly as the costs of many other essential services. According to an analysis of the CPI by the American Medical Association, the equivalent

of a dollar's worth of medical care in 1967 costs \$1.85 today. In comparison, insurance and finance charges which cost a dollar in 1967 have risen today to \$1.97; legal expenses have risen to \$2.00; and postal fees, under government supervision, have risen to \$2.22.

Many other costs have also outstripped medical costs. A dollar's worth of auto repairs in 1967 now goes for \$1.90; appliance repair has risen to \$2.00; plumbing services are up to \$2.10; house reshingling, \$2.33. Then there are the consumer products—sugar, coffee, seafood, rib roasts, bacon, ham, tuna fish, potatoes, and, of course, electricity and everything connected with energy. Even a dollar's worth of blue jeans in 1967 goes for \$1.90 today.

Consider as well, the bite the Social Security tax is taking out of consumers' paychecks. From 1967 through 1977, the maximum Social Security tax increased approximately twice as much as health care costs over the same period. And with the massive new increases enacted by Congress—the members of which, incidentally, do not have to contribute—the sky's the limit.

Nor are comparative price rises under the present system expected to be particularly dramatic, even though federal programs permit millions of poor Americans to enjoy virtually limitless access to health care. According to a projection by Predicasts, Inc., expenditures for education since 1957 will have risen in 1990 by a yearly average of 8.2 percent. Welfare costs will have risen 11.1 percent over the same period, and health care costs will fall in the middle at 10.9 percent.

If this forecast is at all accurate, the situation seems much less alarming than Califano would have it. But Califano is not interested in figures that undermine his case, and he chooses his statistics carefully. Thus, whenever he complains about rising costs, he goes to the Social Security Administration's compilation of health care statistics for 1975 and 1976. These are two good years, for the statistics, if taken alone, do seem to demonstrate that health care costs are the major problem.

But what Califano and others who single out these two years do not discuss is that the size of the figures is due not so much to costs out of control as to costs under controls—the Nixon controls, that is, which remained in effect in the health care field a year after they were lifted in most others.

Thus in 1975, the first full post-control year, medical care costs as recorded on the CPI shot from 5.7 to 12.5 percent—certainly an alarming statistic when taken in isolation. But in 1974, the year in which the rest of the economy was freed from controls, the CPI for all items jumped from 4 to 9 percent, and in 1975 it climbed to 11 percent. In 1976, the third control-free year, the CPI for all items levelled off at 7.1 percent. In the same year, the second year in which health care costs were free from controls, the medical care component of the CPI dropped from 12.5 to 10.1 percent.

Economists call this phenomenon of post-control prices rising to their natural level a "bulge." The bulge is commonly thought to subside after two years. But in the case of the CPI for all items, it was a three-year process, while the figures for 1975 and 1976 cover only the first two years of the health care component bulge. Thus, the relevant comparisons would be between 1974 and 1975, and between 1975 and 1976. When one compares the figures year for year, as Califano does, the comparison between the cost of medicine and the cost of everything else must inevitably be distorted.

In fact, if one stretches the span out a bit the results are quite different. If, for instance, one averages the medical price rise

between 1973 and 1976, and then compares that increase with the rise in costs of all other items, the rate of increase is almost exactly the same. All items on the CPI during that period rose 31.1 percent. Medical costs rose 31.5 percent. That means that since 1973, health care costs have risen at a rate less than one-half of one percent higher than all other items.

It is not quite fair, of course, to confine such an analysis to the 1973-1976 period. Between 1965 and 1973, for instance, health care costs rose 9.6 percent more rapidly than other costs. But these were the years of the great gathering together of federally insured patients, and that increase is directly attributable to federal programs. In any event, it is surely as fair to compare costs between 1973 and 1976 as it is to complain only about the price rises of 1975 and 1976, without acknowledging the effects of price controls.

Califano's tendency to overstate and to use statistics selectively is especially apparent in his frequent assaults on pharmaceuticals. Among all major industries, pharmaceuticals have been most successful at keeping prices down, and in terms of real dollars we are paying considerably less for our prescription drugs now than we were a decade ago. Between 1967 and 1977, according to the Social Security Administration, prices for all goods rose approximately 44 percent. During the same period, however, the price of prescription drugs rose just a bit less than 19 percent.

That figure is especially remarkable when you consider the effect of FDA regulations on the drug industry. During the mid-1960s, it cost approximately \$1.5 million to develop a new drug and win federal approval to market it. Today, that cost has risen to an estimated \$15 million. Yet in 1976, when other costs were rising 5.7 percent, drug prices rose only 3.9 percent.

Nevertheless, despite the figures, the prices of drug products are under almost constant attack in Washington. Senator Kennedy has called for (but not held) hearings on drug prices. The Naderites, in their sixties, with-it fashion, talk of "drug ripoffs." And Califano, in his peculiar rococo style, talks of "patent monopoly pots of gold at the end of the research rainbow."

In each of the areas discussed here—preventive medicine, the "drug ripoff," spiraling costs—the fashionable indictments of the present health care system collide with a collection of real-world facts. But these facts are seldom aired, for the men who set the terms of the national debate simply are not interested in hearing them. These men have been appointed to bring in a system of National Health Insurance. So the existing system is by definition bad, and anything at all is fair that might help to discredit it.

Their job is not an easy one, however. For one thing, the line shifts radically from year to year. Ten years back, when the economy was booming, we were told that although National Health Insurance would be expensive, it was necessary because many Americans were receiving unequal care. Then came Medicare and Medicaid, the problems of equity and access were alleviated, and we were told that, although we were all getting it, American medical care was shoddy and incompetently practiced; that we were not getting what we paid for; and that, although National Health Insurance would be expensive, it would enable the government to exercise control over the quality of care.

Now, however, the line has shifted again. It isn't quality we're worried about any longer. It's cost, pure and simple. Previously the approach was to try to convince us that

National Health Insurance was affordable. Now we're being told that we cannot afford not to have it.

One wishes, before Califano nationalizes our system of medicine, that he would reassure us all by pointing to just one instance in which government intrusion into the private sector has resulted in a less expensive product—or for that matter, a product of higher quality. To my knowledge, that has never happened, and it would be highly unlikely to happen in the complex field of health care.

But perhaps we needn't worry. The first target date for National Health Insurance was late 1977. Then it was moved up to mid-1978. Now Califano is talking about early 1979. In the meantime, as the projected NHI cost estimates continue to soar, the American people, already afflicted by inflation and threatened by a huge new Social Security tax bite, may decide they simply do not want to foot the bill for a nationalized system of medicine. Besides, as most Americans who think about it have come to understand, we already have a comprehensive national health care system, created by the private sector. And in comparison to the systems of those nations—especially Great Britain—where medicine has been socialized, it doesn't look bad at all. ●

#### KEEP LOBBYING DISCLOSURE BILL STRONG

#### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1978

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 and 20 the House took up H.R. 8494, the Public Disclosure of Lobbying Act. During the activities of those 2 days, the House adopted very important strengthening amendments to the bill.

One amendment requires lobbying organizations to report expenditures for grassroots lobbying activities.

Another requires lobbying organizations to disclose the names of major groups contributing \$3,000 or more to their operations.

And, a third requires organizations to disclose the names of their chief representatives, whether paid or unpaid, who engage in lobbying communications on behalf of the organization.

These improvements convert H.R. 8494 from a good bill into an effective and serious lobbying reform bill.

So, when H.R. 8494 comes before us tomorrow for further consideration, I urge my colleagues to keep these improving amendments in the bill and to reject all efforts to delete or weaken them.

H.R. 8494 strikes the necessary balance between the public's right to know who and what influences Federal law-making and the public's right to petition its elected officials and to seek redress of grievances.

It is a bill we can be proud of. Let us not change it now. ●